the east by history, and on the south by friends."

We hope that will always be the case. We hope it will be the case not only with respect to the United States, your immediate neighbour on the south, but with respect to all your southern neighbours, and ours, who are bound by the great forces of geography and history which are distinctive to the New World. But geography and history alone do not make a community, a true community must be a living entity in which the individuality of each member is a source of pride to all members, in which the unity of all is a source of strength to each. And the great community of the Americas cannot be complete without the participation of Canada. That is why we have been encouraged by the recent decisions of Canada to upgrade its participation as an observer in the Organization of American States to ambassadorial status and to apply for membership in the Inter-American Development Bank. For both of these institutions made the abstract concept of community within the Americas a living reality.

A sound concept of community is also important in another international area that we share, the Atlantic Alliance. Just one month after my inauguration as President of the United States, I observed that a new spirit of co-operation within that alliance was essential as we began a new search for co-operation between East and West. The recent agreements concerning Berlin, and the fact, for example, that thousands of families were reunited this Easter for the first time in many years, are among the first fruits of a new era of East-West negotiation.

But, as we seek better relations with our adversaries, it becomes all: the more important to strengthen the alliances with our friends. We must never forget that the strength and the unity of the West have been an indispensable element in helping to bring about the new era of negotiation with the East. That is why we began our round of summit talks last December by meeting with the Prime Minister of Canada, and then with the leaders of other close allies. This is why our East-West conversations will always be accompanied by full and genuine consultations within the Atlantic Alliance.

This alliance began as a way of pooling military resources. Today, it is a way of pooling our intellectual and our diplomatic resources as well. Like our federal approaches to nationhood, like our Canadian-American brotherhood, like our inter-American neighbourhood, the Atlantic Alliance has achieved a creative unity in which the individuality of its members is respected and advanced.

Let us now turn to the world as a whole, for this is where the

301

challenge of building a true community will be most difficult and most important. We, in Canada and the United States, have always been proud to live in what is called the New World. Today there is a new world coming for everyone who lives on this globe. It is our responsibility to make this new world a better world than the world we have known. Canadians and Americans have fought and died together in two world wars in this century. We live now in what has been called a post-war era. But mankind has known a long succession of post-war eras. And each one of them has turned out to be a pre-war era as well. The challenge we face today is to build a permanent post-war era, an era of lasting peace.

My visit to Ottawa comes midway between my visits to Peking and Moscow. In many respects these journeys are very different. In the People's Republic of China, we opened a new dialogue after 22 years of virtually no communication. In the Soviet Union, there is an opportunity to bring a continuing dialogue to productive conclusions. But in their central aim these journeys to Peking and Moscow are alike. Neither visit is directed against anyone, adversary or ally. Both are for the betterment of everyone, for the peace of all mankind. However, we must not allow the fact of summit meetings to create any unrealistic euphoria.

The responsibility for building peace rests with special weight upon the great powers. Whether the great powers fulfill that responsibility depends not on the atmospherics of their diplomacy but on the realities of their behavior. Great powers must not treat a period of detente as an interlude between periods of tension. Better relations among all nations require restraint by great nations, both in dealing with each other and in dealing with the rest of the world. We can agree to limit arms. We can declare our peaceful purposes. But neither the limitation of arms nor the declaration of peaceful purposes will bring peace if, directly or indirectly, the aggressive use of existing weapons is encouraged. The great powers have a responsibility for the aggressive actions of those to whom they give the means of embarking on such action. The great powers must use their influence to halt aggression, not to encourage it. The structure of world peace cannot be built unless the great powers join together to build it. Its strength will grow only as all nations, of all political and social systems, come to accept its validity and sustain its vitality. This does not mean the great powers must always agree.

We expect to continue to have profound philosophical and diplomatic differences with the Soviet Union and with the People's Republic of China in a number of areas. But, through opening new lines of communication, we hope to increase the chance that in the future we shall talk about our differences and not fight about them. As we have prepared for both these journeys the experience of Canada has been most helpful. I am grateful to both the Prime Minister and to the