

sponsible national conversation about how to move forward together and create equal opportunity.

The Supreme Court has raised the hurdle, but it is not insurmountable. Make no mistake: The Court has approved affirmative action that is narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling interest. The constitutional test is now tougher than it was, but I am confident that the test can be met in many cases. We know that from the experience of State and local governments, which have operated under the tougher standard for some years now.

Some weeks ago, I directed my staff conducting the review of Federal affirmative action programs to ask agencies a number of probing questions about programs that make race or sex a condition of eligibility for any kind of benefit. What, concretely, is the justification for this particular program? Have race and gender-neutral alternatives been considered? Is the program flexible? Does it avoid quotas, in theory and in practice? Is it transitional and temporary? Is it narrowly drawn? Is it balanced, so that it avoids concentrating its benefits and its costs? These are tough questions, but they are the right policy questions, and they need answers.

I have instructed the team conducting the administration's affirmative action review to include an analysis of the *Adarand* decision and its implications in their report.

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Report of the
Department of Housing and Urban
Development**

June 13, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the requirements of 42 U.S.C. 3536, I transmit herewith the 29th Annual Report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which covers calendar year 1993.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 13, 1995.

**Address to the Nation on the Plan To
Balance the Budget**

June 13, 1995

Good evening. Tonight I present to the American people a plan for a balanced Federal budget. My plan cuts spending by \$1.1 trillion. It does not raise taxes. It won't be easy, but elected leaders of both parties agree with me that we must do this, and we will.

We're at the edge of a new century, living in a period of rapid and profound change. And we must do everything in our power to help our people build good and decent lives for themselves and their children.

These days, working people can't keep up. No matter how hard they work, one, two, even three jobs, without the education to get good jobs, they can't make it in today's America. I don't want my daughter's generation to be the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents. Now, balancing our budget can help to change that, if we do it in a way that reflects our values and what we care about the most: our children, our families, and what we leave to generations to come.

That's why my budget has five fundamental priorities. First, because our most important mission is to help people make the most of their own lives, don't cut education. Second, balance the budget by controlling health care costs, strengthening Medicare, and saving Medicaid, not by slashing health services for the elderly. Third, cut taxes for the middle class and not the wealthy. We shouldn't cut education or Medicare just to make room for a tax cut for people who don't really need it. Fourth, cut welfare, but save enough to protect children and move able-bodied people from welfare to work. Fifth, don't put the brakes on so fast that we risk our economic prosperity.

This can be a turning point for us. For 12 years our Government—Congress and the White House—ducked the deficit and pretended we could get something for nothing. In my first 2 years as President, we turned this around and cut the deficit by one-third. Now, let's eliminate it.

It's time to clean up this mess. Here's how: First, I propose to cut spending in discretionary areas other than defense by an aver-