



## PRESS RELEASE

For immediate release

April 23, 2013

Ottawa – In the context of the present controversial debate and imminent vote on Bill S-7 (*Combating Terrorism Act*), the International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group makes a last appeal to Members of Parliament to reject the proposed legislation.

The ICLMG opposes the reintroduction of the two provisions of the 2001 *Anti-Terrorism Act* that were subject to a sunset clause: the "investigative hearings" and the "preventive arrest" provisions (section 10). These provisions expired in February 2007 when a majority of Parliament, including 90 Liberal MPs, voted against their prolongation. Six years later, nothing justifies their reintroduction.

“In the aftermath of the Boston Marathon bombing, we appeal to Members of Parliament to not give in to fear,” said Roch Tassé, National Coordinator for ICLMG. “The *Anti-Terrorism Act* was adopted in a rush after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States. Let’s not repeat the same mistake. A more rational assessment of the proposed legislation, one that is not grounded in fear, makes it obvious that the controversial provisions are neither necessary nor effective to confront terrorism.”

He added that “It is highly likely that these provisions, while unnecessary, could target innocent individuals, lead to violations of rights and freedoms and bring into disrepute the administration of justice in Canada.”

Dominique Peschard, co-chair of ICLMG and president of La Ligue des droits et libertés, said that “the Criminal Code, prior to the adoption of the *Anti-Terrorism Act* in 2001, was already an effective tool to counter terrorism and these two provisions were never once used for their intended purpose. As confirmed by yesterday’s events - the arrest of two terrorist suspects in an alleged plot to derail a VIA passenger train - every major criminal terrorism-related incident in Canada since 2001 has been disrupted and prevented without the need for preventive detention or investigative hearings. Reliance on arbitrary powers and a lower standard of evidence can never replace good, effective police work.”

ICLMG is also concerned that the two provisions rest on the very broad definition of what constitutes a terrorist activity and of what constitutes participating in such an activity. As a result, they could allow for arresting and compelling to testify people involved in lawful activity and legitimate political dissent.

-30-

For more information, contact:

Anne Dagenais Guertin  
Communications and Research Coordinator  
International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group  
613-262-4729