

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF
ALEX MACHASKEE IN CELEBRA-
TION OF HIS AWARD OF INTER-
NATIONAL BUSINESS EXECUTIVE
OF THE YEAR

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a very special tribute to one of Ohio's leading business executives, Mr. Alex Machaskee. Alex Machaskee is the president and publisher of The Plain Dealer, Ohio's largest newspaper. On Thursday September 18, 2003, Alex Machaskee will be honored by the World Trade Center of Cleveland as the International Business Executive of the Year.

Mr. Machaskee's extensive career of forty-three years with The Plain Dealer includes thirteen as publisher. In addition to his many business achievements, Northeastern Ohio is proud of Alex Machaskee's civic involvement. His work on the Board of United Way Services, the Musical Arts Association, the International Children's Games, and Crime Stoppers of Cuyahoga County, Inc., are merely a few of his numerous civic activities.

Alex Machaskee embodies the very spirit of American workmanship through his dedication and service. His commitment to the community combined with his devotion to The Plain Dealer merit the award as International Business Executive of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation built upon the ideals of capitalism and the embracing of freedom of speech. Mr. Machaskee advances that which binds us together as one great nation. It has often been said that America succeeds due to the remarkable accomplishments and contributions of her citizens. It is evident that Alex Machaskee has given freely of his time and energy to assist in the promotion of his community.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would urge my colleagues to stand and join me in paying special tribute to Mr. Alex Machaskee. On the occasion of being named the International Business Executive of the Year, we congratulate him for his service and wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

HONORING WELLINGTON E. WEBB

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the important public service accomplishments and leadership of the man who was Denver's mayor from 1991 until 2003, the Honorable Wellington E. Webb.

As many of our colleagues already know, Wellington Webb not only served the people of Denver and the State of Colorado with great distinction, he is also recognized as a leader of national stature. As Denver's first African-American mayor, Wellington Webb's leadership stirred hope to minorities across the nation, and gave proof and promise to the late Dr. Martin Luther King's plea for a time when people might be "judged, not by the color of their skin, but the content of their character."

Wellington Webb began public service in the Colorado General Assembly and in the cabinet of Governor Richard Lamm, where he served with distinction. He was a regional administrator for the Carter Administration and a senior campaign official in President Carter's reelection campaign. I hesitate to draw out the long list of his various public offices and awards because such a list does little to convey the depth of his record, or the weight of his contributions to the City and County of Denver, to the State of Colorado and to the United States of America. Suffice it to say that he and his wife, Wilma, were both drawn to public service from an early age and together, they have amassed an amazing amount of personal experience in local, state and federal public service.

Collectively and as individuals, Wellington and Wilma Webb have contributed a great deal to enhance the discourse that has shaped the last thirty years of politics in Colorado. They are both respected leaders, and as the Chair of the National Conference of Mayors, Wellington was particularly forceful in bringing needed attention to the issues that face America's urban centers. Although he has retired from the politics of city hall in Denver, Wellington has not retired from public service, and I believe the Bush Administration and Congress would do well to seek his advice on the myriad of issues that urban America faces in the aftermath of 9/11.

It has been said that the most effective political leaders are those who know how to combine the talents of listening well, inspiring followers and earning the respect, if not fear, of their adversaries. By these measures, Wellington Webb is an extraordinarily effective leader. Even those who were not supporters of Wellington Webb—and that number shrank to fewer and fewer as time went on and his record grew, would readily admit that he is a man who earns respect.

While I have had only a few opportunities to interact with Wellington Webb in my capacity as a Member of Congress, I learned from every one of our conversations. I admire the courage and perseverance he has shown on so many issues, talking bluntly but with wisdom on many topics, and with a sense of humor that cuts through the nonsense that so often characterizes political debate in our time. My sense is that Wellington Webb never suffered fools, but was not unkind either. I imagine he is uncomfortable with the tributes and accolades that are coming his way in the aftermath of his three terms as mayor, but I hope he will understand that these are important milestones that can inspire a whole new generation of young leaders.

I ask my colleagues in the Congress to not only join me in honoring the extraordinary public service of Wellington E. Webb, but also to join me in expressing the hope that he may find other ways to continue to serve our country.

**FIRST ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL
CONFERENCE ON CIVIC EDUCATION**

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of civic illiteracy and the ever-diminishing level of

public engagement in our representative form of government must be confronted.

I am pleased to report that a new national project, Representative Democracy in America: Voices of the People, funded by the U.S. Department of Education, was created by an Act of Congress to tackle this problem. The project is directed by the Alliance for Representative Democracy, a collaboration of three fine organizations: the Center for Civic Education, The Center on Congress at Indiana University, and the National Conference of State Legislatures.

The Alliance is holding an important conference here in Washington, D.C., from September 20 to 22. The joint bipartisan leadership of the U.S. Congress is serving as the honorary hosts for the conference.

The Conference will bring together key decision-makers on education policy from every state and representatives of professional and civic education organizations. Their common goal will be to create an initiative to encourage our schools to undertake the civic mission of preparing students for effective citizenship. The conference will encourage the establishment of state delegation working groups to improve the status of civic education in their state. I am pleased to note that Linda Start, who is the Executive Director of the Center for Civic Education Through Law, will be the state facilitator for the Michigan delegation.

Student achievement levels in civics simply must improve. I know we all share the hope that out of this conference will come a renewed commitment to make that happen.

**REMEMBERING AND HONORING
THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON OF
AUGUST 18, 2003**

SPEECH OF

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2003

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 40th Anniversary of the March on Washington when over 250,000 Americans convened near the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, brought together by a common cause—achieving equality for all Americans.

On that hot summer day in 1963, Americans arrived in Washington, D.C. to express a dire need for action against the dismal conditions of life for so many of our Nation's African-American citizens. Choosing to respond non-violently to injustices committed against them, the marchers rose above hate, calling for peace and justice with a clear voice that demanded change.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 352, honoring the March on Washington as one of the largest civil rights demonstrations in United States history. It is important that we recognize the monumental importance of this event and its significance in the ongoing struggle for civil rights and equal rights for all Americans. We should also commemorate the courageous and inspiring men and woman who organized and participated in the March and dedicated themselves to the pursuit of equality and justice.

We are a great nation of diverse backgrounds, drawn together by shared values and a common dedication to the cause of freedom,

both at home and abroad. We, as a people, cherish our freedom and should honor those who have helped secure for us, and for those who will follow us, the freedom to pursue opportunity, the freedom to challenge inequality, and the freedom to actively and peacefully participate in the political process.

Let the actions and poignant words of Dr. King serve as an example to us as well as the generations to come, that it is possible to dream and, through persistence and dedication, to realize those dreams. But let us not only commemorate these words, but continue to work to make Dr. King's dream a reality.

As we commemorate the 40th Anniversary of the March on Washington, let us remember the struggles of those who came before us, and in so doing, help fully realize their dream so that one day our children will truly "live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

CLARIFICATION OF SCOPE AND CONCLUSIONS OF PROFESSOR GUSTON'S STUDY

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 of this year, the House debated and passed an important piece of legislation, the Nanotechnology Research and Development Act of 2003 (H.R. 766). During debate of this bill, it became clear that there was a misunderstanding regarding the conclusions of a scholarly study conducted at Rutgers University. The author of that study, which was cited during the debate, has written to me with the request that he be able to clear up the confusion.

I am enclosing for the record the attached letter from David Guston, Associate Professor and Director of the Public Policy Program at Rutgers. Professor Guston's letter clarifies the scope and conclusions of his study, and will help us move forward on issues related to nanotechnology in an informed and thoughtful way in the future.

RUTGERS, EDWARD J. BLOUSTEIN
SCHOOL OF PLANNING AND PUBLIC
POLICY, PUBLIC POLICY PROGRAM,
New Brunswick, NJ, September 17, 2003.

Hon. RUSH HOLT,
Longworth House Office Bldg.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOLT: I write regarding the debate on the House floor on 7 May on the Nanotechnology Research and Development Act of 2003 (H.R. 766).

It has come to my attention that, in responding to Representative Johnson's proposed amendment to the bill to provide for regularly occurring consensus conferences or citizens' panels, Representative Burgess cited (at CR H3727) "[a] scholarly review of the Danish-type citizens' panel process convened to study telecommunications and democracy [that] judged the process to be ineffective."

In later remarks on the amendment, Chairman Boehlert referred to the same "scholarly study," saying that he was told the study "concluded that not even those engaged in organizing the US citizens' panel thought it had any impact." Chairman Boehlert then quoted from the study the fol-

lowing passage (at CR H3727-28): "The single greatest area of consensus among the respondents was that the Citizens' Panel on Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy had no actual impact. No respondent, not even those government members of the steering committee or expert cohort, identified any actual impact."

I am the author of the study in question (which can be found in pre-published form at <http://policy.rutgers.edu/papers/> and via <http://www.loka.org/pages/panel/htm> and in peer-reviewed, published from in Science, Technology, & Human Values 24(4):451-82). I believe that these comments indicate real confusion about my findings. I am therefore writing to correct the record and to ensure that no misunderstanding about my study damages efforts to provide public input into the future of nanotechnology R&D.

There are three important aspects of my study on the Citizens' Panel on Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy of which you should be aware.

First, the study concludes that the citizens' panel had no actual impact on policy decisions because, in large part, it was not designed to. The sentence from the study immediately following the one Chairman Boehlert quotes reads: "A primary reason for this lack of impact is that having one was not a primary goal of the citizens' panel." The organizers of the panel designed it as a proof-of-concept, and they were more interested in understanding how to implement such a panel and in seeing how the experts and lay-citizens would interact than they were in having an actual impact on policy. Although conducting citizens' panels is not quite rocket science, questioning their effectiveness by claiming that this panel did not have an actual impact is like blaming the Gemini program for not going to the Moon: Its designers did not intend it to do so.

Second, my study distinguishes between what I call "actual impact," defined as "a concrete consequence to any authoritative public decision," and three other impacts: (1) those on the "general thinking" about a problem; (2) those on the "training of knowledgeable personnel"; and (3) those that result in an "interaction with lay-knowledge." I develop these other measures to evaluate the impact of citizens' panels for two reasons: (1) because—just as with more traditional research—the education of participants is a primary output of citizens' panels; and (2) because even very formal, expert studies such as those conducted by the National Academy of Sciences or by national commissions often fail to have an "actual impact." The comments made in the floor debate by members of both parties emphasize that scientists and lay-citizens need to learn from each other about nanotechnology, and my study finds that such learning can indeed occur in citizens' panels. To question the effectiveness of citizens' panels by pointing to no "actual impact" of this pilot panel misses the study's finding of "tantalizing evidence that many kinds of impacts can be achieved."

Third—and most importantly—rather than undermining the possibility of providing public input into technical decisions, my research concludes that citizens panels are real opportunities for productive interaction between experts and lay-citizens. My research concludes that future citizens' panels would need better "connection to non-participants" and "higher profile institutional partners" in order to achieve their potential. If citizens' panels were authorized by H.R. 766 and conducted by NSF and its partner agencies, then they would indeed have the institutional support my research indicates they require to succeed.

I hope that the record can be corrected to indicate that my research provides evidence

and analysis to support the productive use of citizens' panels under the conditions that H.R. 766 envisions them, rather than providing evidence against their effectiveness.

Please let me know if I may be of any assistance on such matters in the future, and I thank you for your work on H.R. 766 and for your attention here.

Sincerely,

DAVID H. GUSTON,
Associate Professor and Director.

COMMEMORATING THE 12TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

HON. ERIC CANTOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 12th anniversary of Armenia's independence from the Soviet Union. For many years, and on many fronts, the people of Armenia have been challenged; for their land, for their distinct heritage and culture and have endured the most atrocious of events, genocide.

On September 21, 1991, after the fall of the Soviet Union, a lifelong dream of many Armenians was finally within sight. The country achieved its independence after an astounding 94 percent of its voters turned out in support of Armenia's sovereignty. We would like to join with the Republic of Armenia in celebrating its 12th anniversary of independence and welcome the growing ties between our two countries.

Since 1991, relations between our two nations have been prosperous. Our common struggle against communism reflects the shared values between Armenians and Americans alike. We have also developed strong economic relations; the addition of Armenia to the World Trade Organization earlier this year demonstrates its commitment to free enterprise and lower barriers to trade. Armenia has also been a strong advocate of sustained stability in the Transcaucas region; it has made significant contributions to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's peace process for Nagorno-Karabagh.

Lastly, I would like to wish Armenians across the globe well on the day of their independence. I believe that with the continuing support of the United States, Armenia will prosper and continue to be a loyal friend to our country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FREEDOM TO ESTABLISH STATE HIGH AIR QUALITY ACT OF 2003

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Freedom to Establish State High Air Quality (FrESH AIR Quality)" Act. I'm pleased that my colleague from Connecticut, Representative CHRIS SHAYS, is joining me as an original cosponsor of the bill.

This bill is designed to preserve the ability of States, Indian tribes, municipalities, and air