

Office of Science and Technology Policy Executive Office of the President Eisenhower Executive Office Building Washington, DC 20502

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

February 18, 2004

Contact: Bob Hopkins

(202) 456-6098

rhopkins@ostp.eop.gov

## STATEMENT FROM PRESIDENT BUSH'S SCIENCE ADVISOR AND DIRECTOR OF THE THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY JOHN H. MARBURGER III ON THE UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS DOCUMENT:

"The statement from the Union of Concerned Scientists is disappointing because it makes sweeping generalizations about the Administration based on what appears to be a miscellany of criticisms, many of which have been made in the past by partisan political figures and advocacy organizations. This Administration has strongly incorporated science in its policy-making processes, and encourages sound, independent science. A recent example is the National Research Council report on the Climate Change Science Program Strategic Plan, just released, that found:

"In fact, the approaches taken by the CCSP to receive and respond to comments from a large and broad group of scientists and stakeholders, including a two-stage independent review of the plan, set a high standard for government research programs."

"This Administration has made a strong investment in science, with a record \$132 billion request in FY 2005, a 44% increase since FY 2001 (\$91 billion). President Bush's 2005 budget request commits 13.5% of total discretionary outlays to R&D - the highest level in 37 years. We want these funds to be invested optimally in high quality research and development conducted with the best possible guidance from the technical community. And we want government policies, regulations, and activities to reach the same high standards we have come to expect from this community.

"We have a strong and healthy science enterprise in this country of which I am proud to be a part. I am committed to working with the science and higher education communities to increase understanding on issues of mutual concern, but the sweeping conclusions of the UCS statement go far beyond reasonable interpretations of the issues it recites."

###