

See: Minutes of Subcommittee No. 2
10/9/69, p. 14, Vol. XI, Tape #83
10/22/69, p. 9, Vol. XI, Tapes #84 & 85

CRIMINAL LAW REVISION COMMISSION
311 Capitol Building
Salem, Oregon

ARTICLE 28 . PROSTITUTION AND RELATED OFFENSES

Preliminary Draft No. 1; August 1969

Reporter: Roger D. Wallingford

Subcommittee No. 2

ARTICLE 28. PROSTITUTION AND RELATED OFFENSES

Preliminary Draft No. 1; August 1969

Section 1. Prostitution offenses; definitions. As used in this Article, unless the context requires otherwise:

- (1) "Sexual conduct" means "sexual intercourse" and "deviate sexual intercourse" as defined in section 1, Article 12.
- (2) "Prostitute" means a male or female person who engages in sexual conduct for a fee.
- (3) "Place of prostitution" means any place where prostitution is practiced.
- (4) "Prostitution enterprise" means an arrangement whereby two or more prostitutes are organized to conduct prostitution activities.

COMMENTARY - PROSTITUTION OFFENSES; DEFINITIONS

A. Summary

These four terms have been defined to simplify the statutory language in the prostitution sections that follow. The definitions themselves are self-explanatory. While the word "prostitution" is not itself defined, it clearly represents the activity engaged in by a "prostitute" defined as "sexual conduct" for a fee.

"Sexual conduct" is defined to include both sexual intercourse and deviate sexual intercourse, which is defined in Article 12, section 1 (2), to mean conduct between persons not married to each other consisting of contact between the sex organs of one person and the mouth or anus of another.

"Prostitute" is defined to include both heterosexual and homosexual activity, i.e., the sex of the parties to an act of prostitution is immaterial.

"Place of prostitution" refers to any "situs" where acts of prostitution are consummated.

A "prostitution enterprise" is defined to include a "string" or "group" of two or more prostitutes organized to conduct prostitution activities without a fixed operational situs.

B. Derivation

The definitions, while somewhat modified to reflect current trends in this area of the law, represent a restatement of the general law of prostitution. No particular models were relied upon in drafting the proposed definitions.

C. Relationship to Existing Law

The definitions are new to existing law.

Two major changes in the existing law on prostitution will be fashioned by the definitions applicable to "prostitute" and "sexual conduct," i.e., the law will encompass both male and female prostitutes, and the sexual activity prohibited will extend beyond ordinary sexual intercourse to deviate sexual behavior.

It might be noted that while Article 12, Sexual Offenses, proposed abolition of criminal sanctions against fornication, adultery and sexual activity between consenting adults, much of that activity will still be penalized under this Article if engaged in with prostitutes.

The substantive departures from existing law will be discussed in the commentary to the appropriate section.

Section 2. Prostitution. A person commits the crime of prostitution if he engages in or offers or agrees to engage in sexual conduct in return for a fee.

(Existing
(Law
(
(ORS
(166.060 (d)
(

COMMENTARY - PROSTITUTION

A. Summary

The origins of prostitution as a social phenomenon are now obscured by a distant past. It is obvious that there came a time in man's development when his insistent demand for sexual release was matched by a commercialized response from the female of the species. The social, moral, physical, psychological and legal problems wrought by this "conspiracy of self-interest" has continued to plague the sensibilities of man throughout history.

Research material on the subject of prostitution is voluminous; conflicting moral and legal considerations are equally abundant. While most of the civilized world continues to condemn prostitution in its varied forms, it is generally recognized that so long as the demand exists it will continue to prosper. Sustained prohibitory admonitions by church and state have failed to reform the supply or abate the demand.

In spite of prostitution's persistent will to survive, the arguments favoring continued penal legislation in the area are persuasive. Conflicting views are represented by the following authorities:

Barnes & Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology, pp. 92-96, (3rd ed 1959):

"There are two sharply divided schools of thought on handling the problem of 'the world's Oldestprofession'. The moralists and purists attack prostitution head-on, without considering the underlying causes of the trouble or the complex aftermath of their campaigns. They close up segregated districts and houses of assignation and throw the street walker in jail. They do nothing to remove the causes of prostitution; they simply spread it where it cannot be effectively controlled or inspected. But they cannot really suppress the practice, so long as the demand and the supply exists....

"These short-sighted purist campaigns have had the particularly disastrous effect of making prostitution an ideal field for syndicates. The more practical school argues that we cannot do away with the evil without removing the causes and that such causes cannot be speedily removed. Their program involves segregated districts, public licensing, thorough medical inspection, the protection of prostitutes from exploitation by irresponsible third parties, and appropriate public health education measures....

"Some of the reasons men patronize prostitutes are cogently reviewed in the Kinsey report: (Kinsey, et al, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male, W. B. Saunders Co., 1948, pp. 606-608) ... a lack of sexual outlets in other directions; it is substantially cheaper than marrying or supporting a girl; they can forget other responsibilities or worries such as fear of pregnancy...

"What is to be done with prostitutes who are sent to jails and to reformatories? Prostitution in many states is a crime. But it is absurd to round up streetwalkers, arrest and send them away for treatment, unless there is some object other than to penalize them for plying a trade that is condoned by enough people to make it profitable. Arrest is not a deterrent, for many prostitutes carry on, no matter how often they are arrested...

"Until a program can be inaugurated that will insure the elimination of the panderer and place definite control of the problem in the hands of public welfare agencies, we can expect no adequate solution of the problem of the prostitute. But prostitutes should not be sent to penal institutions, no matter how kind the superintendents are or how understanding they may be about the problem. At present, the great majority of the girls and women in our state reformatories are, or were, prostitutes. The money saved by keeping them out of these prisons could well be applied to paying the salaries of trained personnel, including case workers, psychiatrists, and medical physicians who would handle each case on its individual merits..."

Bloch, Crime in America, p. 273 (1961):

"Prostitution is essentially a social, medical and psychiatric problem, rather than a legal problem. Nevertheless, laws aimed at the procurer, transporter, operator, abductor and 'pimp' are properly in the scope of the law, as they involve exploitation. The Wolfenden Committee examined and

rejected the concept of legalized prostitution as giving an active legal sanction to a socially undesirable traffic. It considered public solicitation for immoral purposes the proper sphere of legal control, while exempting prostitution in itself from criminal responsibility because the law 'is not concerned with private morals or with ethical sanctions'." (Wolfenden Report on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution, 1957, London, England).

25 Law and Contemporary Problems, p. 223 (1960)

"Prostitution might serve as [an] example... not so much of confusion as of evasion. The 'call girl' phenomenon in America today is simply a sophistication of the older practice. Christian culture has always been two-sided about prostitution -- unfairly condemning prostitutes, while winking at or even justifying toleration of prostitutes as a necessary evil. St. Thomas Aquinas reasoned that God allows it 'lest certain goods be lost or certain greater evils be incurred'. (St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologue II-II, Qx, II). In the United States it is a criminal offense in all states, defined as the indiscriminate offer of sexual intercourse for hire; but in England, it is not in itself an offense, although certainly the law there prohibits certain features that commonly attend it, such as street and public solicitation...

"About 69% of the total male population has some experience with prostitution, but a large part have had only one or two experiences, and some 15 to 20% have relations more than a few times a year. Prostitutes account for less than 10% of the total nonmarital sexual outlet for males. (Statistics from Kinsey, et al, supra, p. 597)...

"Prostitution is opposed [in the United States] on many grounds:

"(1) the degradation of the women who engage in it;

"(2) the threat to public health because of the transmission of venereal disease;

"(3) the effect on general law enforcement through police protection;

"(4) the effect on marital relations where recourse is had to prostitution; and

"(5) the patronage of prostitutes by young persons...."

Watson, Psychology for Lawyers, p. 155 (1960):

"Lack of either outlet, prostitution or female friends, may force [the man] to express his mal-adjustments in less desirable forms of sexual conduct like pedophilia or even rape..."

In summary, the arguments in favor of continued penal repression of commercialized sex are:

- (1) Prostitution is an important source of venereal disease.
- (2) Prostitution is a source of profit and influence for criminal groups that traffic in other illegal activities.
- (3) Prostitution is a corrupting influence on government and law enforcement agencies.
- (4) Prostitution is a significant factor in social disorganization, undermining marriage, the home and individual character.

Those who favor legalization of prostitution under public supervision support their argument with the following rationale:

- (1) The law cannot eliminate prostitution.
- (2) Sumptuary laws incapable of effective enforcement encourage extortion and arbitrary prosecution.
- (3) Absence of a commercial outlet for male sexuality results in an increase in sexual crimes.
- (4) Registration and periodic health inspections best control the spread of venereal disease.
- (5) Legalized prostitution affords less opportunity for official corruption than does total repression.
- (6) The containment of prostitution to certain areas facilitates police protection for the general community.

Your reporter feels that the advocates of tolerated prostitution have yet to formulate socially acceptable alternatives to prohibitory legislation. The proposed draft, therefore, is designed to maintain the existing pattern of the law in the United States.

The traditional term "prostitute" includes only a female. In the proposed sections application to conduct of persons of the same sex or opposite sexes, conformity is sought with contemporary criminal law revisions and the Model Penal Code.

The section covers all types of commercial sexual activity, whether heterosexual or homosexual. Since commercial prostitution makes available varied forms of abnormal sexual gratification, it would be unrealistic to confine coverage to "sexual intercourse" alone.

The commercial character of the conduct prohibited is expressed in the term "for a fee." The Model Penal Code speaks in terms of sexual activity "as a business." The California and Illinois Codes use the term "for money." The Michigan and New York Codes use the term "for a fee." It was felt that "as a business" lacked clarity when applied to an isolated act of prostitution. The term "for money" may be unduly restrictive in view of other forms of valuable consideration that may bind the transaction.

B. Derivation

With minor changes, the proposed section is derived from New York Revised Penal Law section 230.00 and Michigan Revised Criminal Code section 6201.

C. Relationship to Existing Law

ORS 166.060. Vagrancy. "(1) The following described persons are guilty of vagrancy and shall be punished upon conviction by imprisonment in the county jail for a period not exceeding six months, or by a fine of not more than \$100, or both:

"(d) Every common prostitute."

In State v. Gustin, 244 Or 531, 419 P2d 429 (1966), the defendant was convicted of vagrancy by prostitution and appealed. The issue raised was whether a single act of solicitation establishes the fact that a person is a common prostitute.

The Court quoted with approval Davis v. Sladden, 17 Or 259, 21 P 140 (1889), approved in Barnett v. Phelps, 97 Or 242, 191 P 502, 11 ALR 663 (1920):

"Said Appleton, C. J.: 'A prostitute is a female given to indiscriminate lewdness for gain; it is the practice of a female offering her body to an indiscriminate intercourse with men.'

"When, then, the word 'prostitute' is applied to a woman, it is meant that she is given to the practice of offering her body to promiscuous intercourse with men for gain. Adultery may be committed by one act of illicit intercourse, but the female to whom the word 'prostitute' can be applied has only gained that character by a long continuance in the vice of lewdness..."

The Court in Gustin held that since the stipulation disclosed but a single offer of illicit intercourse, the evidence had failed to sustain the charge. The Court construed the word "common" used to describe the word "prostitute" in the statute as emphasizing the fact that the statute was directed against women who are given to the practice of offering themselves for promiscuous intercourse with men.

In State v. Perry, 86 Adv Sh 1 (1968), defendant appealed a conviction of the crime of vagrancy in being a common prostitute. Defendant contended that ORS 166.060 (d) was unconstitutionally vague, providing no standard by which the status of a "common prostitute" may be determined.

The Court pointed out that ORS 166.060 (d) does not proscribe and make punishable a specific act of prostitution; it defines the crime in terms of the defendant's status or condition. The Court held that vagrancy may be established by proof of a single act. In discussing the term "common," the Court commented:

"The feature which distinguishes a prostitute from other women who engage in illicit intercourse is the indiscrimination with which she offers herself to men for hire. The term 'common' is frequently used to describe this indiscrimination, and thus the term becomes a redundancy in the expression 'common prostitute'."

The Court then held that to the extent language in State v. Gustin could be interpreted to mean that evidence showing more than one act is necessary to establish a crime under ORS 166.060 (d), it was rejected.

The Court closed its decision with a critical analysis of ORS 166.060 (d) as applied to the crime of prostitution:

"The complexities created by the enactment of ORS 166.060 (d) as a crime of personal condition as distinguished from a crime of action present serious questions of their constitutionality as well as difficult problems of procedure and evidence and should prompt the legislature to heed the advice of Professor Sherry in Vagrants, Rogues and Vagabonds -- Old Concepts in Need of Revision, 48 Calif L Rev 537, 567 (1960):

"In these circumstances the time is surely at hand to modernize the vagrancy concept or, better yet, to abandon it altogether for statutes which will harmonize with notions of a decent, fair and just administration of criminal justice and which will at the same time make it possible for police departments to discharge their responsibilities in a straightforward manner without the evasions and hypocrisies which so many of our procedural rules force upon them. This may be done by drafting legislation having to do with conduct rather than status, legislation which will describe the acts to be proscribed with precision and which will be free of the hazy penumbra of medieval ideas of social control characteristic of existing law'."

TEXT OF REVISIONS OF OTHER STATES

Text of Model Penal Code

Section 251.2. Prostitution and Related Offenses.

(1) Prostitution. A person is guilty of prostitution, a petty misdemeanor, if he or she:

(a) is an inmate of a house of prostitution or otherwise engages in sexual activity as a business; or

(b) loiters in or within view of any public place for the purpose of being hired to engage in sexual activity.

"Sexual activity" includes homosexual and other deviate sexual relations. A "house of prostitution" is any place where prostitution or promotion of prostitution is regularly carried on by one person under the control, management or supervision of another. An "inmate" is a person who engages in prostitution in or through the agency of a house of prostitution. "Public place" means any place to which the public or any substantial group thereof has access.

Text of Illinois Criminal Code of 1961

§ 11-14. Prostitution

(a) Any person who performs, offers or agrees to perform any of the following acts for money commits an act of prostitution:

- (1) Any act of sexual intercourse; or
- (2) Any act of deviate sexual conduct.

(b) Penalty.

A person convicted of prostitution shall be fined not to exceed \$200 or imprisoned in a penal institution other than the penitentiary not to exceed one year, or both. 1961, July 28, Laws 1961, p. 1983, § 11-14.

PROSTITUTION AND RELATED OFFENSES

Text of California Tentative Draft

Section 1800. Prostitution.

Any person who solicits another to engage in or who engages in any sexual conduct with another for money is guilty of prostitution. In any prosecution for an offense under this chapter, the sex of the parties concerned is immaterial.

Prostitution is a petty misdemeanor.

Text of New York Revised Penal Law

§ 230.00 Prostitution

A person is guilty of prostitution when such person engages or agrees or offers to engage in sexual conduct with another person in return for a fee.

Prostitution is a violation. L.1965, c. 1030, eff. Sept. 1, 1967.

Text of Michigan Revised Criminal Code

[Prostitution]

Sec. 6201. (1) A person commits the crime of prostitution if he engages in or agrees or offers to engage in sexual conduct with another person in return for a fee.

(2) Prostitution is a Class B misdemeanor.

Section 3. Patronizing a prostitute. A person commits the crime of patronizing a prostitute if he:

- (1) Pays or offers to pay a fee to engage in sexual conduct with a prostitute; or
- (2) Enters or remains in a place of prostitution with intent to engage in sexual conduct.

COMMENTARY - PATRONIZING A PROSTITUTE

A. Summary

Your reporter would like to open the discussion of this section with a quote from Gebhard, et al, Sex Offenders, Harper & Row, p.10 (1965):

"An apocryphal story combining humor and truth beautifully illustrates society's divergent attitudes toward the same behavior in males and females. If a man walking past an apartment stops to watch a woman undressing before the window, the man is arrested as a peeper. If a woman walking past an apartment stops to watch a man undressing before a window, the man is arrested as an exhibitionist."

An interesting exception to this "class distinction" is found in the man who patronizes a prostitute. The patron has traditionally been immune from criminal liability, unless his conduct gave rise to some other offense, as adultery, sodomy or lewdness.

Prostitution was not a common law offense. The rationale giving impetus to such legislation was founded upon social and moral considerations reflecting a characterization of the patron as a "victim," e.g., venereal disease, corruption of the young, unhealthy reliance upon illicit sex. While moralists condemned prostitution on one hand, many secretly condoned its existence as preferable to sexual activity with "chaste and virtuous" ladies. Recognizing that men were inflicted with this chronic biological malady, public opinion unobtrusively accepted the notion that treatment was best served by women beyond the protection of "good society."

Modern criminal code revisions have rejected this double standard by enacting penal sections aimed at the patron or customer whose demand throughout history has provided the necessary support for prostitution.

The provision was first forwarded by the Model Penal Code. (See Model Penal Code section 251.2 (5)). The minutes of the ALI meeting that finally approved the section indicate that there was considerable opposition to its adoption. (See 39th ALI Proceedings, pp. 221-223 (1963)). The following excerpt reflects these opposing views:

"MR. STEINBERG: ...Section 251.2 (5) makes it a crime to patronize prostitutes. As I understand it, fornication is not a crime, and adultery is not a crime, and I think that's wise. Our New York experience with adultery is that it is unenforceable, and bad law makes bad law enforcement.

"I suggest to you that making the man a criminal in this type of activity is unwise, and as a practical matter -- I hesitate to intrude practicality on this -- you would be making the man a victim of shakedowns by either vice cops or prostitutes with little hope of getting convictions, because the man who might be called as a witness to the case would be able to plead privilege.

"It seems to me that you would not be doing violence to the whole idea of the modern view of sexual relations if you dropped this provision, and I just don't know what social concept is involved in not making it a crime to engage in fornication but to make it a crime to go to a prostitute.

"PROFESSOR SCHWARTZ: ...Now, the theory of the section is this. First of all, the patron is soliciting the commission of a crime.

"Secondly, when the police raid a house of prostitution, it is going to be a little hard to differentiate between the males who are present as participants in the operation and the males who are present as customers, and therefore we thought that it wasn't going too far to say that everybody on hand either as a customer or a participant is subject to arrest, and then they can sort them out.

"I end by saying...that if you strike it out it will not evoke tears from me.

"JUDGE BRIETEL: I won't cry...but I certainly would be unhappy. I think the point of the original provision for making the man guilty of some offense was a recognition that this was an act that involved culpability on the part of both sexes and not one, and that the culpability of this arrangement was one that led to other criminal activities, and the original old rule that the man was completely innocent of everything was very definitely based upon a very peculiar -- I hope -- standard of conduct with regard to both sexes."

The provision was then passed over the dissenting votes.

The New York Revised Penal Law and the Michigan Revised Criminal Code both adopted a provision on patronizing a prostitute. A similar provision was also adopted by Illinois. The California Proposed Penal Code Revision, section 1801, adopts the same position. The original proposed New York revision did not include the offense. The revision staff comment discloses that its adoption was the result of strongly expressed sentiment in the course of public hearings. According to the staff, "the reasons most vigorously advanced are: one, that criminal sanctions against the patron as well as the prostitute should aid in the curtailment of prostitution; and, two, that to penalize the prostitute and exempt the equally culpable patron is inherently unjust."

The New York and Michigan provision has been discussed by two prominent legal authorities, both of whom raise serious questions about the wisdom of such legislation:

32 Brooklyn L Rev (1966) (Morris Ploscowe, Member N. Y. State Bar; former City Magistrate; Adjunct Professor, N. Y. U. Law School; author of Sex & The Law and The Truth About Divorce; co-author of Cases and Materials on Family Law):

"One of the extraordinary changes in the new Penal Law is the provision which would punish the customers of prostitutes. Under section 230.05, a person is guilty of patronizing a prostitute when he pays a fee to another for sexual conduct with him or solicits or requests another to engage in sexual conduct with him in return for a fee. The offense is a violation, punishable by a fifteen day jail sentence. It is obvious that the legislature is seeking to fill our jails with short term prisoners who have committed no other offense than trying to get rid of their sexual urges by the time honored method of resorting

to a prostitute. This is stupid penology. It is also self-defeating if one is interested in the determent or prevention of prostitution. The 'John,' as the customer of a prostitute is generally known, does not usually testify against the prostitute, even when he is only a witness under subpoena, under present police procedures. He is even less likely to testify when his testimony will subject him to 15 days in jail. The result will be more dismissals of cases against prostitutes.

"Moreover, as the statute is presently phrased, a police officer on the vice squad is guilty of violating the statute when he offers a fee in return for sexual conduct. Since most prostitution cases result from direct solicitation by police officers or acquiescence in the solicitation of the woman and the agreement to pay a fee by the man, it is a little difficult to see how vice squads can effectively operate under this statute, unless courts are prepared to overlook illegal acts committed by police officers.

"It is dangerous to succumb to female propaganda with respect to the equality of the sexes when drafting penal law provisions concerning prostitution. The result as seen above may be non-enforcement of prostitution laws. Moreover, since our new Penal Law punishes acts of prostitution as a violation by a maximum of 15 days in jail, it could just as well have eliminated prostitution as an offense from the law. One cannot control prostitution with such illusory penalties..."

In 60 Mich L Rev 717-760 (1962) Mr. B. J. George, Jr., Professor of Law, University of Michigan, discusses the problem in an article entitled, "Legal, Medical and Psychiatric Considerations in the Control of Prostitution":

"Statutes which directly penalize the act of patronizing a prostitute are not common, though they do exist. More often, activity of the customer may violate a collateral statute in broad terms. Fornication statutes, where they do exist, apply to any act of sexual intercourse between persons who are not married to each other, except as the legislature or courts add the requirement of public, open or notorious cohabitation. Solicitation statutes or ordinances include the man who

initiates contact with a prostitute. Where houses of prostitution exist, those who frequent or loiter about them are guilty of a crime.

"Statutes or ordinances often penalize anyone who enters any place for purpose of illicit intercourse or lewdness. Appellate courts, however, have not shown overwhelming enthusiasm toward the application of such statutes, particularly those which penalize persons 'loitering' in a house of prostitution, or a male who has a single act of intercourse with a prostitute. Lacking any of these statutes, the male's conduct may still amount to aiding and abetting an act of prostitution, thus making him vicariously responsible for the woman's act. In any event, the invocation of these statutes is less likely to be designed to punish the male or control his future activities than it is to coerce him to cooperate with the prosecuting authorities by testifying against the woman....

"Continued application of criminal penalties ...seems inevitable. But if such an approach is taken, it must be understood that it will in fact constitute no deterrent. Puritan-minded reformers aside, no one seems seriously to contend that fear of punishment will prevent a woman from becoming a prostitute or that a fine or period of imprisonment as such will reform her. On the contrary, if a sense of isolation or immaturity is the cause of the prostitution, harsh, mechanical imposition of punishment will reinforce the basic drives and will tend to confirm the woman in her career. If an authoritarian approach is to be successful at all, it must be through its application to adolescent pre-prostitutes and sexual delinquents who, if reached through special juvenile proceedings and provided with adequate supervision, may at least in some instances be salvaged before becoming prostitutes. If these measures are ineffective, then disease prevention is the only by-product of the application of criminal penalties, and this might be better accomplished through administrative, civil or quasi-criminal proceedings than through the gristmill of metropolitan criminal courts....

"Prostitution exists because there is a demand for it; in theory, if the demand was eliminated the institution would decline in significance or disappear entirely. The demand, however, continues to a degree in modern society, not subject entirely

to control through social disapproval, particularly in metropolitan areas in which the conduct of any given individual is not likely to come to the attention of or be particularly a matter of concern on the part of others. Legislatures, therefore, continue to invoke criminal penalties directly or indirectly against the customer. Insofar as patronage of prostitutes is an accepted local custom, legal doctrine will not accomplish much in practice ...one may reasonably conclude that the customer will not be deterred by the threat of or reformed by the application of criminal penalties...

"Arrests of customers are made in most instances with no expectation that an actual criminal prosecution will be carried through, but only as an inducement to the male to cooperate in convicting the woman. Not only does this reinforce the man's pattern of conduct by reducing such anxiety or guilt reactions as he may have, but it also reinforces the woman's hostility toward society when she finds that the man...goes free while she is made to suffer...

"About all that can be said for punishment of the customer is that both prostitute and customer perforce need to be cautious in their negotiations and that this may be incentive for the male to engage in extra-marital sexual relations with women with whom he is already in contact in some other context.

"Society's only effective step in controlling the customer is to do what it can to encourage normal sexual adjustment, which if successful will eliminate both the potential customer and the potential prostitute."

The arguments for and against patronizing prostitution legislation may be summarized as follows:

In Support:

- (1) The equal culpability factor demands equal application of the criminal law.
- (2) The male is guilty of soliciting the commission of a crime.
- (3) If the patron is found in a place of prostitution, a patronizing statute simplifies law enforcement.

- (4) Aids in curtailment of prostitution activities.
- (5) Expression of public policy against patronizing prostitutes.

In Opposition:

- (1) Patronizing statute difficult to enforce.
- (2) Exposes the culpable patron to shake-down, extortion, blackmail.
- (3) Makes prosecution of prostitutes more difficult.
- (4) Hampers vice squad activity in controlling prostitution.
- (5) Will not act as a deterrent to the male seeking paid companionship.
- (6) Patron does not represent equal threat to social order, e.g., venereal disease, youthful sexual delinquency, involvement in other criminal activities.
- (7) Prosecution threatens stability of home and family, public exposure, damage to reputation, disgrace, divorce.
- (8) Induces men to seek other, potentially more harmful, sexual outlets; minors, adulterous relationships, incestuous alliances, use of force and violence.

Some validity can be found for each of the thirteen points advanced. Each of them are open to challenge on various grounds: moral, sociological, psychological, legal, etc.

The provision has been submitted on the basis of its acceptance by other states as reflected in recent criminal code revisions. After a comprehensive review of the subject matter, your reporter recommends against adoption of the provision. The arguments against the provision seem more persuasive than those that favor its adoption. Assuming that it would be an ineffective deterrent to patronizing prostitutes, the problems inherent in its applicability and enforcement appear to substantially outnumber any potential benefits.

It might be noted that Article 6, Inchoate Crimes, section 4, Solicitation, reads:

"A person commits the crime of solicitation if with the intent of causing another to engage in specific conduct constituting a crime or an attempt to commit such crime he commands or solicits such other person to engage in that conduct."

This provision would reach the potential patron who actively solicits an act of prostitution. It would not reach the patron who responded affirmatively to a solicitation from a prostitute.

B. Derivation

The section is derived from the California Proposed Penal Code Revision, Tentative Draft No. 2, section 1801.

C. Relationship to Existing Law

Article 12, Sexual Offenses, proposed abolition of the crimes of adultery, fornication and sodomy as between consenting adults. In the absence of these penal provisions, there is no existing criminal law directed at the adult male who engages in sexual conduct with a prostitute for money. There are, of course, a number of criminal statutes directed toward sexual conduct with minors, commercial or non-commercial. ORS 167.015 is a lewd cohabitation provision that might be applicable if the patron "lewdly or lasciviously cohabited or associated" with a prostitute.

TEXT OF REVISIONS OF OTHER STATES

Text of Model Penal Code

Section 251.2. Prostitution and Related Offenses.

(5) Patronizing Prostitutes. A person commits a violation if he hires a prostitute to engage in sexual activity with him, or if he enters or remains in a house of prostitution for the purpose of engaging in sexual activity.

Text of Illinois Criminal Code of 1961

§ 11-18. Patronizing a Prostitute

(a) Any person who performs any of the following acts with a person not his spouse commits the offense of patronizing a prostitute:

- (1) Engages in an act of sexual intercourse or deviate sexual conduct with a prostitute; or
- (2) Enters or remains in a place of prostitution with intent to engage in an act of sexual intercourse or deviate sexual conduct.

(b) Penalty.

A person convicted of patronizing a prostitute shall be fined not to exceed \$200 or imprisoned in a penal institution other than the penitentiary not to exceed 6 months, or both. 1961, July 28, Laws 1961, p. 1983, § 11-18.

Text of California Tentative Draft

Section 1801. Patronizing a Prostitute.

(1) A person is guilty of patronizing a prostitute if he offers to pay or pays money to engage in sexual conduct with a prostitute; or

(2) Enters or remains in a place of prostitution with intent to engage in sexual conduct.

Patronizing a prostitute is a petty misdemeanor.

PROSTITUTION AND RELATED OFFENSES

Text of New York Revised Penal Law

§ 230.05 Patronizing a prostitute

A person is guilty of patronizing a prostitute when:

1. Pursuant to a prior understanding, he pays a fee to another person as compensation for such person or a third person having engaged in sexual conduct with him; or
2. He pays or agrees to pay a fee to another person pursuant to an understanding that in return therefor such person or a third person will engage in sexual conduct with him; or
3. He solicits or requests another person to engage in sexual conduct with him in return for a fee.

Patronizing a prostitute is a violation. L.1965, c. 1030, eff. Sept. 1, 1967.

Text of Michigan Revised Criminal Code

[Patronizing a Prostitute]

Sec. 6205. (1) A person commits the crime of patronizing a prostitute if:

- (a) Pursuant to a prior understanding, he pays a fee to another person as compensation for that person or a third person having engaged in sexual conduct with him; or
- (b) He pays or agrees to pay a fee to another person on an understanding that in return that person or a third person will engage in sexual conduct with him; or
- (c) He solicits or requests another person to engage in sexual conduct with him in return for a fee.

(2) Patronizing a prostitute is a Class B misdemeanor.

Text of Connecticut Proposed Penal Code

§ 85. Patronizing a prostitute

A person is guilty of patronizing a prostitute when:

1. Pursuant to a prior understanding, he pays a fee to another person as compensation for such person or a third person having engaged in sexual conduct with him; or
2. He pays or agrees to pay a fee to another person pursuant to an understanding that in return therefor such person or a third person will engage in sexual conduct with him; or
3. He solicits or requests another person to engage in sexual conduct with him in return for a fee.

Patronizing a prostitute is a class A misdemeanor.

Section 4. <u>Promoting prostitution.</u> A person	(
commits the crime of promoting prostitution if he	(Existing
knowingly:	(<u>Law</u>
	(
	(ORS
	(
(1) Owns, controls, manages, supervises or	(167.230
otherwise maintains a place of prostitution or a	(167.225
prostitution enterprise; or	(167.105
	(167.110
	(167.115
	(167.120
(2) Induces or causes a person to engage in	(167.125
prostitution or to remain in a place of	(167.130
prostitution; or	(167.135
	(167.140
	(465.110-.990
	(434.070
(3) Receives or agrees to receive money or	(174.110 (2)
other property, other than as a prostitute being	(167.240
compensated for personally rendered prostitution	(
services, pursuant to an agreement or understanding that such money or	
other property is derived from a prostitution activity; or	
(4) Engages in any conduct with the intent to institute, aid or	
facilitate an act or enterprise of prostitution.	

COMMENTARY - PROMOTING PROSTITUTION

A. Summary

This section creates a single comprehensive offense covering conduct characteristic of prostitution carried on as a commercial enterprise. The proposed legislation is designed to reach the typical "panderer," "pimp" and "madam."

Within the purview of the proposed section a person promotes prostitution if he:

- (1) Provides premises or persons for prostitution purposes;
or
- (2) Causes or aids a person to engage in prostitution; or
- (3) Operates or assists in operating a house of prostitution;
or

PROSTITUTION AND RELATED OFFENSES
Preliminary Draft No. 1

- (4) Procures or solicits patrons for prostitution; or
- (5) Solicits persons to patronize a prostitute; or
- (6) Receives or agrees to receive money or property known to be derived from prostitution; or
- (7) Transports a person into or within the state with the intent of promoting prostitution; or
- (8) Does any other act with the intent of facilitating prostitution.

Section 6 of this draft, Compelling prostitution, covers specific aspects of promoting prostitution which serve as aggravating factors in increasing the punishment:

- (1) Use of force or intimidation; or
- (2) Inducing or causing a person under the age of 18 to engage in prostitution; or
- (3) Inducing or causing one's spouse or child to engage in prostitution.

Subsection (1) covers both the fixed situs and "call girl" type of prostitution activity. It extends to anyone actively participating in such an operation.

Subsection (2) is aimed at the "panderer," defined as "One who solicits for prostitutes or lewd women." (Black's Law Dictionary, p. 1265 (1951)). To "pander" has also been defined as "To entice or procure a female, by promises, threats, fraud, or artifice; to enter any place in which prostitution is practiced, for the purpose of prostitution." (See Boyle v. State, 110 Ark 318, 161 SW 1049). It should be noted that this Article does not restrict the word "prostitute" or prostitution generally to the female.

Subsection (3) is directed at the person who knowingly derives a profit from prostitution activity. It is more restricted in scope than is the usual "living off the earnings of a prostitute" statute. Traditional "pimping" statutes penalize "living or deriving support or maintenance in whole or in part from the earnings or proceeds of [a female person's prostitution]." (See Cal Pen Code 266h).

Such legislation is criticized by the Model Penal Code commentator:

"It is obvious that such laws were evolved to help prosecutors convict men believed to be engaged

in promoting prostitution, often of their wives, if there were sufficient evidence the man might be convicted of soliciting for the woman. But where evidence of soliciting or other actual complicity in prostitution is lacking, conviction can be had on proof merely that she supports him 'in whole or in part.'

"Such legislation is insupportable in principle and goes well beyond any pragmatic justification which might be urged for it. In no other instance is criminal liability based on the bare fact that one is supported by another person who gains his livelihood illegally." (MPC Commentary, Tent Draft #9, p. 180 (1959)).

Subsection (3) therefore requires the knowing receipt of money or other property upon an agreement or understanding that such benefit is derived from prostitution.

Subsection (4) is designed to reach any conduct that, in effect, aids and abets an act or enterprise of prostitution. This would include procuring prostitutes for patrons and procuring patrons for prostitutes. It would also reach transportation of persons for purposes of prostitution.

The federal Mann Act (18 USC 2421, 2422, 2423 (1951)) provides a felony penalty for anyone who transports a female across state lines for "prostitution, or debauchery or for any other immoral purpose." There is also considerable state legislation punishing the transportation into the state of females for prostitution purposes (See Md Ann Code Gen Laws, art 27, 528 (1952)) "through or across" the state.

A different question arises in connection with intrastate, or local, transportation, where the transporter knows that the purpose of the trip involves prostitution, e.g., a cab driver. A relatively disinterested person should not have to curtail his normal business practices because he knows about another's illicit pursuits. This is based upon the assumption that the transporter does not directly or indirectly promote or directly profit from the prostitution activity.

Subsection (4) therefore requires an intent to aid or facilitate prostitution, which would exclude from coverage activity incidental to the proscribed conduct.

B. Derivation

With some modifications in language and structure the section is derived from Model Penal Code section 251.2 (2) (a) through (h).

C. Relationship to Existing Law

There are eight penal statutes in the Oregon criminal code directed at the exploitation of prostitution:

ORS:

167.105: Keeping a bawdyhouse. One year, \$500 fine.

167.110: Common fame as evidence of bawdyhouse; rights of lessor.

167.115: Placing wife in house of prostitution. Wife is a competent witness against her husband. 10 years.

167.120: Living with, receiving earnings of, or soliciting for a prostitute. 15 years.

167.125: Procuring female to engage in prostitution. Five years, \$5,000 fine.

167.130: Transporting female for prostitution purposes. Five years, \$10,000 fine.

167.135: Procuring or transporting female under 18 for prostitution purposes. 10 years, \$10,000 fine.

167.140: Sufficiency of female's testimony in prosecution for encouraging prostitution. Must be corroborated by other evidence. Does not apply to ORS 167.120.

ORS 465.110 through 465.990 provides for the abatement of houses of prostitution as a nuisance. Violation of an injunction is punishable as contempt.

ORS 434.070 includes prostitutes and other lewd persons as members of the class which may be required to submit to examination by the State Health Officer. It also prohibits issuance of a certificate to a prostitute indicating freedom from venereal disease.

ORS 174.110 (2) provides that as used in the statutory laws of this state, words used in the masculine gender may include the feminine and the neuter.

ORS 167.240 prohibits inducing a minor to visit a house of prostitution. Penalty:

- (1) If a minor, \$100 fine and six months in MacLaren School for Boys.
- (2) If a corporation, \$1,000 fine.
- (3) Any other person, \$250 fine and one year in jail.

ORS 167.225: Taking away female under 16 years of age without consent of parents for purpose of marriage, concubinage or prostitution. Two years and \$500 fine.

The wide disparity in these penalty provisions is not supported by any persuasive rationale. The 15 year penalty for living with or soliciting for a prostitute seems unusually severe when the deleterious effect of that conduct is compared to conduct proscribed in other statutes.

ORS 167.115, 167.135 and 167.225 all prohibit conduct that would constitute compelling prostitution under the proposed draft.

ORS 167.125 and 167.130 proscribe conduct that would also be treated as compelling prostitution if the element of force or intimidation were involved.

State v. McGinnis, 56 Or 163, 108 P 132 (1910), held that section 1932, B & C Comp, as amended [now ORS 167.105], directed at keeping a bawdyhouse, denounced acts either of omission or commission, and that if the owner of a structure leased it for purposes of prostitution, or knew that it was being so used and interposed no objection, he is guilty under the statute.

The proposed draft makes a distinction between a person who is active in the operation of a house of prostitution and one who, as lessor or lessee, has knowledge of prostitution activities on the premises and makes no reasonable effort to halt or abate such activity. The latter conduct is covered in section 5, Permitting prostitution, and would be graded a lesser offense.

State v. Underwood, 79 Or 338, 155 P 194 (1916), held that an indictment for soliciting another on behalf of a prostitute must allege the name or identity of the prostitute so that the defendant could rebut the evidence of her alleged unlawful occupation.

In State v. Goesser, 203 Or 315, 280 P2d 354 (1955), defendant female was convicted under ORS 167.120 for receiving earnings of a common prostitute. The Court reversed on the grounds that the statute was directed solely to the conduct of a male panderer, as indicated by the language "any man". In view of this decision, the Legislative Assembly in 1955 amended ORS 167.120 to read "any person".

State v. McCowan, 203 Or 551, 280 P2d 976 (1955), held that "in a prosecution for receiving the earnings of a common prostitute, the alleged prostitute is not an 'accomplice' within meaning of the statute providing that conviction cannot be had on testimony of an 'accomplice' unless it is corroborated, since she could not be indicted and punished under the same statute which was employed against the defendant."

State v. Norris, 82 Or 680, 162 P 859 (1917), held that within section 2078, OL [now ORS 167.230], defining the crime of soliciting, procuring or enticing a child under 18 years to have sexual intercourse, the words "procure", "solicit", and "entice" each import an initial, active and wrongful effort. ORS 167.230 prohibits the procuring of a child under 18 years for immoral purposes. It would seem to cover procuring a minor for prostitution and placing such minor in a house of prostitution. The penalty is 20 years.

State v. Brown, 245 Or 245, 421 P2d 692 (1966), held that, under ORS 167.130, the failure of the transported female to consummate an act of sexual intercourse was not a valid defense, stating, "The performance or nonperformance of a separate offense by the female, while it may have been relevant in the jury's consideration of the entire transaction, is not a necessary element of the crime charged."

The proposed draft makes no substantive change in existing law. It does combine in one offense various aspects of commercialized prostitution that are presently covered in separate statutes with widely divergent penalties. It is submitted that a more realistic penalty structure will make more effective prosecution of this socially disruptive conduct.

TEXT OF REVISIONS OF OTHER STATES

Text of Model Penal Code

Section 251.2. Prostitution and Related Offenses.

(2) Promoting Prostitution. A person who knowingly promotes prostitution of another commits a misdemeanor or felony as provided in Subsection (3). The following acts shall, without limitation of the foregoing, constitute promoting prostitution:

(a) owning, controlling, managing, supervising or otherwise keeping, alone or in association with others, a house of prostitution or a prostitution business; or

(b) procuring an inmate for a house of prostitution or a place in a house of prostitution for one who would be an inmate; or

(c) encouraging, inducing, or otherwise purposely causing another to become or remain a prostitute; or

(d) soliciting a person to patronize a prostitute;
or

(e) procuring a prostitute for a patron; or

(f) transporting a person into or within this state with purpose to promote that person's engaging in prostitution, or procuring or paying for transportation with that purpose; or

(g) leasing or otherwise permitting a place controlled by the actor, alone or in association with others, to be regularly used for prostitution or the promotion of prostitution, or failure to make reasonable effort to abate such use by ejecting the tenant, notifying law enforcement authorities, or other legally available means;
or

(h) soliciting, receiving, or agreeing to receive any benefit for doing or agreeing to do anything forbidden by this Subsection.

(4) Presumption from Living off Prostitutes. A person, other than the prostitute or the prostitute's minor child or other legal dependent incapable of self-support, who is supported in whole or substantial part by the proceeds of prostitution is presumed to be knowingly promoting prostitution in violation of Subsection (2).

Text of Model Penal Code (Cont'd)

Section 251.2. Prostitution and Related Offenses. (Cont'd)

(6) **Evidence.** On the issue whether a place is a house of prostitution the following shall be admissible evidence: its general repute; the repute of the persons who reside in or frequent the place; the frequency, timing and duration of visits by non-residents. Testimony of a person against his spouse shall be admissible to prove offenses under this Section.

Text of Illinois Criminal Code of 1961

§ 11-15. Soliciting for a Prostitute

(a) Any person who performs any of the following acts commits soliciting for a prostitute:

- (1) Solicits another for the purpose of prostitution; or
- (2) Arranges or offers to arrange a meeting of persons for the purpose of prostitution; or
- (3) Directs another to a place knowing such direction is for the purpose of prostitution.

(b) **Penalty.**

A person convicted of soliciting for a prostitute shall be fined not to exceed \$200 or imprisoned in a penal institution other than the penitentiary not to exceed one year, or both. 1961, July 28, Laws 1961, p. 1983, § 11-15.

§ 11-16. Pandering

(a) Any person who performs any of the following acts for money commits pandering:

- (1) Compels a female to become a prostitute; or
- (2) Arranges or offers to arrange a situation in which a female may practice prostitution.

(b) **Penalty.**

A person convicted of pandering by compulsion shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary from one to 10 years. A person convicted of pandering other than by compulsion shall be imprisoned in a penal institution other than the penitentiary not to exceed one year or in the penitentiary from one to 5 years. 1961, July 28, Laws 1961, p. 1983, § 11-16.

§ 11-19. Pimping

(a) Any person who receives money or other property from a prostitute, not for a lawful consideration, knowing it was earned in whole or in part from the practice of prostitution, commits pimping.

(b) **Penalty.**

A person convicted of pimping shall be fined not to exceed \$500 or imprisoned in a penal institution other than the penitentiary not to exceed one year, or both. 1961, July 28, Laws 1961, p. 1983, § 11-19.

Text of California Tentative Draft

Section 1803. Promoting Prostitution.

A person is guilty of promoting prostitution who:

(1) owns, controls, manages, supervises or otherwise keeps, alone or in association with others, a place of prostitution or a prostitution enterprise; or

(2) knowingly solicits, induces or causes a person to commit or engage in prostitution or to reside in or occupy a place of prostitution; or

(3) accepts or receives money or other property pursuant to an agreement or understanding with any person whereby he participates or is to participate in the proceeds of prostitution activity.

Promoting prostitution is a felony of the third degree.

Section 1804. Abetting Prostitution.

A person is guilty of abetting prostitution who:

(1) solicits a person to patronize a prostitute; or

(2) procures a prostitute for a patron; or

(3) knowingly and for the purpose of prostitution, transports any person into, out of or within the state, or who procures or pays for the transportation of any person into, out of or within the state for the purpose of prostitution; or

(4) knowingly permits prostitution in any premises under his possession or control or fails to make reasonable effort to halt or abate such use.

Abetting prostitution is a misdemeanor.

Text of New York Revised Penal Law

§ 230.15 Promoting prostitution; definitions of terms

The following definitions are applicable to this article:

1. "Advance prostitution." A person "advances prostitution" when, acting other than as a prostitute or as a patron thereof, he knowingly causes or aids a person to commit or engage in prostitution, procures or solicits patrons for prostitution, provides persons or premises for prostitution purposes, operates or assists in the operation of a house of prostitution or a prostitution enterprise, or engages in any other conduct designed to institute, aid or facilitate an act or enterprise of prostitution.

2. "Profit from prostitution." A person "profits from prostitution" when, acting other than as a prostitute receiving compensation for personally rendered prostitution services, he accepts or receives money or other property pursuant to an agreement or understanding with any person whereby he participates or is to participate in the proceeds of prostitution activity. L.1965, c. 1030, eff. Sept. 1, 1967.

§ 230.20 Promoting prostitution in the third degree

A person is guilty of promoting prostitution in the third degree when he knowingly advances or profits from prostitution.

Promoting prostitution in the third degree is a class A misdemeanor. L.1965, c. 1030, eff. Sept. 1, 1967.

§ 230.25 Promoting prostitution in the second degree

A person is guilty of promoting prostitution in the second degree when he knowingly:

1. Advances or profits from prostitution by managing, supervising, controlling or owning, either alone or in association with others, a house of prostitution or a prostitution business or enterprise involving prostitution activity by two or more prostitutes; or

2. Advances or profits from prostitution of a person less than nineteen years old.

Promoting prostitution in the second degree is a class D felony. L.1965, c. 1030, eff. Sept. 1, 1967.

§ 230.30 Promoting prostitution in the first degree

A person is guilty of promoting prostitution in the first degree when he knowingly:

1. Advances prostitution by compelling a person by force or intimidation to engage in prostitution, or profits from such coercive conduct by another; or

2. Advances or profits from prostitution of a person less than sixteen years old.

Promoting prostitution in the first degree is a class C felony. L.1965, c. 1030, eff. Sept. 1, 1967.

Text of Michigan Revised Criminal Code

[Promoting Prostitution: Definition of Terms]

Sec. 6220. The following definitions are applicable in the following three sections:

(a) A person "advances prostitution" if, acting other than as a prostitute or a patron of a prostitute, he knowingly causes or aids a person to commit or engage in prostitution, procures or solicits patrons for prostitution, provides persons or premises for prostitution purposes, operates or assists in the operation of a house of prostitution or a prostitution enterprise, or engages in any other conduct designed to institute, aid, or facilitate an act or enterprise of prostitution.

(b) A person "profits from prostitution" if, acting other than as a prostitute receiving compensation for personally-rendered prostitution services, he accepts or receives money or other property pursuant to an agreement or understanding with any person whereby he participates or is to participate in the proceeds of prostitution activity.

[Promoting Prostitution in the First Degree]

Sec. 6221. (1) A person commits the crime of promoting prostitution in the first degree if he knowingly:

(a) Advances prostitution by compelling a person by force or intimidation to engage in prostitution, or profits from such coercive conduct by another; or

(b) Advances or profits from prostitution of a person less than 17 years old.

(2) Promoting prostitution in the first degree is a Class B felony.

[Promoting Prostitution in the Second Degree]

Sec. 6222. (1) A person commits the crime of promoting prostitution in the second degree if he knowingly:

(a) Advances or profits from prostitution by managing, supervising, controlling or owning, either alone or in association with others, a house of prostitution or a prostitution business or enterprise involving prostitution activity by 2 or more prostitutes; or

(b) Advances or profits from prostitution of a person less than 20 years old.

(2) Promoting prostitution in the second degree is a Class C felony.

[Promoting Prostitution in the Third Degree]

Sec. 6223. (1) A person commits the crime of promoting prostitution in the third degree if he knowingly advances or profits from prostitution.

(2) Promoting prostitution in the third degree is a Class A misdemeanor.

Section 5. Permitting prostitution. A person commits the crime of permitting prostitution if he knowingly permits prostitution in any premises under his possession or control or fails to make reasonable effort to abate such activity.

(Existing
(<u>Law</u>
(ORS
(167.105
()

COMMENTARY - PERMITTING PROSTITUTION

A. Summary

An active role in the management of a place of prostitution exposes an actor to criminal liability under section 4 (1) of this Article.

This section imposes an obligation upon a lessor or lessee to make reasonable efforts to abate known prostitution activity emanating from premises under his possession or control. It does not reach "negligent" conduct. It does not make it a crime for the landlord to "refuse to eject", since he has available other "reasonable" means of effecting an abatement, e.g., report to law enforcement officers.

B. Derivation

With minor changes, the section is derived from the proposed California Revised Penal Code, section 1804 (4).

C. Relationship to Existing Law

ORS 167.105 prohibits "Any person who keeps or sets up, or permits to be kept or set up, a house of ill-fame, brothel or bawdyhouse..." Violation carries a maximum penalty of one year and a \$500 fine.

State v. McGinnis, 56 Or 163, 108 P 132 (1910), held that this statute covered both acts of omission and commission, stating "if the owner of the structure should lease it for the purpose of prostitution, or know that it was being used therefor and interposed no objections, he could be convicted of the offense prescribed." (Accord: State v. Richie, 56 Or 169, 108 P 134 (1910)).

This section would continue to grade such conduct as a misdemeanor. The active involvement in a prostitution activity would be considered promoting prostitution under

section 4 (1) and graded as a felony. A justifiable basis exists for distinguishing the culpability of one who actively operates a house of prostitution from one who passively allows such an operation to continue unabated. Of course, if the landlord derives personal profit from such activity, he would be guilty of promoting prostitution under section 4 (3).

TEXT OF REVISIONS OF OTHER STATES

Text of Model Penal Code

Section 251.2. Prostitution and Related Offenses.

(2) Promoting Prostitution. A person who knowingly promotes prostitution of another commits a misdemeanor or felony as provided in Subsection (3). The following acts shall, without limitation of the foregoing, constitute promoting prostitution:

(g) leasing or otherwise permitting a place controlled by the actor, alone or in association with others, to be regularly used for prostitution or the promotion of prostitution, or failure to make reasonable effort to abate such use by ejecting the tenant, notifying law enforcement authorities, or other legally available means; or

Text of Illinois Criminal Code of 1961

§ 11-17. Keeping a Place of Prostitution

(a) Any person who has or exercises control over the use of any place which could offer seclusion or shelter for the practice of prostitution who performs any of the following acts keeps a place of prostitution:

- (1) Knowingly grants or permits the use of such place for the purpose of prostitution; or
- (2) Grants or permits the use of such place under circumstances from which he could reasonably know that the place is used or is to be used for purposes of prostitution; or
- (3) Permits the continued use of a place after becoming aware of facts or circumstances from which he should reasonably know that the place is being used for purposes of prostitution.

(b) Penalty.

A person convicted of keeping a place of prostitution shall be fined not to exceed \$500 or imprisoned in a penal institution other than the penitentiary not to exceed one year, or both. 1961, July 28, Laws 1961, p. 1983, § 11-17.

Text of New York Revised Penal Law

§ 230.40 Permitting prostitution

A person is guilty of permitting prostitution when, having possession or control of premises which he knows are being used for prostitution purposes, he fails to make reasonable effort to halt or abate such use.

Permitting prostitution is a class B misdemeanor. L.1965, c. 1030, eff. Sept. 1, 1967.

Text of Michigan Revised Criminal Code

[Permitting Prostitution]

Sec. 6225. (1) A person commits the crime of permitting prostitution if, having possession or control of premises that he knows are being used for prostitution purposes, he fails to make reasonable efforts to halt or abate that use.

(2) Permitting prostitution is a Class B misdemeanor.

Section 6. Compelling prostitution. A person commits the crime of compelling prostitution if he knowingly:

(1) Uses force or intimidation to compel another to engage in prostitution; or

(2) Causes or aids a person under the age of 18 to engage in prostitution; or

(3) Causes or aids his wife, child or stepchild to engage in prostitution.

(Existing
(Law
(
(ORS
(167.125
(167.115
(167.135
(167.230
(

COMMENTARY - COMPELLING PROSTITUTION

A. Summary

This section recognizes three types of promoting prostitution that act as aggravating factors in increasing the seriousness of the offense. It covers conduct in aid of prostitution which is accompanied by force or duress, which exploits the immature or which victimizes a dependent person.

Subsection (1) reflects the view that a prostitute's voluntary participation is a factor in measuring the culpability of the "promoter". The social and psychological factors drawing a person into a life of prostitution are complex and varied. While it is perhaps true that penal legislation will never serve as a fully effective deterrent against voluntary prostitution, the law should continue to apply its most severe penalties for forceful compulsion in this area.

Subsection (2) affirms certain public policy positions:

- (1) The immature deserve particular protection in the area of sexually orientated offenses.
- (2) As maturity increases, there is a concomitant increase in resistance to personal engagement in prostitution.
- (3) The harmful effects of a life of prostitution are cumulative and progressive; involvement at an early age make reform and rehabilitation more difficult.

The induction of a wife into prostitution has traditionally been severely penalized. Society views such conduct as grossly disruptive to the sanctity of marriage and the stability of the home. Subsection (3) extends the scope of such coverage to include children and stepchildren. It is apparent that the public policy rationale is equally applicable to this class of persons. If the child was forced into prostitution, or was less than 18 years old, the provisions of subsections (1) and (2) would apply.

B. Derivation

The basic structure of the section is derived from proposed California Revised Penal Code section 1805. (See Tentative Draft No. 2, June, 1968).

C. Relationship to Existing Law

Existing law was discussed in the commentary to section 4, promoting prostitution. The conduct covered in this section is presently prohibited by three Oregon statutes:

ORS 167.125, Coercing female to engage in prostitution.
Five year maximum.

ORS 167.115, Placing wife in house of prostitution.
Ten year maximum.

ORS 167.135, Procuring female under 18 for prostitution.
Ten year maximum.

Under the proposed Article on prostitution, these offenses would not be limited to females, i.e., it would be a crime to coerce a male into prostitution, or to cause a minor male to engage in prostitution. The term "wife" was not changed to "spouse" in the proposed section, since it is highly unlikely that a wife would cause or aid her husband to engage in prostitution. Coverage is provided for a mother who causes her child or stepchild to engage in prostitution.

TEXT OF REVISIONS OF OTHER STATES

Text of California Tentative Draft

Section 1805. Compelling Prostitution.

A person is guilty of compelling prostitution who:

- (1) by force, threat or duress compels another to engage in prostitution; or
- (2) causes or aids a person under the age of eighteen to commit or engage in prostitution; or
- (3) causes or aids his wife, child or any person whose care, protection or support he is responsible for, to commit or engage in prostitution.

Compelling prostitution is a felony of the third degree.

Other:

See also Text of Revisions of Other States under section 4, promoting prostitution, pages 28 through 32 of this draft.

Section 7. Promoting and compelling prostitution;
corroboration. A person shall not be convicted under
sections 4 and 6 of this Article solely on the
uncorroborated testimony of the person whose
prostitution he is alleged to have promoted or
compelled.

(Existing
(Law
(ORS
(167.140
(136.550
(

COMMENTARY - PROMOTING AND COMPELLING PROSTITUTION;
CORROBORATION

A. Summary

This section continues the corroboration requirement in existing law for felony crimes in this area. The corroboration rule is usually not applied in other areas of sexual misconduct. As noted in the commentary to the Sexual Offenses Article:

"...Seduction statutes usually, rape statutes occasionally and sodomy and indecent exposure cases hardly ever, require that the complainant's testimony be corroborated. If such corroboration defense is to be allowed at all there is validity for applying it to all sex offenses. Wigmore disapproves of corroboration requirements in general on the ground that they are unnecessary because (1) jurors are naturally suspicious of such complaints and (2) the court has the power to set aside a verdict for insufficient evidence. 7 Wigmore Evidence, s. 2061 (3 ed 1940); 60 ALR 1124, 62 Yale LJ 55 (1952).

"While a general caution against convicting on the bare testimony of the complainant has validity, it would seem that the emphasis would be better placed on the credibility of the complainant than on the mere weight of evidence. If the testimony of the complainant is credible it should be sufficient. Note, 18 Ore L Rev 264 (1939)."

The proposed draft on Sexual Offenses did not include a corroboration requirement.

It is reasonable to assume that the false complainant presents a problem in all areas of sexual offenses, including prostitution. Your reporter feels, though, that a corroboration requirement for prostitution offenses does not create a palpable inconsistency. Certain distinctions may legitimately be drawn between promoting and compelling prostitution and other sexual offenses. There is a commercialized aspect of prostitution that supports corruption for profit; the thrust of social disapproval is directed not at the sexual conduct itself, but towards the environment in which it thrives.

The ordinary complainant in a sex case has been victimized by an isolated criminal act; corroborating evidence is often sparse or nonexistent. To make out the crime of promoting or compelling prostitution an additional affirmative act must be shown -- the act of prostitution itself. It is not an unreasonable burden upon the state to prove by independent evidence that an act of prostitution was, in fact, committed.

Since the Attempt Article relates to the substantive offense attempted, it is presumed that the corroboration rule would apply equally to an attempt to promote or compel prostitution.

B. Derivation

The section is derived from New York Revised Penal Law section 230.35.

C. Relationship to Existing Law

ORS 167.140. Sufficiency of female's testimony in prosecution for encouraging prostitution. Upon a trial for inveigling, enticing or taking away an unmarried female for the purpose of prostitution, the defendant cannot be convicted upon the testimony of the female injured unless she is corroborated by other evidence tending to connect the defendant with the commission of the crime.

State v. McCowan, 203 Or 551, 280 P2d 976 (1955), held that this section did not apply to ORS 167.120, Living with, receiving earnings of, or soliciting for a prostitute.

ORS 136.550 requires that the testimony of an accomplice be corroborated by other evidence tending to connect the defendant with the commission of the crime.

State v. Barnett, 86 Adv Sh 131, 436 P2d 821 (1968), held that only those who could be punished for the crime for which accused is tried are accomplices.

A prostitute would therefore not be an accomplice to the crime of promoting or compelling prostitution.

State v. Caldwell, 241 Or 355, 405 P2d 847 (1965), held that evidence adequate to support a conviction is not essential to constitute corroboration; it is sufficient to meet the requirements of the statute if it fairly and legitimately tends to connect the defendant with the commission of the crime.

The proposed corroboration requirement broadens ORS 167.140 to include the crime of receiving the earnings of or soliciting for a prostitute. This would, in effect, negate the holding in State v. McCowan. If a corroboration rule is required in this area at all, no logical basis exists for the distinction drawn in ORS 167.140.

TEXT OF REVISIONS OF OTHER STATES

Text of New York Revised Penal Law

§ 230.35 Promoting prostitution; corroboration

A person shall not be convicted of promoting prostitution or of an attempt to commit the same solely on the uncorroborated testimony of a person whose prostitution activity he is alleged to have advanced or attempted to advance, or from whose prostitution activity he is alleged to have profited or attempted to profit.
L.1965, c. 1030, eff. Sept. 1, 1967.

Section 8. Evidence. On the issue of whether a place is a place of prostitution as defined in subsection (4) of section 1 of this Article, its general repute and the repute of persons who reside in or frequent the place shall be competent evidence. In any prosecution under subsection (3) of section 6 of this Article, a wife is a competent witness against her husband.

(Existing
(Law
(ORS
(167.110
(167.115
(139.320

COMMENTARY - EVIDENCE

A. Summary

Special evidence rules for admission of reputation of alleged houses of prostitution, as well as incriminating testimony against a spouse, are common legislation in the field of prostitution. (e.g., Ohio Rev Code Ann 2905.25 (1953); Ga Code Ann 26-6206 (1953); Wis Stat 944.35 (1957)).

Abrogation of the common law privilege of the defendant to bar his spouse from testifying against him has special utility in prosecuting pimps and panderers who not infrequently are married to the prostitute. See Wyatt v. United States, 263 F2d 304 (5th Cir 1959), sustaining admissibility of the wife's testimony, without the aid of a statute, on the basis that even under common law a wife could testify against her husband as to offenses of which she was the victim. There was no evidence in the case that Wyatt's prostitute wife was anything but a willing collaborator with him.

B. Derivation

With substantial structural changes, the section is derived from Model Penal Code section 251.2 (6).

C. Relationship to Existing Law

ORS 167.110, Common fame as evidence of bawdyhouse: "In all prosecutions under [this statute], common fame is competent evidence in support of the indictment."

PROSTITUTION AND RELATED OFFENSES
Preliminary Draft No. 1

The species and quantum of proof necessary to sustain a conviction under this statute has been twice discussed by the Oregon court:

State v. Thomas, 56 Or 170, 108 P 135 (1910), "Though the character of the house [of ill-fame] and the right to its possession depended upon evidence of common fame, such general reputation, if believed beyond a reasonable doubt, was sufficient to establish the averments of the indictment."

State v. Gold, 133 Or 635, 290 P 1093 (1930), "Evidence of possession of premises by defendant charged with maintaining house of prostitution held sufficient to take case to jury. Acts of defendant charged, in exercising authority over premises and directing and discharging employees, implied that she was in possession."

ORS 167.115, relating to placing a wife in a house of prostitution, states: "In all prosecutions under this section a wife is a competent witness against her husband."

ORS 44.040. Confidential communications. "(a) ...A wife shall not be examined for or against her husband without his consent."

State v. Luper, 49 Or 605, 91 P 444 (1907), held that ORS 44.040 providing that neither husband nor wife shall be examined as to any communication made by one to the other does not apply to criminal proceedings.

ORS 139.320, Husband or wife as witness. "In all criminal actions in which the husband is the party accused, the wife is a competent witness...; but neither husband nor wife in such cases shall be compelled or allowed to testify in such cases unless by consent of both of them... provided, that in all cases of...other unlawful act committed against any minor child of either or both of the parties,...husband or wife shall be allowed to testify against the other."

In State v. LeFils, 209 Or 666, 307 P2d 1048 (1957), the Supreme Court construed ORS 139.320 as it relates to compelling a non-consenting wife to testify over her husband's objections:

"The effect of this statute is 'to remove the subject matter from the field of incompetency of witnesses as at common law and to transfer it to the field of privilege', (State v. Dennis, 177 Or 73, 97, 159 P2d 838, 161 P2d 670 (1945))...except in the instances mentioned in the provisos to this statute, either party may be a witness when the

other is the accused, if both have actively consented...Had the legislature intended that the witness-spouse should be compellable in the proviso, the word 'competent' or the word 'compelled' would have been used..."

Another instance of removal of this privilege is found in ORS 167.625, Special rules of evidence for nonsupport sections:

"(3) No provisions of law prohibiting the disclosure of confidential communications between husband and wife apply. A wife is a competent and compellable witness."

TEXT OF REVISIONS OF OTHER STATES

Text of Model Penal Code

Section 251.2. Prostitution and Related Offenses.

(6) Evidence. On the issue whether a place is a house of prostitution the following shall be admissible evidence: its general repute; the repute of the persons who reside in or frequent the place; the frequency, timing and duration of visits by non-residents. Testimony of a person against his spouse shall be admissible to prove offenses under this Section.

Text of California Tentative Draft

Section 1806. Evidence.

On the issue whether a premise is a place of prostitution the following shall be admissible evidence: its general repute and the repute of the persons who reside in or frequent the place. In a prosecution for any offense defined in this chapter, the privileges defined in Evidence Code Sections 970, 971 and 980 do not apply.