Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Briefly, I wish to comment on three points that have appeared in the press recently.

The first has to do with a report some time ago, ten days ago, perhaps, in the Washington Post that the United States was preparing to end its embargo with regard to Haiti, and I wish to state very flatly that the United States has no plans to end its embargo at this time. We continue to evaluate its effects, of course, and we are providing substantial amounts of humanitarian aid through non-governmental organizations, and we thank the Assistant Secretary General for the time and energy that he has given to this topic.

In addition, those of you who have had occasion to have discussions with me know that I myself have in recent months expressed some concerns about certain aspects of the embargo from the standpoint of the rule of law both internationally and inside Haiti. I repeat, however, flatly, that my government has no plans to unilaterally lift the embargo and certainly none absent major achievements of the goals which we have set for ourselves.

The second has to do with a Los Angeles Times article that appeared today in effect suggesting that we support a deal of some kind where the embargo would be lifted in return for a particular set of political manuevers, and let me simply read the official statement today of the press spokesman on that subject: "...that is not our position. We do not favor any particular formula for restoring democracy to Haiti. It is for the Haitians themselves to conduct negotiations to determine the best way to restore democracy. We support the OAS resolutions and the Secretary General's efforts to bring about a political dialogue." End of quote. I would note that the OAS resolutions talk about facilitating dialogue among the Haitians, and quite clearly that is the position of the United States and it is inconceivable under those terms that the United States could a priori, without regard to the views of the parties involved, invent a solution.

The third point I would like to make is not so much a question of fact but of comment, of opinion. Those of you who read an article in the News of the Week in Review section of yesterday's New York Times will have found that the writer used the word "ploddingly" with regard to the OAS achievement in putting in the beginnings of a civilian presence in Haiti. Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to the Secretary General through you, I would note that in our last session I spoke spontaneously out
of any item before discussion of this Council to praise what I thought was his tenacity and intelligence in finding minimal grounds that enable precisely this breakthrough. Today I would like to congratulate the Secretary General on his choice of Colin Granderson of Trinidad to act as coordinator of this mission, and to express my hope that the distinguished Michael Manley will apply his intelligence and tenacity to helping to find a successful formula that will win the support of this body and its member states. It seems to me that, in practical terms, we can afford to be highly supportive of the Organization, and of its Secretary General in his efforts.

That is all I had planned to say. I will make one final point which is perhaps one of the sources of the rumor that the United States was planning to unilaterally drop its embargo. We have legal requirements for what we do. In this case, an embargo depends on a declaration by the President of a state of national emergency, which is what is required, in turn, to authorize the issuance of the Executive Orders on which the United States embargo explicitly legally depends. Economic sanctions by the United States were imposed on Haiti last October 4, and a state of national emergency lasts one year. Lest anybody incorrectly assume, the way some press people obviously have, that this means that the United States will lift its embargo on October 4, let me note that the President has before him the papers to extend the national emergency with regard to Haiti.

Thank you very much.