

human body. So this virus can be identified both in a cow—is it mad or not? Well, it may just be angry but not crazed—and in a human.

Dealing with a very, very serious human issue and also a serious economic issue for those of us in the cattle business. This is a big thing. And what has happened—I love charts.

Ms. SPEIER. As do I.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I noticed, Representative SPEIER, that you love charts too. So I borrowed this. I think you used it earlier today. This is instructive.

You were just talking with the Representative, our friend from San Diego, about the enormous increase that took place for the National Institutes of Health during the George W. Bush conservative period of time. It is right there, \$21 billion; and then over the years, it began to lose a little bit of its, I guess, interest. And then, as we went into the late years of the George Bush administration, it dropped down there. And then, of course, the great crash. A little bump here, which I think is the stimulus bill, pushing more money into research at the National Institutes of Health. And then we have seen, beginning in 2010, what has got to be one of the stupidest policies this Nation has engaged in.

□ 1815

It happened to be in 2011, when the House changed from Democratic control to Republican control. We have seen a very steep decline—a \$1.5 billion reduction and annual decline in the National Institutes of Health.

This same decline in the last 3 years is what is the result of the austerity budgets that have been imposed upon us by the Republicans trying to solve the national deficit by cutting Federal expenditures. The entire European community has come to the conclusion that doesn't work. Austerity budgeting does not increase economic growth. It has caused stagnation. Certainly, in Europe we are beginning to see, I think, a large part of the slow growth in the United States caused by austerity budgets.

But specifically to the health care of Americans—our health, our well-being—this is really serious. This means people are going to have additional illnesses. You spoke earlier about some of those, like diabetes. Diabetic research funding is cut through the National Institutes of Health.

This one I really find frightening. I find this frightening because this is very personal. My mother-in-law spent the last 2 years of her life with a very, very serious case of Alzheimer's disease. She died in a hospice program in our home. We, I suppose, were a very small part of this because we took care of her. But right now we are spending \$200 billion a year dealing with Alzheimer's.

We know that the population is going to increase and the elderly population is going to skyrocket as the baby

boomers move into their later years. By 2050, it will be \$1.2 trillion for Alzheimer's.

Is there anybody in America, any family in America, that is not concerned about Alzheimer's? I don't know who they are. I know my family is concerned about it. Every family that I know—and I know many because I have been in public life for a long time and met perhaps thousands, or hundreds of thousands, of people—and every single one of them is concerned about Alzheimer's.

This is the financial side of it. The human side of it, I can tell you, is serious. I can tell you the effect it has.

Ms. SPEIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would.

Ms. SPEIER. To your point, this \$1.2 trillion in the year 2050 is coming from all the taxpayers in this country. Because these are Medicare patients. These are Medicaid patients. What would be really stunning is to understand that if we were able to delay the onset or progression of Alzheimer's by 6 years, it could produce an annual savings of \$51 billion in 2015, \$126 billion in 2025, and a whopping \$444 billion—almost half a trillion dollars—in the year 2050, when that cost is going to skyrocket to \$1.2 trillion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am so glad you interrupted because that is an extremely important fact.

Let's go back and look at that. In 2015, the savings are how much?

Ms. SPEIER. They are \$51 billion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. They are \$51 billion. We are going through this budget exercise where, by the way, the sequestration cut continues, although the across-the-board is eliminated. Half of the sequestration cut will continue because of this budget, but we will be able to try to balance out the prioritization.

But the total savings in 2015 is less than the \$50 billion that you have suggested could be saved if we could extend the onset and the severity of Alzheimer's. We watched this very closely in my family. The fact of the matter is that the National Institutes of Health's funding for Alzheimer's is coming to understand the nature of Alzheimer's and, therefore, how to deal with it.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank you for yielding. Both of you are absolutely right. It is so shortsighted to have us cut back on funding for the National Institutes of Health and their research agenda. When you make a cut in this area one year, it isn't like you can make it up the next year. Researchers go on to other fields.

It is shortsighted to make these kinds of cuts.

I also wanted to comment on the fact that every day members of the Safe Climate Caucus have come to this House floor and talked about the shortsightedness of the leadership of the House of Representatives in ignoring the science on climate change. And so every day we have had speakers—the

gentleman from California has been one of them—to just use a minute to talk about this pressing issue.

Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal reported that China has released a national blueprint for adapting to climate change. This follows the International Energy Agency's recent prediction that China will install more renewable energy over the next two decades than the U.S. and Europe combined. And China has recently implemented a series of regional cap-and-trade programs which are putting a price on carbon in China.

According to the Chinese Government—and I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity—climate change has already cost its people tens of billions of dollars and potentially thousands of lives. These developments in China are important because China is the world's largest emitter of carbon pollution, and we are the second largest. Our two countries need to play a leading role in addressing this global threat.

President Obama is committed to global leadership. His climate action plan calls for working with China and other nations to bend the post-2020 emissions trajectory. He is bringing in John Podesta, an experienced leader with a deep understanding of climate issues, to help him succeed.

We in the House need to stop being part of the problem and start being part of the solution. We need to start taking the climate threat seriously and work to find solutions. If China can take action on climate change, so can the U.S. If we don't, we will lose the race to develop the clean energy technologies that will power the future.

Let's not be shortsighted. Let's invest in research—research to protect our health and research to protect our planet.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. WAXMAN, for bringing up the leadership that China has.

I notice that the leader of our hour talked about China's leadership in another field.

Let me turn back to our leader, Representative SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I just point out that China is eating our lunch, so to speak.

This is just the funding from 2012 and 2013. We referenced this earlier. And Congressman WAXMAN was talking about what they are doing relative to climate change. Look what they are doing in R&D spending in the last 2 years. It is up 15 percent. Germany, Japan, and South Korea are up 5 percent. Where is the United States, Mr. GARAMENDI?

Mr. GARAMENDI. In the red, going down.

Ms. SPEIER. That is right: a cut of 5 percent. So another example of how China is going to eclipse us in more ways than one. And those young researchers that we have been talking about are going to be going to China to do their research.