

NEW PROSTITUTION LAW

No law on prostitution, whether to legalize it, or to decriminalize it (regulate it), can make it a safe activity, and it ultimately results in higher rates of human trafficking, sexual exploitation and violence.

In December, 2013, in a legal challenge (*Bedford v. Attorney General of Canada*), the Supreme Court of Canada struck down Canada's prostitution law.

According to this decision, the federal government was required to create a new prostitution law within one year, that is, by December, 2014. If it failed to do so, there would then be no law at all restricting prostitution in Canada. Therefore, a law on the complex social issue of prostitution, which has troubled society for thousands of years, had to be crafted by the Conservative Government in just a matter of months in order to ensure it passed both the House of Commons and Senate by the December deadline. The government was further challenged by the restrictions placed on it by the Supreme Court decision in the *Bedford* case.

No law on prostitution, whether to legalize it, or to decriminalize it (regulate it), can make it a safe activity, and it ultimately results in higher rates of human trafficking, sexual exploitation and violence. Because of this, and the need to protect vulnerable individuals, such as aboriginal women, the government had to quickly search for a solution. It did so by choosing to target the purchasers of sex (the johns), but not the prostitute her/himself for selling sex.

As a result, this legislation attempts to protect prostitutes, who are usually involved in this activity because of past abuse, addiction, extortion, intimidation, human trafficking or poverty. This legislation also bends over backwards to protect children from prostitution.

It is likely that this new law will be legally challenged in due course. The government, no doubt, is well aware of this fact, but it will take at least five years for such a legal challenge to reach the Supreme Court of Canada. The latter, as is its usual practice, will likely overturn the new law on prostitution since this law does not conform to its own liberal views. It will drum up some "constitutional" reasons to buttress its decision to strike the law down. In the intervening period before this occurs, the government will, at least, have time to study the issue in greater depth in order to develop a stronger, more effective law. In the meantime, this new prostitution law will remain in effect.



› This cartoon by Gary Clement first appeared in the *National Post*, on June 5, 2014.

CONTENTS

THE NEW PROSTITUTION LAW	PAGE 1
CANADA'S LEADERSHIP ROLE ON MATERNAL & CHILD HEALTH CARE	PAGE 2
PORNOGRAPHY: EVERYWHERE	PAGE 3
AN EQUAL PARENTING LAW —A NECESSITY	PAGE 4
HOMOSEXUALS' PHONY VICTIM GAME RE: SUICIDE	PAGE 6

The key provisions of the new prostitution law include:

- Targeting the purchasers of sexual services (the johns) with penalties from a \$500 fine to five years in prison or ten years if the prostitute is under 18 years of age;
- Criminalizing those who benefit financially from the exploitation of prostitutes, i.e. pimps, sex traffickers and others, such as escort agencies, massage parlors, or strip clubs, who procure others for the purpose of prostitution. It exempts, however, such individuals as physicians, pharmacists, accountants or bodyguards, and taxi drivers, etc. who receive payment for providing their specific services to prostitutes in circumstances that do not involve exploitation.
- Prohibiting advertising whether online (websites) or in the print media for sexual services, with imprisonment penalties from 18 months to five years maximum. The exception to this prohibition on advertising is that prostitutes themselves will be permitted to advertise. The legislation, however, does not specify in what manner prostitutes may advertise their services. Will such advertising by a prostitute be permitted in newspapers, magazines or on the internet? Will it be permitted on billboards, which could display eye-catching scantily clad women with their telephone number or online address? How can there be assurance that such advertisements will not be seen by those under 18 years of age? This aspect of a prostitute advertising services should be clarified in the legislation before it is passed into law.
- Prohibiting the selling of sexual services in public places where a child, 18 years or younger, may be

expected to be present, such as malls, school grounds, recreation centers, pools, parks, religious institutions and residential streets. According to Justice Minister Peter MacKay, a “public place” will be determined on a case by case basis;

- Increasing the penalties related to child prostitution from five years to ten years maximum;
- Providing \$20 million to fund programs to help sex workers get out of prostitution: who will operate such programs? Will agencies operated by prostitutes themselves have access to these funds? How will these programs be monitored, and by whom?

There is no doubt that the government faced a difficult challenge in creating this new prostitution law which, as stated in the preamble of the Act, is to “protect human dignity and the equality of all Canadians by discouraging prostitution, which has a disproportionate impact on women and children”.

It would, perhaps, have been preferable if the legislation had made prostitution itself illegal so that, when prostitutes are charged with the offence of prostitution, they could be given the option of treatment for alcohol or drug addiction or retraining, etc. Such options are provided to drug addicts in the drug courts. If the convicted addict takes treatment, the charges are stayed. This could have been a solution to the prostitution issue, and would have answered the justifiable concerns of protecting and assisting vulnerable prostitutes. Perhaps such a law may be drafted in the future.

In the meantime, although this new legislation is not perfect, it seems, at least, to have attempted to meet the challenge of protecting vulnerable women and children. †

CANADA'S LEADERSHIP ROLE ON MATERNAL & CHILD HEALTH CARE



[Harper] stated that Canada was striving to be a consensus builder, and funding abortion

made it more challenging to rally others to the cause, as many, ... did not accept abortion.

Under the former Liberal government, Canada's foreign aid carried heavy baggage in that it was loaded down with ideological demands accompanying the grants. Demands on countries receiving foreign aid included: insistence that they implement policies on contraception, feminism (empowerment of women and gender equality) and abortion. This was demanded even though such policies were contrary to the faith and culture of many of the Third-World recipients.

When the Conservative government assumed power, it began to change the hefty weight carried by the ideological demands placed on foreign aid. Instead, it insisted that Canadian foreign aid should become “hands-on”, providing tangible, measurable, financial support, addressing the country's real needs and not trying to change the recipient country's fundamental beliefs. Nowhere was this new foreign aid policy more apparent than with the initiative first proposed by Prime Minister Harper at the G8 meeting held in Muskoka, Ontario, in June 2010. This initiative provided positive hands-on policy on maternal and child health care which included clean water, immunizations and better nutrition, as well as the training of health care workers, etc.

At that time, the Prime Minister pledged \$2.85 billion between 2010 and 2015. By May, 2014, 80% of the pledge had been disbursed.

The media, the opposition political parties, and left-wing NGO's (non-government organizations) were incensed that Mr. Harper refused to include abortion in the funding package. The Liberals confidently brought a motion before the House of Commons in March, 2010 which included abortion in the maternal health package. They anticipated that this would easily pass, and Mr. Harper, at the very least, would be severely embarrassed by his supposedly narrow, regressive view of excluding abortion from the maternal health initiative. The motion, however, failed 144–138. Three Liberal MP's were so disgusted with their own party's motion that they voted "no", and dozens of Liberal MP's stayed away from the vote.

The maternal health care initiative has now become Canada's top development project. There cannot be any doubt that there is a deep need for this initiative, since globally, 6.6 million children die each year from preventable and curable diseases such as pneumonia, diarrhea, malaria and measles; 2.6 million babies are stillborn, and approximately 300,000 mothers die during pregnancy and delivery each year. As Mr. Harper mentioned, some interventions have minimal cost to us, but do make an enormous difference. For example, the provision of vitamin A capsules to a child costs only .04¢ per year per child, but reduces mortality by 25%.

After the G8 Summit in 2010, in order to keep the issue on the global agenda, Mr. Harper co-chaired a UN Commission in New York City in 2013 on accountability and transparency so as to monitor the progress of the maternal health initiative by having nations gather health data on it on the grounds that there must be assurance that the money is going into the right pockets. NGO's who received funding were also required to submit reports on their progress and other significant data.

TORONTO SUMMIT ON MATERNAL & CHILD HEALTH, MAY, 2014

In order to keep this initiative ongoing, and to renew its funding, the government held a Summit on Maternal Health Care in Toronto on May 28 to May 30, 2014. The Summit

was called "Saving Every Woman, Every Child Within Arm's Reach". This Summit attracted some of the world's movers and shakers such as the Aga Khan, Queen Rania, Al Abdullah of Jordan, UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon, Melinda Gates, co-chair of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (the wealthiest philanthropic organization in the world), heads of the World Bank, and UN World Health Organization (WHO), the Executive Director of UNICEF and Jakaya M. Kikwete, President of Tanzania.

ABORTION TOO DIVISIVE

During the Summit, Mr. Harper stated that abortion was too divisive an issue to include in the maternal and child health package. He stated that Canada was striving to be a consensus builder, and funding abortion made it more challenging to rally others to the cause, as many donor countries, as well as recipients of the funding, did not accept abortion.

He also pledged another \$3.5 billion over five years (2015–2020) to improve the health of mothers and children. This funding, he said, would focus on combatting diseases by way of immunization, nutrition and health systems as well as collecting needed statistics to show that the money is being well spent. It will also be used for statistics, providing technology to register the births and deaths of millions of babies each year which now go undocumented.

Melinda Gates thanked Canada and Mr. Harper for his leadership in this initiative, as did the pro-abortion head of UNICEF, Dr. Margaret Chan, and UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon. Even the pro-abortion "red" Toronto Star, in an editorial on May 30, 2014, congratulated Mr. Harper for his persistence and leadership and "staying the course" while rallying the world to this life-saving cause.

As Mr. Harper stated during the Summit, "...our success is not measured in money spent, but on the number of lives saved." That is happening, thanks to Mr. Harper's determination to directly help women and children in the developing world. †

PORNOGRAPHY: EVERYWHERE

BY: KATHY WOODCOCK —MOTHER OF TWO SONS.

Is it time for Moms to take up placards against booksellers who would deliberately expose children to pornography for the sake of profit?

The sudden death of a popular high school principal in a Canadian city last year shook up the school community. Rumours circulated for months that it was the popular new book **Fifty Shades of Grey** that had led to the death. Those of us who knew nothing about that ignominious title, went straight to our device for reading digital books, Kobo, to see for ourselves what possible connection there could be. This book has been a run-away best seller, mass-marketed

by Costco and every major book chain. It is, apparently, the single most frequently left behind item in hotel rooms. One broadcaster cited the figure 50,000 copies of this book left behind in hotels and motels world-wide in 2012.

Why would people ditch a \$25 book? A likely answer is that they would be ashamed to have it in their homes or reluctant to place it in the vicinity of their kids. The book is a serialized tale of bondage and domination sex with strong fairy tale elements: a Cinderella type main character swept off her feet and whipped mercilessly by a handsome, billionaire prince compelled to rough foreplay by a twisted and damaging erotic relationship in his past. It has spawned scores of sado-masochistic tales, now cleverly packaged with

attractive, neutral covers and marketed as “romance”, all readily available at every Chapters and Indigo outlet. Many of them, by authors such as Maya Banks, Opal Carew, Leigh Leighton and Shayla Black, involve questionable consensual sex with multiple partners. Looking at their pretty jackets, on offer near the groceries at the supermarkets, you’d never guess they’re cleverly sanitized tales of rough sex and gang rape. Why, they even contain disclaimers indicating all characters depicted are of legal age so that they can fly under the radar of censors.

But could reading such books really lead to death? Sadly, they appear to be the inspiration for several accidental hangings and one German woman’s death from out-of-control whippings by her otherwise non-murderous boyfriend; all documented through the efforts of the search engine that never sleeps: Google Inc.

Now, normally, I would shrug and think: Gee, how sad for those people. But the death of my son’s school principal occurred close to a period of high profile media coverage of gang rape stories carried across North America. It led me to wonder: was it a coincidence that books celebrating rough sex were being made readily available through popular outlets and the internet, at the same time as the Stuebenville rapists are convicted and Rehtaeh Parson’s suicide story from Nova Scotia gains prominence? I don’t think so. And the more important question is this: why are we heading in this direction? What are the cultural triggers provoking such behaviours and why are we seeing such an explosion of porn available in pretty packages at the drug store and on iPad screens?

I am not a prude but I must confess to being aghast when I first started clicking links on my e-reader. “Fifty Shades” and its connected subject matter takes you instantly to a realm of pornography that few of us ever imagined existed. There are tales of every sordid, debauched situation imaginable and then some. I won’t tell you what the aliens do with their tentacles in the science fiction versions, but you better hope your 14 year old doesn’t find out ahead of you. The sub-genres cover medical exploration, farms and breeding, biker,

historical, cheerleader, bankers, mafia, babysitters, police and even preachers gone wrong. All without filters.

There are many households like mine, where e- books are shared between devices with one account holder. Parent controls do not exist and there is no way to limit searches. Once you start clicking the links into erotica sub-genres, your system becomes corrupted and “defaults” to those so that subsequent searches for items like, Peter Rabbit, will provide a stream of offensive bunny tales the like of which no child should be exposed. The propensity of Google to store information about personal searches means that an inquisitive foray into “Fifty Shades” territory will see your recommended list become overrun with adult fiction suggestions you simply don’t want your children to ever see.

But will you have a choice? As Costco, Kobo and the grocery stores are now marketing “Porn as Norm”, my teen and yours are going to be exposed, it’s just a matter of when. If you give them their own reader, there is every possibility that they will accidentally click on drastically inappropriate and disturbing material, much like what the cable companies are delivering to television screens in the multi-channel packs.

What to do about it is the next big question. There does seem to be a rather nasty corporate agenda at work of which concerned parents need to take note. Product placement is everything in retail sales. Since being alerted to this issue and these materials, I now check at bookstores I patronize. Often, adult erotica is placed next to sections recommended for teen girls. When I complained about this to my local Chapters manager, the adult erotica got moved—right next to the pretty blank journals—also purchased by young women. The internet controls recommended in Britain by Prime Minister Cameron are one answer. Regardless, as a society and as parents, we have some serious discussions about a very unpleasant matter ahead. Is it time for Moms to take up placards against booksellers who would deliberately expose children to pornography for the sake of profit? Maybe so. †

AN EQUAL PARENTING LAW —A NECESSITY

Study after study shows that it is critical for children to have both their parents closely involved in their daily lives—not just visiting, but as an immediate, fully involved permanent presence.

It is no secret that the family law and family courts in Canada are a mess. The family courts have a huge backlog caused by the traditional adversarial system of lawyers on each side, arguing on behalf of their client, for better or

worse. It gives rise to wild accusations and parental alienation caused by pitting one spouse against the other. What do the judges actually know and understand about the situation, as they struggle to figure out what is best for all the parties, or, more specifically, what is in the “best interests of the child”?

If that is the criteria, then why is it, according to Statistics Canada, that the 2011 General Social Survey on Families data reveal that after separation or divorce, 70% of children reside with their mother, with only 15% living with their father, while 9% reported that the children spent equal time living between the two parents’ homes and 8% indicated other living arrangements.

Hopefully, these statistics don't indicate that only 15% of fathers are deemed capable of looking after their own children, while 70% of mothers are regarded as the superior parent. No, it is simply easier to award the mother custody since she is usually the parent providing the most regular care for the child.

Even when the father has been granted a court order for access to his children, it is frequently not complied with. The mother need only claim that the children don't want to visit their father, and that's that. The father can bring a legal action against the mother for failure to obey the court order, or even for contempt of court—but few do so for financial as well as emotional reasons.

In addition, the family court system (including facilities, judges, court personnel, filings, therapists, mediation assessors and others), cost the Canadian taxpayer billions of dollars each year. What can never be calculated is the harm caused to the children by a separation or divorce. The children carry the sorrow of their parents' separation or divorce with them to their graves. Coping—yes, suffering—yes, surviving—yes, but at a terrible price.

Study after study shows that it is critical for children to have both their parents closely involved in their daily lives—not just visiting, but as an immediate, fully involved permanent presence. Equal parenting doesn't mean precise equality, which is not achievable anyway. Typically, parents' and children's schedules are incapable of precise measurement but it does mean shared decisions about their child's life—medical, educational, religious, sports, etc. Obviously, if one of the parents is abusive, an alcoholic or a drug addict, etc. then equal parenting should not be considered, but, otherwise, it should be a first presumption when determining custody.

BILL C-560: EQUAL PARENTING

Conservative MP Maurice Vellacott introduced Bill C-560 into Parliament which, if passed, would have required a rebuttable presumption of equal shared parenting for children of divorcing parents. This was not a new idea. In 1998, a Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons also made this sensible proposal, but it was never implemented.

Mr. Vellacott's Bill went down to defeat 80–174 on May 28, 2014. Why?

1. Resistance from the Canadian Bar Association (CBA) which argued that the bill was not in the child's "best interests". Of course, it was. The real objection for the CBA was that an equal parenting law would curtail family law litigation, which is the backbone of many legal practices. In effect, it was in the CBA's "best interests" to protect its members by maintaining the current system of adversarial litigation to settle family disputes.
2. Some of the lawyers still roaming the halls of the Justice Department are the female legal officers who

were appointed by the former Liberal government. These are feminists through and through, who glittered and shone under the light provided by former feminist Minister of Justice Anne McLellan and feminist admirer, Allan Rock. They would never accept Bill C-560 and would do all they could to derail it.

The bill was not perfect and did include some triggers to upset some, but not enough to defeat it.

The bill was defeated directly by the fact that the Conservative government ordered the Cabinet and Parliamentary Secretaries to vote against the bill, which they obediently did, although the backbenchers were given a free vote. Even the social conservative Cabinet Ministers, such as Jason Kenney, Kelly Block, Ed Fast, Rob Nicholson and Parliamentary Secretaries Paul Calandra, Bob Dechert and Kevin Sorenson voted against the bill.

What was going on with the Conservatives, who had previously passed a resolution in support of equal parenting at a policy convention in 2005? Perhaps the answer may lie in the statement made during the debate by Justice Parliamentary Secretary Bob Dechert, who said that the government would "review the custody and access provisions of the *Divorce Act* and, in so doing, will consider how it can encourage parents to rely less on adversarial processes and focus on the needs of their children". A breakthrough? Perhaps.

Also, Senator Anne Cools, undoubtedly the most knowledgeable parliamentarian on the tangled issue of family law, introduced her own bill on equal parenting in March, 2014. Senate Bill S-216 is a solid, thoughtful bill that may yet see the light of day.

Senator Cools' bill requires that no divorce will be granted unless a "parenting plan" has been provided to the court. The parenting plan sets out the responsibilities and authority of each parent with respect to the care, development and upbringing of the child of the marriage on such matters as:

- The child's place of residence or, residential schedule;
- The allocation of time spent by the child under the care of each parent;
- The allocation and exercise of decision-making authority relating to the child's education, health, and moral or religious upbringing;
- A process for resolving disputes between the parents as to the interpretation or implementation of the plan;
- A process for revising or updating the plan; and
- Any other matter relating to the child's care, development and upbringing.

Bill S-216 also provides that the dissolution of the parents' marriage does not alter the shared responsibility of the parents for the child, nor does it sever the nature of the parent-child bond. It also provides that the child has a right

to know and be cared for by each parent; the child has a right to spend time with and communicate with other persons with whom the child has a significant relationship, such as grandparents or other relatives; and that each parent retains authority and responsibility for the care, development and upbringing of the child, including the right to participate in major decisions respecting the child's health, education, and moral or religious upbringing.

In effect, this bill is excellent because it defines what is actually meant by "equal parenting".

It is hoped that Senator Cools' bill will be passed by the Senate and then referred to the House of Commons

for passage. Please [write to Senator Cools](#) to thank her for her excellent bill and to encourage her in regard to having it passed by Parliament. Her address is as follows:

Honourable Senator Anne Cools

The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A4

One thing is absolutely certain: the present, adversarial system of settling family disputes is highly damaging. According to polls, 80% of Canadians agree with this and want changes in the family court system. †

HOMOSEXUALS' PHONY VICTIM GAME RE: SUICIDE

Homosexuals have made much advancement based on their claim that they are victims of "homophobia" and "discrimination". Their argument is so common and widely accepted, that they are not even required to provide the courts with any concrete evidence of this supposed discrimination. The courts have just blindly accepted homosexual claims of discrimination. As a result, the courts have time and again amended the law to accommodate the demands of these activists, based merely on their anecdotal evidence.

It seems, however, their claims that their "victimization" leads to their high rate of suicide, are not true.

A study was published, in the April 2nd, 2014 issue of *Asia Pacific Psychiatry*, which concluded that the high rate of suicide among homosexuals is not due to discrimination or family rejection, etc., but is, in fact, due to conflicts arising from the homosexuals' own relationships with their romantic partners. That is, according to the study, a higher percentage of homosexuals took their lives because of depression or despondency caused by their stressful romantic relationships. It is well established that homosexual

relationships are far less stable than those of heterosexuals. It is this problem, experienced by homosexuals' ever-changing sexual partners, that leads to their depression and high rate of suicide.

This recent study confirms previous studies, which found that homosexuals have greater mental health problems than do heterosexuals. It is this fact that leads to their high suicide rate. For example, a study in 2001, by homosexual Theo Sandfort, a social psychologist at Utrecht University in the Netherlands, showed a much higher rate of mental disorder among homosexuals than among heterosexuals. In the Netherlands, homosexuality is much more accepted than in any other country in the world. That is, the social climate toward homosexuality in the Netherlands has long been and remains considerably more tolerant than elsewhere in the world. Yet, the suicide rate among homosexuals in the Netherlands remains conspicuously high.

Maybe it is time for homosexual activists to stop trying to pull the wool over the public's eyes, by claiming homophobia: Instead, they should look to themselves for their own failures. †

MESSAGE BOARD

- Please remember to [renew](#) your membership for 2014. \$30/yr or \$50/yr for a group. Check your address label for your expiry date or phone our Ottawa office.
- If you are a member of a service group or church group or a business looking for a worthwhile organization to make a [donation](#) to, please consider REAL Women of Canada as a recipient.
- Social media is an important way to let others know about REAL Women of Canada. Check out our media releases and articles on our [Facebook](#) page, Like them and share them with your contacts.

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 • 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 or by mail. Thank you.