

information that was found in Soviet or Russian archives. Since the validity of the information which has reawakened the debate has not been established conclusively, we are in a very murky area in terms of saying that that information provides a basis for saying, cease the effort to normalize relationships between this country and the southeast Asian countries that are contemplated in this resolution. We, as I stated earlier, as a Legislature are not going to influence the policy of the American government in this regard. This resolution, however, does state what the Legislature believes ought to be done by this country. I think that, as a part of the normalization process, a discussion of the issues addressed by this resolution would certainly have to be a very important factor, but it cannot be a set of circumstances where those who are trying to extricate America from this thicket will be told by anybody that normalization of relations shall be deferred until such time as these issues are satisfactorily and adequately addressed. First of all, ...and I realize a resolution is not a statute, what does satisfactorily mean? Does that mean sitting down at the table and saying, we have reviewed this information which was provided by the erstwhile enemies of this country and the Soviet Union and after considering it there is no validity to it? Is that a satisfactory consideration? Adequately addressing, does that mean that...does the term "to address" mean that information must be given on each one of these named individuals or there has not been an adequate addressing of the issue? Rather than have language in the resolution which would not allow a unanimous vote on the resolution, I think the language should be stricken. It does not, in any way, and by it I mean striking this language, detract from the goal and purpose of the resolution. I'm not going to read the Whereases because they're in the Journal and anybody who would like to read them can find them. But there is a discussion in those Whereases of the strong desire to obtain information. The question is whether ceasing the effort to normalize relationships is a way to procure that information. Maybe it is, maybe it isn't. The next question, in whose benefit or to whose benefit will normalization redound? There are business people, there are governmental officials who feel that it is essential to the United States' own interests to normalize relationships with countries in the part of the world being addressed by this resolution. Should America assume a posture which cannot produce the desired result in either instance, the first instance being to get this information if it's not available, and if such information is deemed to not be available by those