25, 1994, and passed a joint resolution regarding the sad situation of the Hungarian and other minorities in Transylvania—Romania.

While I realize the practical obstacles standing in the way of such a resolution of the ethnic question in Transylvania, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the thoughtful and bold proposal the resolution is advancing. There is no question that the tangled ethnic issue which the post-Communist government of President Iliescu seems to be incapable, or even unwilling, to solve, needs courageous and new initiatives which can point the way to a resolution which all the parties are able to live with.

AMERICAN HUNGARIAN CONGRESS AND HUNGARIAN NATIONAL WORLD COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Whereas, the history of the Transylvanian Hungarians, ever since they were separated from the Hungarian nation by the Trianon and Paris peace treaties and became a national minority in Romania, clearly demonstrates that they can neither individually nor as an ethnic group exist in Romania under acceptable humane conditions; and

Whereas, in addition, as a result of Romanian nationalist discrimination and persecution, the Csángó-Hungarians of Moldavia are no longer listed on official Romanian statistics; and

Whereas, fifty years ago, about one million Jews lived in Romania, and today they number less than 20,000; and

Whereas, fifty years ago, about 800,000 Germans lived in Romania, and today their number is about 100,000; and

Whereas, at the present time, the number of Romas (Gypsies) in Romania is about five million, but Romanian statistics recognize only a few hundred thousands; and

Whereas, since the Peace Treaty *Diktat* of Trianon, Hungarians who perished in Romanian internment camps or fled the country are estimated to be more than one million;

Therefore, in the knowledge of the above facts, the Hungarian National World Council and the American Hungarian Congress request, in the name of the more than two million Hungarians living in the United States of America, and other countries of the Western world; that be it

Resolved, tat the Government of Hungary and the other governments of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe secure the continued existence of the 2.5 million Transylvanian Hungarians (who were separated from their Hungarian motherland by the Trianon and Paris peace treaties) in accordance with European democratic norms (e.g. Switzerland and Belgium), so that within the framework of an independent Transylvania the Hungarians, Germans, Romanians, Gypsies and other ethnic groups may exercise their self-determination and rights as associated nations.

In witness thereof, signed in Cleveland, OH in the United States of America, this 25th day of November, 1994.

PROPOSING A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Stenholm balanced budget amendment of which I am a cosponsor. As I was recovering from back surgery last week, I sat at home watching the House debate legislation on C–SPAN and I saw the legislative process through the eyes of our constituents.

It's no great secret that Democrats and Republicans have differing views on many issues, but what is scarcely known is that we share many common goals as well. That message all too often gets lost in the confusion over parliamentary procedure that America sees at home. My colleague CHARLES STENHOLM and other Democrats have been working to pass a balanced budget amendment for years. I was proud to begin working with these conservative Democrats on a balanced budget amendment during my first year in Congress. Democrats like Mr. STENHOLM and Republicans like Mr. BARTON have risen above partisanship in bringing the balanced budget amendment to the forefront of political debate.

This week we are being given the chance to build on the efforts of Mr. STENHOLM and Mr. BARTON by cooperating to eliminate one of the largest threats to the continued prosperity of our country—the deficit. A majority composed of both Democrats and Republicans now believes that a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget is the right choice for taking our country into the 21st century with the guarantee of permanent fiscal responsibility. The question seems to be how to do it. I simply ask that you don't get lost in all the speeches that you hear on the floor this week. We must not get so caught up in the debate over how to balance the budget that we let the balanced budget itself slip away.

Past Congresses have proven they lack the will to balance the budget. A balanced budget amendment will provide the constitutional mandate that will ensure that future Congresses make balanced budgets the rule rather than the exception. But we can't forget that passing a balanced budget amendment will only be the foundation on which we must build a fiscally responsible Government. The real work will come later when we vote on spending cuts and reductions in the size of Government that will be necessary to eliminate the deficit. Again, I urge my colleagues to support the balanced budget amendment and to dedicate themselves to making the tough decisions that will be necessary to eliminate our deficit.

WELFARE, TIME, AND MONEY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, as Congress considers reforming our Nation's welfare system, articles and editorials throughout the country are capturing some of the key elements of the debate on the issue.

Just recently our distinguished colleague from Missouri, BILL CLAY, during a hearing of the Committee on Economic Opportunities, elaborated on the need for a welfare system that provides education and training, child care and health care support for individuals. His words were subsequently captured in an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post Dispatch.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share the Post Dispatch editorial with my colleagues. It is insightful and certainly worthwhile reading. I also take this opportunity to commend BILL CLAY for his continued leadership on the welfare reform issue, and other issues of importance to American families.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 23, 1995]

WELFARE, TIME, AND MONEY

At times, the public debate over welfare is depicted in ways to suggest that liberals want to do nothing about the problem and that conservatives have all the right answers. If the debate continues in that vein, chances are the people who need help the most could get lost in the rhetoric.

Last Wednesday, at a hearing of the Committee on Economic Opportunities, the ranking Democrat, Rep. William L. Clay of St. Louis, tried to boil the debate down to sensible questions: Are there enough jobs for the 4.6 million adults now receiving welfare? Who will care for the children while their parents work?

At issue are not people who are capable of finding work immediately. Forty-six percent of them, Mr. Clay notes, have less than a high school education. And the skills of the rest are such that they wouldn't be able to find work that pays a sufficient wage to support families.

''If we want welfare to become a temporary support system,'' he said, ''then we must provide the education and training and child care and health care support essential to long-term employment. But that will take time and money.''

Precisely. Time and money.

But that's not all. Both the GOP and the Clinton administration have to acknowledge that many of the hard-core segment of the welfare population are just plain unemployable. A study done for the federal government noted that this segment includes many with lower IQs, among other problems, making it exceptionally difficult for them to move easily from public aid to private work.

Another issue worth more discussion is the sorry state of this nation's child-support payment system. Illinois is a good example. A state audit found that 62 percent of the court-ordered support cases lacked sufficient information, such as driver's license numbers and Social Security numbers, to collect payments.

The Republican administrations at the top of Illinois government certainly haven't demonstrated that their party has all the solutions to welfare. Washington can make it easier for states to track these so-called deadbeat parents, some of whom are known to avoid their responsibilities by moving to another state. Why not use Internal Revenue Service records to help states keep track of these parents and make them pay their fair share?

Meanwhile, both the Republicans and the administration would do well to acknowledge Mr. Clay's points that genuine welfare will take time and money. To say the problem can be solved quickly or cheaply is either a delusion or a deception.