

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 form 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