

Since the 1920's, AAA clubs across the country have been sponsoring student safety patrols to guide and protect younger classmates against traffic accidents. Easily recognizable by their fluorescent orange safety belt and shoulder strap, safety patrol members represent the very best of their schools and communities. Experts credit school safety patrol programs with helping to lower the number of traffic accidents and fatalities involving young children.

We owe AAA our gratitude for their tireless efforts to ensure that our Nation's children arrive to and from school safe and sound.

And we owe our thanks to these exceptional young men and women for their selfless actions. The discipline and courage they displayed deserves the praise and recognition of their schools, their communities and the Nation.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY last month. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

Today, I would like to detail a heinous crime that occurred August 8, 2000 in Providence, Rhode Island. Two young men said they were severely beaten and kicked by two strangers. The two victims were walking down a street when a car slowed and passed them. Minutes later the car drove by again, and the occupants began shouting vulgarities, anti-gay slurs and said, "We're going to kill you." The victims yelled back; the perpetrators allegedly got out of the car, shouted more anti-gay slurs and vulgarities, threw a beer can at them and then proceeded to beat and punch the victims in the head and body until one of them almost lost consciousness. The perpetrators eventually got in their car and fled, and witnesses called for help.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NUCLEAR CONTROL INSTITUTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Nuclear Control Institute, NCI, this year celebrates its 20th anniversary. For 20 years the NCI has worked to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons to nations or to groups. In honor of their achievements and contributions, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of congratulations to NCI by our

former colleague, Senator John Glenn, and the remarks of the founder and president of NCI, Paul Leventhal, at NCI's 20th anniversary conference on April 9, 2001, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOHN GLENN INSTITUTE,
PUBLIC SERVICE & PUBLIC POLICY,
Columbus, Ohio, April 9, 2001.

Mr. PAUL LEVENTHAL,
c/o Mr. Len Bickwit,
Miller & Chevalier, Chartered,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PAUL: I want to extend to you personally my most sincere congratulations on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Nuclear Control Institute. Your contribution to the debate on nuclear proliferation has been invaluable over the years and undoubtedly has helped make the world a safer one in which to live. I will always appreciate your & Senator Ribicoff's role in initially involving me in the nonproliferation issue during my early days in the Senate. While we have not always agreed on the specific measures to be taken in support of nonproliferation, we have always shared the objective that the control of nuclear weaponry must rank high on the list of the nation's public policy priorities. Your tireless work in support of that objective well deserves the commemoration it is receiving today.

Best regards,
Sincerely,

JOHN GLENN.

NUCLEAR POWER AND THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS: CAN WE HAVE ONE WITHOUT THE OTHER?

Good morning, I am Paul Leventhal, president of the Nuclear Control Institute, and I want to welcome you to NCI's 20th anniversary conference, "Nuclear Power and the Spread of Nuclear Weapons—Can We Have One Without the Other?"

NCI got started 20 years ago on a spring day like today when I landed a \$7,500 contribution from an anonymous member of the Rockefeller family. Wade Greene, the Rockefeller program officer who has been so helpful to a number of non-profit organizations represented here today, called it a "stimulative grant" to encourage giving by other foundations. But I had just lost my job on Capitol Hill, when the majority of the Senate switched to the party other than the one my boss and subcommittee chairman, Gary Hart, belonged to. So, I wasted no time and applied the Rockefeller check to renting a desk in the corridor of a small law firm located in a town house a block away from here, on N Street. With the desk came a posh conference room, suitable for holding meetings with other NGOs with an interest in plutonium and proliferation, and NCI was born.

In those days, NCI stood for The Nuclear Club Inc. The name was too clever by 5/8ths. But we used it anyway in a full-page New York Times ad, on Sunday, June 21, 1981, to launch our fledgling organization. The ad, which you will find in your folders, posed the question, "Will Tomorrow's Terrorist Have an Atom Bomb?"—a question, unfortunately, still highly relevant today, as is the answer. NCI's name has changed, but our mission—to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons to nations, or to groups—remains the same.

The ad's creator was Julian Koenig, an original member and still a member of our Board. He is a Madison Avenue legend, now retired, whose credits included Volkswagen's original "Think Small" campaign and the naming of "Earth Day."

At first, Mr. Koenig expressed reluctance about joining our board, but I assured him that NCI would have to solve the plutonium problem in five years, or he and I probably wouldn't survive to talk about it anyway. I was wrong on both counts. We haven't solved the problem. We are still around to talk about it. To paraphrase Faulkner, NCI has endured, if not prevailed. We are all still here to talk about the role of nuclear power, plutonium and other associated proliferation risks—that is the purpose of our meeting today.

Those of you familiar with NCI's work probably detect something different about today's program. When we planned this conference—and here I wish to acknowledge the contribution of Marvin Miller of MIT, a long-time technical adviser and all-around shmoozer for NCI—we discussed whether we should look at nuclear power in a broader context: Do we need nuclear power? How essential is it? This is a policy area that Nuclear Control Institute has not ventured into before. Although some in industry and bureaucracy conclude that our opposition to civilian use of plutonium and the other nuclear weapons material, highly enriched uranium (HEU), means that we are opposed to nuclear power, we are in fact not an anti-nuclear organization. We have maintained a policy of neutrality on nuclear power and steer clear of efforts to shut the industry down. We are anti-plutonium and anti-HEU, not anti-nuclear.

Our purpose today in examining the need for nuclear power, and the possible alternatives to it, is the current push by industry and apparently by the Bush Administration to revive nuclear power and to expand it in response to growing concerns about electricity-supply shortages and global warming.

To underscore this point, today's Washington Post quotes Vice President Cheney as saying, "We need to build 65 new power plants for the next 20 years, and my own view is that some of those ought to be nuclear, and that's the environmentally sound way to go."

We strongly believe that such an initiative should not go forward without first examining whether there is an irreducible proliferation risk associated with nuclear power, and whether this risk is serious enough to change current commitments to nuclear power.

If the nuclear industry refuses to end its love affair with plutonium, especially now that it is widely acknowledged that plutonium is not an essential fuel because of the abundance of cheap, non-weapons usable uranium, then the world may well be better off without nuclear power. In that case, we should look to alternative sources of energy and to energy conservation and efficiency measures. Even if industry gives up plutonium, there are still severe proliferation dangers associated with the prospect of cheap, efficient enrichment technology and with potentially limitless sources of uranium.

So, we will be examining two sets of questions today:

Are there viable alternatives to nuclear power?

Are the proliferation risks associated with nuclear power so great as to make these alternative approaches imperative?

We have called on a world-class set of experts to address these questions, and we also have an expert audience representing a full range of views that should keep the speakers on their toes. NCI has always sought to be inclusive and to invite opposing viewpoints to be represented at its conferences. This approach sometimes generates heat, but also light. We ask the speakers to keep to their time limits and the questioners to be succinct and to the point. We have a number of