

Jan. 29 / Administration of George Bush, 1991

evision. Prior to his address, the President attended a reception in the Speaker's Conference Room hosted by the congressional leadership. Parts of this address could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Foreign Minister Antonios Samaras of Greece

January 30, 1991

Q. When are you coming to Greece, Mr. President?

The President. Well, let me say I'm looking forward to coming to Greece. And I want to tell the Foreign Minister that I'd like very much to have the Prime Minister come here, because we have a strong relationship with Greece. We're delighted with the cooperation we are receiving. I view it as a partnership.

And I don't know exactly on timing because we've had to delay a trip that might well have tied into a stop in Greece. But I hope you will tell the Prime Minister that—one, of our gratitude for the wonderful cooperation in this partnership approach we've got; two, of our commitment to Greece, longstanding, and to its security and to its prosperity.

And I guess, really, my message to the Greek people would be one of gratitude for its steadfast standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States and many other countries in standing up against the aggression that Saddam Hussein has perpetrated.

So, Greek-American relations are in good shape. And what we're going to talk about is how to make them even better, if we can.

Q. Mr. President, does your resolve for implementation of all U.N. resolutions include the Cyprus issue as well?

The President. Well, we've been looking at that for a long, long time. Quite clearly, it's not something that the United States can do. We've long favored support for the Secretary-General's initiative.

But that's the last question I'll take—a very good one and an issue that I hope can be resolved. We've got a full-time, a very able Ambassador who remains involved on it in multilateral—Mr. Ledsky. We have a good Ambassador in Athens who has our full confidence. So, I hope we can be helpful. But that's a problem that I'd love to see solved, in keeping with these U.N. resolutions.

Thank you all very much.

Note: The exchange began at 10:05 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, President Bush referred to Prime Minister Constantinos Mitsotakis of Greece; President Saddam Hussein of Iraq; United Nations Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar de la Guerra; Nelson C. Ledsky, U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator; and Michael Sotirhos, U.S. Ambassador to Greece.

Remarks at the 50th Anniversary Observance of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Four Freedoms Speech

January 30, 1991

Thank you very much, Speaker Foley. And may I salute the leaders of both Houses of Congress; pay my respects to Anne Roosevelt and to Arthur Schlesinger, Bill vanden Heuvel; and distinguished rep-

resentatives of the Congress here; distinguished representatives of our World War II allies who are with us; certain ambassadors; and to the many friends.

It is an honor to be with you on this

extraordinary day of reflection, rededication, and renewal, inspired by the stirring words of this great President.

You know, a day when we think of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Emancipation Proclamation—Franklin Roosevelt called these documents “milestones of human progress.” And he added one more to the list that we’ve heard about—the charge he named his Four Freedoms of Common Humanity. All of these landmark charters are optimistic. After all, that’s what inspiration is about. But President Roosevelt knew that they are more than just idealistic goals. Together they are the moral North Star that guides us.

Two hundred years ago, perhaps our greatest political philosopher, Thomas Jefferson, defined our nation’s identity when he wrote: All men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Fifty years ago, our greatest American political pragmatist, Roosevelt, refined that thought in his four freedoms, when he brilliantly enunciated the 20th-century vision of our Founding Fathers’ commitment to individual liberty. And he saw that liberty was made up as we’ve heard: freedom of expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. And for these 200 years this concept of human dignity has been a beacon drawing to these shores people from across the globe—people like a boy named Quang Trinh, a Vietnamese teenager who almost died escaping from the country where he’d seen his mother killed, his father jailed, his brother’s spirit broken. Quang fled the only life he’d known for freedom. He jumped into shark-infested waters for freedom, starved in delirium for freedom. And when he was rescued and told that he could enter the United States, he wept for joy.

Quang calls America freedom country. Imagine if every person across this world could call their homeland freedom country. We do—and we do because the four freedoms have shaped the American character. They’ve molded who we are as individuals and as a nation. And they’ve made us realize that along with the freedoms that are our birthright come solemn responsibilities.

As we look around the world at the events of the past year, we see how these very same beliefs are bringing about the emergence of a new world order, one based on respect for the individual and for the rule of law—a new world order that can lead to the lasting peace we all seek, where children will never have to repeat Quang’s ordeal. And that’s what’s at stake—a new chapter of human history.

And that’s why an international coalition of 28 nations backed by the United Nations is standing up to the evil that challenges this ideal halfway around the world in the Middle East. We cannot, we must not, and we will not let that hope for a better world be threatened.

It is our commitment to the new world order that takes us to the sands and the seas of the Gulf. And we’re there because we realize that each of Roosevelt’s four freedoms leads us to the greatest of all human aspirations—the freedom to live in peace.

We stand now, I really believe, at a defining moment in history, much as the man we honor today did a half a century ago. No one knew better than President Roosevelt what hard work freedom really is. And when he introduced first the four freedoms, Roosevelt’s America was entering a war against the oldest enemy of the human spirit—evil that threatened world peace.

But listen to the confidence of purpose that he expressed in that same speech: “Our national policy in foreign affairs has been based on a decent respect for the rights and dignity of all nations, large and small, and the justice of morality must and will win in the end.” That charge is as true today in the Gulf as it was 50 years ago in Europe. And the triumph of the moral order must still be the vision that compels us.

So, we ask God to bless us, to guide us, and to help us through whatever dark nights we still may face. We hope that, in the sublime resolve of those who strive so that all may live in peace and freedom, we will show how this nation has forged its very soul; and that the liberty bell of the four freedoms will ring for all people in every nation of this world.

Thank you very much.

Jan. 30 / Administration of George Bush, 1991

Note: The President spoke at 11:33 a.m. in Statuary Hall at the U.S. Capitol. In his opening remarks, he referred to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Anne Roosevelt, granddaughter of

Franklin D. Roosevelt; and historians Arthur Schlesinger and William vanden Heuvel, co-chairmen of the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on the Canada-United States Free-Trade Agreement

January 30, 1991

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 304(f) of the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement Implementation Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-449; 102 Stat. 1875), I am pleased to transmit the attached report pertaining to the implementation and effectiveness of oper-

ation of the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement (FTA) in its first 2 years.

GEORGE BUSH

The White House,
January 30, 1991.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Cyprus Conflict

January 30, 1991

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (92 Stat. 739; 22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I am submitting to you this bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. This report covers the period from mid-October through December 1990.

During this period the United Nations Secretary General, whose good offices mission forms the core of international efforts to resolve the Cyprus problem, sought to begin implementation of the "plan of action" that he had outlined in his report to the U.N. Security Council of July 12. This plan (described in my report to you of August 30) was designed to prepare the ground for restarting the intercommunal talks.

In mid-October the Secretary General asked his Special Representative on Cyprus, Ambassador Oscar Camilion, and Mr. Gustave Feissel of his New York staff, to test the degree of support for the U.N. plan of action in Athens and Ankara, as well as with the two communities in Cyprus. In Athens and Ankara Ambassador

Camilion and Mr. Feissel received firm offers of cooperation.

In Nicosia the picture was mixed. Both the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities pledged their cooperation with the Secretary General and reiterated their support for UNSC Resolution 649. Each side also made clear its belief that the other side was intransigent and that progress in carrying out the "plan of action" was therefore unlikely.

To lend U.S. support to the Secretary General's efforts, I asked my Special Cyprus Coordinator, Ambassador Nelson Ledsky, to travel to the area in late October. Ambassador Ledsky met twice with the Turkish Foreign Minister, once with the Greek Foreign Minister, and several times each with President Vassiliou and Mr. Denktash. In the course of these meetings, Ambassador Ledsky also discussed a series of possible interim steps that might provide an impetus to the U.N.-sponsored negotiating process. He explained to each party why such a process could not begin with a unilateral gesture by some other party and outlined