

AAAS Preliminary—Final Budget Resolution—Projected Effects of Concurrent Budget Resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) on Nondefense R&D—Continued

[All figures in millions of dollars budget authority]

Agency/Program	Key	R&D** FY 1995 estimated	R&D FY 1996 es- timated	R&D FY 1997 es- timated	R&D FY 1998 es- timated	R&D FY 1999 es- timated	R&D FY 2000 es- timated	R&D FY 2001 es- timated	R&D FY 2002 es- timated	R&D*** FY 2002 constant dollars	Constant dollar difference 1995- 2002 (percent)
Total Commerce R&D		1,284	783	784	787	782	777	787	797	642	-50.0
Total EPA R&D	(9)	619	554	554	554	554	554	554	554	446	-27.9
Total Education R&D	(10)	175	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	-97.8
Total AID R&D	(10)	314	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-100.0
Total Veterans R&D	(3)	297	297	297	297	297	297	297	297	239	-19.5
Total NRC R&D	(3)	82	82	82	82	82	82	82	82	66	-19.5
Total Smithsonian R&D	(3)	135	135	135	135	135	135	135	135	109	-19.5
Total TVA R&D	(5)	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-100.0
Total Corps R&D	(3)	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	44	-19.5
Total Labor R&D	(11)	62	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	21	-66.0
Total Other R&D	(12)	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	132	-19.5
Total nondefense R&D		34,303	29,911	29,261	28,901	28,621	28,467	28,476	28,487	22,939	-33.1

House Budget Committee Policy Assumptions: Fiscal Year 1996 Budget Resolution prepared by the House Budget Committee, May 10, 1995 and Conference Report for Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1996, June 26, 1995.

** Source: AAAS Report XX: Research and Development FY 1996.

*** Expressed in FY 1995 dollars. Adjusted for inflation according to GDP deflators.

Key of assumptions:

¹ Based on specific program reduction in House resolution, assuming R&D as percent of appropriation remains constant.

² Elimination of account in House resolution.

³ Not specifically mentioned in either House or conference resolution; assumes freeze at FY 1995 level.

⁴ Based on specific program INCREASE in House resolution, assuming R&D as percent of appropriation remains constant.

⁵ Planned privatization in House resolution; would no longer be federal R&D.

⁶ Reductions in Forest Resources and Management Research and Ecosystems Research in House resolution.

⁷ Assumes \$150 million reduction each year from elimination of Intelligent Vehicle Development R&D.

⁸ Elimination of \$20 million in R&D High-Speed Rail in House resolution.

⁹ Elimination of \$85 million in R&D for ETI; all other R&D frozen at FY 1995 level.

¹⁰ Assumes elimination of all programs containing R&D within agency based on House resolution detail; Howard University R&D added back in conference.

¹¹ Elimination of ETA R&D in the House resolution; all other R&D frozen at FY 1995 level.

¹² HUD, Justice, and USPS R&D frozen at FY 1995 levels.

¹³ Based on specific program reduction in concurrent resolution, assuming R&D as percent of appropriations remains constant.

¹⁴ Conference added \$2 billion over seven years to general science above House level; distributed over NASA and NSF research activities (excluding facilities).

Deflators: 1995-1.30; 1996-1.34; 1997-1.38; 1998-1.42; 1999-1.46; 2000-1.51; 2001 est.-1.56; 2002 est.-1.61; 1995-2002-1.24. Deflators from OMB, Budget of the United States Government FY 1996 until FY 2000, then 3.5 percent inflation thereafter.

EXHIBIT 3

PUBLIC SURPRISES POLLSTERS, BACKS
FEDERAL R&D

(By Ken Jacobson)

Public opinion researchers went to the districts of some leading House Republicans in April expecting to hear condemnations of federal spending on R&D. Instead, recalls Steve Wagner of Luntz Research & Strategic Service, participants in focus groups they moderated tended to rate R&D an "above-average priority" even though many stood behind efforts to reduce the federal deficit.

"We went looking for things that didn't pan out," says Wagner, whose groups were recruited in New Orleans, the district of House Appropriations Committee Chairman Bob Livingston, and Houston, home of House Majority Whip Tom DeLay and Ways & Means Committee Chairman Bill Archer.

"We went looking for the degree to which government investment in R&D was seen as corporate welfare, and we didn't find it. We went looking for the degree to which concerns about the deficit cast such a pall over everything that R&D should take a disproportionate or even a proportionate cut, and they told us 'no.' It's fair to say," Wagner admits, "that I was surprised by the extent of support" for R&D that was in evidence.

That's not to say that the 10- to 13-voter groups, which met for two hours each, had a very detailed picture of how the federal government spends its R&D dollars. And that's true even though they were chosen to take part in the research—commissioned by IBM, Hewlett-Packard, Kodak, and Genentech—in part of their level of education and their interest in current affairs.

According to Public Opinion Strategies' Neil Newhouse, in charge of groups in House Science Committee Chairman Bob Walker's Lancaster, Pa., district and the Columbus, Ohio, district of House Budget Committee Chairman John Kasich, participants showed awareness that federal R&D encompasses the fields of space, health, and defense, but had little knowledge of specific programs.

Nonetheless, they staunchly defended the federal R&D function. "We pushed people hard in terms of trying to get them to move away from support from R&D. But their support was broad and had a level intensity," Newhouse says, that "contradicted what we saw as the current political environment."

Behind their attitudes may be the fact that, as Wagner puts it, "people are very pragmatic." Far from being greeted with what he regards as "ideological" stances, Wagner says, the researchers heard messages he encapsulates as: "'Jobs are a priority, finding a cure for AIDS is a priority, and if it takes the government to do it, the government should do it.' If they think government involvement will make the situation better, people will not hesitate to say that that's a legitimate function of government."

Still, that doesn't imply an absolute faith in government, or even much faith at all. This mistrust, however, is also directed toward the private sector, and what emerges, according to the researchers, is a preference for public-private R&D partnerships.

"Neither the government nor private industry is completely trusted to make these investment decisions," states a summary of their findings that the two polling organizations issued jointly. "The government remains the agency of the common interest. Private business is seen as more efficient, more disciplined, but also self-interested."

"These perceptions cannot be changed in the short run, but they can be used: Let the private sector say what is feasible, which technologies offer the promise of payoff, and [let] the government say what is in the national interest to develop. A partnership of both entities looking over each other's shoulder will likely be the most satisfying to the voters."

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE?
LOOK AT THE ARITHMETIC

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before contemplating today's bad news about the Federal debt, let us have "another

go," as the British put it, with our little pop quiz. Remember. One question, one answer.

The question: How many millions of dollars does it take to make a trillion dollars? While you are thinking about it, bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the Federal debt that now exceeds \$4.9 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, July 18, the total Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$4,929,786,301,717.48, of which, on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,713.55.

Mr. President, back to the pop quiz: How many million in a trillion? There are a million million in a trillion.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I want to speak for just a few moments in reaction to the speech made this morning by President Clinton on the subject of affirmative action. The principle that every individual should have an equal opportunity to rise as high as his or her ability will take them, regardless of race, gender, religion, nationality, or other group characteristic, is a defining ideal of our society. We must be very wary of any deviation from that principle, no matter how well intended. That is why it is clearly time to review all Government affirmative action programs in which an individual's membership in a group, whether defined by race, gender, national origin, or other similar characteristics, may determine whether he or she will be awarded a Government benefit.

Mr. President, while America has clearly not yet realized the national

ideal of equal opportunity for all, it is important to note that we have made considerable progress over the three decades since President Johnson issued the first Executive order calling for affirmative action to end job discrimination. I think we should be proud of that progress—long overdue as it may have been. Every President since President Johnson, and every Supreme Court since then, has acknowledged that affirmative action programs were intended to be temporary. In the debate that is ongoing now, and on which the President made a major statement today, I believe we should pause to acknowledge not only our continuing commitment to equal opportunity and the work we still have to do to realize it for all Americans, but also to acknowledge our success in overcoming what was not only a legally sanctioned system of discrimination in our country but also ingrained biases about race and gender which were extremely widespread in our country. We have come a long way from those days. Today, poll after poll shows a very high and broad national consensus about ensuring equal opportunity for all, which, of course, was what the civil rights movement was all about.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, some poorly conceived and implemented affirmative action programs have done more to disturb and confuse that broadly accepted national consensus about equal opportunity than they have done to help their intended beneficiaries. Affirmative action is dividing us in ways its creators could never have intended because most Americans who do support equal opportunity, and are not biased, do not think it is fair to discriminate against some Americans as a way to make up for historic discrimination against other Americans. For, after all, if you discriminate in favor of one group on the basis of race, you thereby discriminate against another group on the basis of race. In discussing this subject the other day, a young man offered me this simple wisdom that we all learned from our mothers and fathers: "Two wrongs," he said, "don't make a right."

President Clinton deserves our praise for his willingness to wade into this fray and examine whether affirmative action programs are advancing our goal of equal opportunity in a manner that is consistent with our ideals and our Constitution. In particular, I am encouraged by the President's expressed commitment to implement the Supreme Court's recent *Adarand* decision on affirmative action. The Department of Justice has informed all Federal agencies that every program employing race-based or similar criteria must be rigorously examined to ensure that it is narrowly tailored to meet a compelling governmental interest that cannot otherwise be achieved. If a program does not meet that test, it must be significantly changed, or it must be eliminated.

In my own view, Mr. President, most Government programs in which race, gender, or similar status are dominant factors, will not survive the Supreme Court's new *Adarand* test. If that is in fact the case, we must work together to find new and, I would hope, more broadly acceptable ways to achieve the goal of promoting equal opportunity for all—particularly our poorest neighbors. I accept the premise, as I believe most Americans do, that there is still much work to be done. We must be prepared to devote more resources to enforcing our civil rights laws vigorously. We need to direct our attention, energy, and money to helping poor people, regardless of race or ethnic background, by making greater investments in education and job training, economic opportunity, and empowerment. Doing so would not only be more effective in achieving our national ideal of equal opportunity for all, but I think would restore a sense of traditional American fair play to this field that, sadly, for too many has been lost.

Some critics of affirmative action are simultaneously urging the dismantling of programs that are keys to helping poor people gain the education and skills that will make equal opportunity real for them. I will join the President, as I have before, in fighting both to preserve and reform, where necessary, those programs, and in finding ways to address the profound problems faced by those who are victims not only of discrimination, but of poverty.

I invite all our colleagues within this Chamber, in the House, and all people of good will throughout the country, who are committed to making our society as fair as possible—whatever their party affiliation or views on affirmative action—to join this important effort in the months and years ahead.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1977. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and relat-

ed agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1977. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1206. A communication from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, case number 92-68; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1207. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology), transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental legislative environmental impact statement with respect to the START II Treaty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1208. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 1994 financial statements of the United States Mint; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC-1209. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to provide administrative procedures for the nonjudicial foreclosure of mortgages on properties to satisfy debts owed to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1210. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 17, United States Code, title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1211. A communication from Commissioners of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, notice of errors in the transmittal of the report "Funding Federal Civil Rights Enforcement"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1212. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to enable the United States to meet its obligations to surrender offenders and provide evidence to the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia and to the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Citizens Responsible for Genocide and other such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighboring States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1213. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Attorney General's Report on Risk Exposure of Private Entities Covered by the Federally Supported Health Centers Assistance