



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

ELIZABETH HOUSE YORK ROAD LONDON SE1 7PH

TELEPHONE 01-934 9000

FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mark Addison Esq
Private Secretary
10 Downing Street
London SW1

16 July 1986

Dear Mark,

EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND ARTS COMMITTEE REPORT: FUTURE OF THE SCIENCE BUDGET

I enclose a copy of the Government's response to the above report, which was sent on 16 July to the Chairman of the Committee. I also enclose a copy of the Parliamentary Question and Answer announcing its publication.

I am copying this letter and enclosures to Jill Rutter (Chief Secretary's Office), Tony Galsworthy (Foreign and Commonwealth Office), Ivor Llewelyn (Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Foods), Robin Young (Department of the Environment), Tony Laurance (Department of Health and Social Security), Geoff Dart (Department of Energy), John Howe (Ministry of Defence), John Mogg (Department of Trade and Industry), Andrew Lansley (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster's Office), Michael Stark (Cabinet Office) and John Fairclough.

Yours sincerely,
R L Smith

R L SMITH
Private Secretary

WEDNESDAY 16 JULY 1986

QUESTION NO

MR ROBERT KEY (SALISBURY): To ask the Secretary of State for Education and Science what is the Government's response to the First Report from the House of Commons Education, Science and Arts Committee Session 1984-85 on The Future of the Science Budget, and if he will make a statement?

MR KENNETH BAKER

I have written today to the Chairman of the Committee with the Government's response. It is being published as a White Paper (Cmnd. 9849).

It is important to maintain a healthy and vigorous science base, for the efficiency, competitiveness and innovative capacity of the national economy and for the wider well-being of the United Kingdom. My Department's expenditure on the science base - some £19 yearly for every citizen of the UK - is only a part of the total resources that the nation - Government and the private sector - devotes to research and development. The science community and others who spend the taxpayer's money have a duty to address not only their own particular allocation and use of resources and how to get best value for them, but also larger questions. These are: what resources the nation should devote to science; its balance between pure, strategic and applied research; and the choice and selective pursuit of priorities in the national interest. With my Department the University Grants Committee and the universities, the Research Councils, and the Advisory Board for the Research Councils are considering these matters, setting priorities, developing selectivity, and undertaking redeployment, rationalisation and concentration to ensure greater value for money. This activity must continue. The private sector, where our investment nationally in civil R and D is lagging behind that of our competitors, must also recognise and play its proper part particularly in strategic and applied research and development, and in the identification of future exploitable areas of science. The Committee's Report is a welcome stimulus and contribution to informed public discussion of these important matters.





10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

15 July 1986

cefg MT

Dear Rob

EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND ARTS COMMITTEE REPORT:
FUTURE OF THE SCIENCE BUDGET

Thank you for your letter of 14 July. I can confirm we are content with the draft reply attached to your letter.

I am copying this letter to Jill Rutter (Chief Secretary's Office), Tony Galsworthy (Foreign and Commonwealth Office), Ivor Llewelyn (Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food), Tony Laurance (Department of Health and Social Security), Geoff Dart (Department of Energy), John Howe (Ministry of Defence), John Mogg (Department of Trade and Industry), Andrew Lansley (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster's Office), Robin Young (Department of the Environment), Michael Stark (Cabinet Office) and John Fairclough.

Yr

Mark Addison

Mark Addison

Rob Smith Esq
Department of Education and Science.

GA

CBG
✓

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

ELIZABETH HOUSE YORK ROAD LONDON SE1 7PH

TELEPHONE 01-934 9000

FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mark Addison Esq
Private Secretary
10 Downing Street
LONDON SW1

14 July 1986

Dear Mark

EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND ARTS COMMITTEE REPORT: FUTURE OF THE SCIENCE BUDGET

1. Thank you for your letter of 7 July. Mr Baker is planning to publish the Government's response as a White Paper on Wednesday 16 July. He proposes answering an arranged PQ, and writing to the Chairman of the Committee, as in the attached drafts. The PQ reply seeks to incorporate the points made by John Fairclough referred to in your letter. I should be grateful for clearance. *at 11ap*

2. I am copying this letter to Jill Rutter (Chief Secretary's Office), Tony Galsworthy (Foreign and Commonwealth Office), Ivor Llewelyn (Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food), ~~Richard Allan (Department of Transport)~~, Tony Laurance (Department of Health and Social Security), Geoff Dart (Department of Energy), John Howe (Ministry of Defence), John Mogg (Department of Trade and Industry), Andrew Lansley (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster's Office), Michael Stark (Cabinet Office) and John Fairclough. + *Robin Young (Department of the Environment)*

Yours sincerely

Shirley Tindle

R L SMITH
Private Secretary

PP

DRAFT [To be tabled, preferably, by Mr Robert Key]

Q To ask the Secretary of State for Education and Science what is the Government's response to the First Report from the House of Commons Education, Science and Arts Committee Session 1984-85 on The Future of the Science Budget, and if he will make a statement?

A I have written today to the Chairman of the Committee with the Government's response. It is being published as a White Paper (Cmnd.). I am arranging for copies to be placed in the Libraries of both Houses.

It is important to maintain a healthy and vigorous science base, for the efficiency, competitiveness and innovative capacity of the national economy and for the wider well-being of the United Kingdom. My Department's expenditure on the science base - some £19 yearly for every citizen of the UK - is only a part of the total resources that the nation - Government and the private sector - devotes to research and development. The science community and others who spend the taxpayer's money, have a duty to address not only their own particular allocation and use of resources and how to get best value for them, but also the larger and more difficult questions. ^{These are} the adequacy of the national total; its balance between pure, strategic and applied research; and the choice and selective pursuit of priorities in the national interest. With my Department the University Grants Committee and the universities, the Research Councils, and the Advisory Board for the Research Councils are considering these matters, setting priorities, developing selectivity, and undertaking redeployment, rationalisation and concentration to ensure greater value for money. This activity must continue. The private sector, where our investment nationally in civil R and D is seriously lagging behind that of our competitors, must also recognise and play its proper part particularly in strategic and applied research and development, and in the identification of future exploitable areas of science. The Committee's Report is a welcome stimulus and contribution to informed public discussion of these important matters.

ADDRESSEE'S REFERENCE

FILE NUMBER

TO	ENCLOSURES	COPIES TO BE SENT TO
Sir William van Straubenzee MBE MP Chairman Education, Science and Arts Committee House of Commons LONDON SW1A 0AA		
(FULL POSTAL ADDRESS)		(FULL ADDRESSES, IF NECESSARY)

LETTER DRAFTED FOR SIGNATURE BY Mr Kenneth Baker
(NAME OF SIGNATORY)

NAME OF DRAFTING OFFICER D W Tanner Date 11.7.86

I am sending you, with this letter, copies of the Government's response to your Committee's report on the future of the Science Budget and of my Parliamentary Answer given today, about its publication. I regret the delay in replying; I believe Keith Joseph explained some of the causes. In no way does this imply, on the part of Government, a lack of concern for this important subject or of appreciation of the work of your Committee. You know something of my own personal interest in these matters. I know that you and your Members will not hesitate to ask me and my Department for further material and evidence if you want it, and we will do our best to respond.

SCIENCE + TECH: Budget PT4

