

and criticism from our government and the United Kingdom, Germany, and the United Nations. The world realizes that introducing sophisticated anti-aircraft missiles and powerful air surveillance radar into the fragile Cyprus peace would dangerously raise tensions between Greek and Turkish Cypriots, and between Greece and Turkey.

Even though Russia is a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, it seemingly flouts numerous Security Council resolutions and United Nations efforts to defuse the tensions in Cyprus. Indeed, just last Friday the U.N. Security General cited the S-300 sales in his report to the Security Council recommending renewal of the U.N. peace-keeping force in Cyprus.

Even Greece argued for an alternative; place the S-300s on the Greek island of Crete instead of Cyprus. Although not an optimal solution, this alternative at least would have kept the missiles out of the immediate crisis zone.

United States Ambassador Kenneth Brill endorsed such an idea, stating in the press that the United States would like to see the missiles deployed anywhere but Cyprus.

President Clerides of the Republic of Cyprus rejected the Greek plan. In press statements, he tried to downplay the missile crisis, calling it but one issue of many regarding security. This is quite an understatement, as the missiles could destroy aircraft flying in southern Turkey and the radar equipment reportedly could reach as far as Israel. The introduction of these missiles creates a real risk of wider conflict in the eastern Mediterranean.

More disappointing was Russia's reaction to the proposal. The Russian reaction was more defensive, more ominous—and insulting. Russia condemned Mr. Brill's statement as "unfriendly", and formally rebuked our diplomats in Moscow for interfering in what Russia labels an exclusively commercial and bilateral deal. The Russian Ambassador to Cyprus responded by saying that Russia is "nobody's colony."

The Russians appear to have mistaken diplomacy for interference, and arms sales for acts of sovereignty. International prestige comes from settling crises, not provoking them. With power comes responsibility. The best way for Russia to show it remains important on the world stage is to act responsibly, to work for a solution to the military tension on Cyprus rather than inflame it for financial gain.

It is unclear why Russia has taken this course at a time when it hopes for foreign aid to help ease its deep financial crisis. Russia risks damaged ties with the U.S., international condemnation, and the disruption of commerce in the Mediterranean. What is the motive?—making money from the missile sale; trying to divide NATO members; posturing against Israel and its expanding ties to Turkey; or asserting a bold Russian presence abroad to divert attention from problems at home? Certainly none of these reasons should be worth damaging relations with the international community—or provoking hostilities in Cyprus.

We should expect higher standards of conduct from Russia, a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. Further, its treatment of United States diplomats, who are working to find solutions to a crisis which everyone except the Greek Cypriots and Russia want to resolve, is unacceptable.

The Administration needs to more forcefully persuade the Russian leadership to halt the

sale. The President must take a hard line against Russia's treatment of United States diplomatic efforts and personnel, and their efforts to thwart the will of the international community. The U.S. and international community must not take sides in the Cyprus matter, but work for an honest and fair solution for both sides. Stoking the fire with high tech weaponry sales to one party can only lead to further deterioration and a more difficult road for peacemakers in the international community.

#### BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH COULD SAVE MEDICARE

#### HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 18, 1998*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to encourage my colleagues to continue supporting increased funding levels for the National Institutes of Health (NIH). This funding is critical for biomedical research that benefits all Americans. It improves quality of life.

San Diego County is a leader in the field of biomedical research. One of our local champions for medical research is Dr. Lawrence Goldstein, an investigator in the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and a professor in the Division of Cellular and Molecular Medicine and Department of Pharmacology at the UCSD School of Medicine. I submit an article from the San Diego Union Tribune in which Dr. Goldstein suggests that biomedical research could help save the Medicare Trust Fund from bankruptcy.

[From the San Diego Union Tribune, Dec. 11, 1998]

#### MEDICARE CURE: BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH?

(By Lawrence S. Goldstein)

While not obvious, part of the solution to the impending Medicare crisis may be greater federal investment in biomedical research.

This surprising conclusion was recently suggested by a series of studies from Dr. Kenneth Manton and colleagues at Duke University. These researchers analyzed the incidence of disability among the elderly between 1982 and 1994 and found that it fell steadily every year.

One of the major factors driving these consistent declines in disability appears to be biomedical research, which ultimately leads to improved health care for elderly and other patients. Effectively, this means that biomedical research helps us to do a little bit better every year at keeping the elderly productive, active and healthy and often helping to keep them out of nursing homes.

The story, however, gets better since keeping the elderly actively engaged in daily life not only keeps them, their children and grandchildren happier, but also saves our country large amounts of money that would otherwise pay for physical support and nursing homes.

Little wonder that the federal government, with the strong bipartisan leadership and support of members of our local congressional delegation—Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Brian Bilbray and Bob Filner—increased biomedical research funding for the National Institutes of Health by 15 percent this past year.

There are important long-term implications of these studies for our society and the benefits it may reap from biomedical re-

search. Imagine for a moment that the incidence of disability among the elderly in 1994 had been that of 1982. Manton and colleagues estimate that this would have meant that 400,000 more elderly Americans would have been living in nursing homes in 1994 than actually were.

This would cost \$17 billion more in 1994 than was actually spent (assuming that typical annual nursing home residence cost in 1994 was \$40,000). Compared to the actual 1994 Medical expenditures of 167 billion dollars, this is a significant savings, just by keeping these seniors out of nursing homes. These estimated annual savings on nursing home residence alone are also larger than the National budget for all biomedical research supported through the NIH (15 billion dollars this coming year).

Imagine, on the other hand, that we could slightly improve the annual rate of decline in disability. Manton estimates that if we could increase the rate of decline from the current 1.2 percent per year to 1.5 percent per year, this small change could completely change future projections for Medicare expenditures and lead to solvency in 2028 instead of bankruptcy.

Although part of the puzzle to reducing health care costs for the elderly and everyone else is by more efficient delivery of medical care, most of our physicians are already working as hard as they can. Indeed, at this point, it is not clear that additional efficiency can be wrung out of the delivery side of the medical system without sacrificing quality.

A better and more cost-effective route for reducing health care costs in the long run is biomedical research. Such research is the best way to understand the causes of disease, to ensure that the most appropriate treatments are delivered and to find the best methods of support for the ill. Better understanding of the causes of acute or chronic diseases leads to better prevention, treatment and even cure. Important improvements in lifestyle and diet are also guided by research, which tells us what changes matter the most and what changes are unnecessary or even damaging.

Finally, research can tell us what therapies are most valuable in each situation, and it can tell us how to apply them in the best and most cost-effective manner. Combined, improvements in health care coming directly from research can lead to significant declines in disability among the elderly.

Last year, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution in favor of doubling the budget of the NIH in the next five years, even in a time when government reduction is widely supported. The House has been entertaining a similar resolution, and most of our local representatives have signed on as co-sponsors.

They have done so for good reason. What these members realize is that increased biomedical research will not only help us solve our health problems and save Medicare, but, it is one of the most cost-effective long-term investments to achieve these goals.

Let us encourage our representatives in this quest and make biomedical research our No. 1 priority as we enter the next millennium. Our children will thank us even as they enjoy our healthier company in the years to come.

Goldstein is an investigator in the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and a professor in the Division of Cellular and Molecular Medicine and Department of Pharmacology at the UCSD School of Medicine.