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 estimated	R&D FY 1997 estimated	R&D FY 1998 estimated	R&D FY 1999 estimated	R&D FY 2000 estimated	R&D FY 2001 estimated	R&D FY 2002 estimated	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