

The domestic use bills would be legal tender only in the U.S.; the foreign use bills would be legal tender abroad only. The two types of money could be exchanged at banks subject to U.S. currency transaction reporting requirements only. The domestic use bills have distinctly different coloring from the foreign use bills. This means money smuggled out of the country to be laundered at offshore banks that do not engage in currency transaction reporting would be worthless.

A 6-month currency exchange period would begin one year from the date of enactment. Old \$100 bills must be exchanged for new domestic or foreign use \$100 bills within this 6-month period, or they become worthless. The bill includes a process for extending the exchange period for hardship cases.

The currency exchange must occur at banks regulated by U.S. currency transaction reporting and anti-money laundering laws or at foreign banks that the Secretary of the Treasury finds by treaty or agreement abide by currency transaction reporting laws.

The Act would be financed by using credits obtained from extinguishing the Treasury's liability for \$100 bills not exchanged within the exchange period. Additional credits so generated would be returned to the general fund.

Section 4. Notice of Currency Exchange Period. The Secretary must begin notifying foreign and domestic governments and financial institutions of the upcoming exchange period within 6 months of enactment.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. AKAKA):

S.J. Res. 26. A joint resolution designating April 9, 1995, and April 9, 1996, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE NATIONAL FORMER PRISONER OF WAR  
RECOGNITION DAY

• Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my good friend and predecessor as chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Senator ROCKEFELLER, in introducing a Joint resolution which would recognize the service and dedication of America's former prisoners of war [POW's]. The Joint resolution would designate April 9, 1995, and April 9, 1996, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition day." April 9 is the anniversary of the fall of Bataan in 1942. On that day more Americans became POW's than any other day in our history.

Every American who dons the uniform of our country makes a unique commitment of service and duty to our country and to our fellow citizens. Many factors, some as random as fate itself, determine how that commitment will be realized. For some, military service may be little more than an office job here in the United States. For others, military service can combine bitter privation with the agony of combat. Perhaps no American veterans have been called upon to honor their commitment to our country under circumstances more difficult than those endured by our former POW's.

Former prisoners of war have seen combat. By definition they were close enough to the enemy to be captured; frequently after being wounded, shot down, or sunk by enemy action. But for them, the war didn't end when they were taken by the enemy, it was just beginning. At the worst, their experience was one of malnutrition, torture, and nonexistent medical care, combined with the burden of watching comrades die as fellow slave laborers while working under conditions that would make the worst villain of a Dickens novel look like a philanthropist.

Even under the best possible conditions, the POW experience places American service members in the position of being dependent upon our nation's enemies for every scrap of food, every bandage, every human need. In such circumstances, the reward for treason, or even cooperation, is high. The penalty for resistance and loyalty is immediate, frequently painful and sometimes fatal. This resolution recognizes the sacrifice and loyalty of the POW's who maintained their commitment of service to our country. In so doing, it helps fulfill the duty we have to former POW's. A duty derived from the faithful discharge of their duty to us.

Mr. President, in this century 142,257 American servicemembers have become POW's. For over 17,000 of them, the experience was fatal. They died while in the hands of our enemies. Of the 125,202 who returned to our shores, only about 62,000 remain alive today.

This Joint resolution commemorates the service of former POW's who sustained their commitment to our country under circumstances that few of us can imagine, and none would willingly endure. I ask this body to honor the memory of those who have already died; I urge the Senate to express its gratitude to those still alive; and I call upon my colleagues to join with Senator ROCKEFELLER, members of the committee on Veterans' Affairs, and myself in sponsoring this Joint resolution. •

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 12

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 12, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage savings and investment through individual retirement accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 141

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 141, a bill to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 to provide new job opportunities, effect significant cost savings on Federal construction contracts, promote small business participation in Federal contracting, reduce unnecessary paperwork and re-

porting requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under part B of the Medicare program of emergency care and related services furnished by rural emergency access care hospitals.

S. 227

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 227, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide an exclusive right to perform sound recordings publicly by means of digital transmissions and for other purposes.

S. 233

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 233, a bill to provide for the termination of reporting requirements of certain executive reports submitted to the Congress, and for other purposes.

S. 245

At the request of Mr. COHEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 245, a bill to provide for enhanced penalties for health care fraud, and for other purposes.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] were added as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 17

At the request of Mr. KEMPTHORNE, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 17, a joint resolution naming the CVN-76 aircraft carrier as the U.S.S. Ronald Reagan.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO  
MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, January 31, 1995 at 9:30 a.m. in open session to consider the nomination of Eleanor J. Hill to be inspector general of the Department of Defense.

Immediately following, the Committee will meet in closed session to receive an intelligence briefing on the smuggling of nuclear material and the role of international crime organizations; and on the proliferation of cruise and ballistic missiles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 31, 1995, to conduct a hearing to look into the Mexican peso crisis and the administration's proposed loan guarantee package to Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to meet Tuesday, January 31, 1995, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing on the importance of savings in our economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 31, 1995, at 10:00 a.m. to hold a hearing on consideration of ratification of the START II Treaty (Treaty Doc. 103-1).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management and the District of Columbia, Committee on Government Affairs, be granted authority to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 31, 1995, at 2 p.m., to hold a hearing on oversight of the FDIC and the RTC's use of D'Oench Duhe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SPACE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on January 31, 1995, at 10:00 a.m. on Department of Commerce Science and Technology Programs Oversight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### THE DEATH PENALTY—A PIVOTAL ISSUE

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the issue of capital punishment is going to rear its head again in this session of Congress, and, once again, we will probably do what is politically expedient but is wrong.

I will continue to vote against capital punishment.

Recently, William H. Rentschler of my State, a member of the executive committee of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, had an op-ed piece in the Chicago Tribune on the question of capital punishment. It contains so much common sense that I ask to insert it into the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 29, 1994]

THE DEATH PENALTY—A PIVOTAL ISSUE

(By William H. Rentschler)

Autumn of 1994 was "the killing season."

The ancient art of state-sanctioned killing clearly was a dominant issue, largely ignored in most post-election analyses of the Nov. 8 balloting.

The death penalty probably was as decisive a factor in the Republican sweep as the call for less government intrusion, even though the two are philosophical opposites.

Virtually every major winner, in upsetting incumbents, promised, in effect, to kill more human beings for an ever wider assortment of crimes, and to kill them dead and quicker.

Today, an overwhelming percentage of Americans tell pollsters they favor capital punishment, which seems to have become nearly as popular as tax cuts, Sunday afternoon football and strawberry yogurt. Which, of course, is why candidates seized on the issue with such self-righteous, drum-beating fervor.

If indeed all those elected keep their promises to enforce the death penalty more vigorously and broadly, this nation, in the final years of the 20th Century, will be witness to the greatest killing spree on American soil since the Civil War.

Never mind that:

There is no valid evidence capital punishment deters homicides and other violent crimes. Quite the contrary, homicides typically increase in the proximity of where an execution is carried out.

In our society, where the criminal justice system is erratic and uncertain, we inevitably will continue to execute some innocents.

A grossly disproportionate percentage of those who die at the hands of the state or wait their fate on death row are poor, illiterate, African-American or Hispanic. The homicide rate is highest in those states where executions are most frequent. Texas is the prime example. The death penalty no longer exists in any Western nation except the United States.

The public is angry and uptight. People are terrified and intolerant of escalating crime. Many want to rid society permanently of the slaving brutes they perceive as perpetrators of violence. A sizable majority of citizens would give the state virtual carte blanche to exterminate these beasts.

But wait. The "slaving brute" image embraces only a fraction of those who murder, maim and commit hideous, heinous crimes. Chicago Police Commissioner Matt Rodriguez states that homicides are committed in great numbers by family members, including parents and children, friends, neighbors, and business associates, than by prowling, predatory strangers. And the increasing numbers of random murders by violent, out-of-control youths, especially gang members, occur mainly in their own urban neighborhoods, according to Rodriguez.

Slight, bespectacled Susan Smith, the small-town South Carolina mother who rolled her two tiny sons to a watery grave in the family car, hardly fits the bestial profile

society embraces so readily. Yet her apparent crime was monstrous and unfathomable.

Many, I believe, wish somehow the murderer would have been the black male of her fictional alibi. Then the answer would have been neat and simple; it would have fed inherent prejudice. That the killer, by her own confession, turned out to be the pathetically confused and conscienceless young (white) mother, tortured by the demons of a failed marriage, mounting bills and doomed romance, is much more complicated and challenging to our emotions, attitudes and pat, built-in assumptions.

The death penalty is so widely accepted largely because it provides a measure of seeming certainty to a society greatly frustrated by its inability to solve its most vexatious problems. But it is a simplistic answer, akin to the primitive law of the jungle. It is evidence of a society unwilling and incapable of coming to grips rationally with hard challenges.

Capital punishment makes a mockery of such noble legal canons as equal justice under law and the bedrock right of all to simple fairness.

No matter how atrocious Smith's crime, precedent tells us she almost certainly will not be executed; yet the make-believe black man of her grotesque fairy tale surely would have been found guilty and put to death if her charade had been accepted.

Los Angeles prosecutor Gil Garcetti already has announced O.J. Simpson, a rich celebrity and one-time role model, will not be executed if convicted of two murders by a jury. Nor will any murderer of wealth, fame and community standing. This confirms an old Russian proverb: "No one is hanged who has money in his pocket."

The death penalty is reserved exclusively for society's little people, its powerless, its rabble, its dregs. This alone makes capital punishment wrong in a just society.

Since we really execute very few, since the death penalty will never be a prime factor in curbing violent crime, since the nation is faced with many other nagging concerns begging for solutions, it is hardly unreasonable to say that those candidates who collectively spent countless hours and millions of TV dollars trumpeting their passionate support for capital punishment were behaving irresponsibly and short-changing voters. •

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1995

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 1, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 5 minutes, each with the exception of the following Senators: Senator GRAHAM, of Florida, 20 minutes; Senator HARKIN, 20 minutes; Senator BRADLEY, 15 minutes; Senator BENNETT, 15 minutes; Senator MURKOWSKI, 15 minutes; Senator DORGAN, 10 minutes; Senator GRAMS, 10 minutes.

I further ask that at 11:30 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of House Joint Resolution 1, the constitutional