

defence". The new Agreement recognizes that "space has become an increasingly important component of most traditional military activities", and consequently the need to defend against "a growing number of nations which have acquired or have ready access to space services which can be used for strategic and tactical purposes against our interests".

Since the new NORAD Agreement is the vehicle for possible Canadian participation in the U.S. national and theatre missile defence programs, and

since there is concern that these programs violate aspects of the ABM Treaty, and

because there were no public hearings or consultation prior to the 1996 renewal,

we ask that the Minister of Foreign Affairs consult with members of the interested and informed public as soon as possible re: the directions of the NORAD command, and the implications of the new Agreement for arms control and disarmament processes and understandings.

(Annex C)

Notes for an Address by the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, Minister of Foreign Affairs, at York University, North York, ON, October 30, 1996

"Building Peace to Last: Establishing a Canadian Peacebuilding Initiative"

Introduction

Thank you for inviting me to meet with you today. As you know, one of the commitments this government made was to open up the formulation of Canadian foreign policy to a much wider range of participants, including the academic world. That is why I have chosen to speak to you here today on what is, I believe, one of the most significant challenges we face in the post-Cold War world: building sustainable peace in countries prone to recurring cycles of violence.

In speaking with you today, I would like to outline my own thinking on why "peacebuilding" is necessary and what it means in concrete terms, recognizing that it is an evolving concept. And I would like to share with you a new initiative that we are taking as part of Canada's response to the challenge that peacebuilding poses.

New Era, New Needs

The end of the Cold War was hailed by some as the harbinger of global peace. But what it has brought us is not peace - but a new kind of war. The current crisis in the Great Lakes region of Africa is the most recent in a series of tragic internal conflicts with profound regional implications. Too many countries are caught in the trap of seemingly unstoppable repetitions of conflict within their own borders, the cost of which is measured not only in the millions of lives extinguished, but also in the despair of those who survive. In an increasingly globalized world, these crises directly or indirectly affect us all.

In Cambodia, El Salvador, the Middle East, Haiti, Rwanda and Bosnia, the international community has learned the hard way that traditional approaches to conflict resolution are not enough. There is still a clear role for the solutions that characterized the Cold War era. Canada's path-breaking contribution to international peace and security - the concept of peacekeeping - remains a key tool. But it is not the tool for preventing ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia, nor for ending hate propaganda in Rwanda, nor for getting the Palestinian Authority on its feet before the possibility of Middle East peace slips through our fingers.

The conflicts we face now are no longer purely military in nature, nor will they be resolved by military solutions alone. They occur within states, rather than between them, but they tend to spill over into surrounding regions. And they are characterized by long-term cycles of violence in the absence of the capacity to sustain a peaceful society.

The Response: Peacebuilding

The international community has begun to rethink the whole concept of security in the light of these developments. Countries such as Norway and Holland have been in the forefront of this effort, as has Canada. Out of this rethinking two key concepts have emerged: human security, and, as the means to secure human security, peacebuilding.

I have already spoken about the concept of human security, when I addressed the United Nations General Assembly this fall. The concept of human security recognizes that human rights and fundamental freedoms, the rule of law, good governance, sustainable development and social equity are as important to global peace as are arms control and disarmament. It follows from this that, to restore and sustain peace in countries affected by conflict, human security must be guaranteed just as military security must. This is where peacebuilding comes in: as a package of measures to strengthen and solidify peace by building a sustainable infrastructure of human security. Peacebuilding aims to put in place the minimal conditions under which a country can take charge of its destiny, and social, political and economic development become possible.

I see peacebuilding as casting a life line to foundering societies struggling to end the cycle of violence, restore civility and get back on their feet. After the fighting has stopped and the immediate humanitarian needs have been addressed, there exists a brief critical period when a country sits balanced on a fulcrum. Tilted the wrong way, it retreats into conflict. But with the right help, delivered during that brief, critical window of opportunity, it will move toward peace and stability.

This is not, of course, an easy thing to do. These are highly volatile situations, where the needs are many and the time to respond is short. An effective response often requires coordination among organizations - non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the military, and civilian experts - that usually work independently. It requires horizontal thinking that cuts across military,