AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

It will be seen in the students and the graduates of Marquette University, in the men and women who wear our uniform around the world and do more good in conditions that are more safe and secure because of his labor.

It also lives on, as we heard today so movingly, in the memories of those of us who were lucky enough to have known and loved him. He left each of us our own stock of Les Aspin stories, guaranteed to bring a smile to our faces and warmth to our hearts as long as we remain on this Earth.

Well, Les is God's servant now. And finally, finally, he is with someone with sufficient energy to keep up. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:18 p.m. at St. John's Church.

Statement on the Nuclear Agreement With North Korea
June 13, 1995

I welcome the agreement reached between the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in Kuala Lumpur on key issues related to implementation of the US–DPRK Agreed Framework. Achieved through close consultation with our friends and allies in the Republic of Korea and Japan, the agreement keeps North Korea's dangerous nuclear facilities frozen and confirms that the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) will select the reactor model and prime contractor for the light-water reactor project. At the same time, KEDO has confirmed that both the reactor model and prime contractor will be South Korean.

In addressing these and other issues, today's understandings are an important step on the road toward full implementation of the US–DPRK Agreed Framework, which provides the international community with assurance against a North Korean nuclear threat and North Korea with opportunity to rejoin the community of nations. We also continue to believe that the resumption of North-South dialog is essential not only to the full implementation of the Agreed Framework but also to the continuing effort to build lasting prosperity and a stable peace on the Korean Peninsula.

Statement on the Supreme Court Decision on Affirmative Action
June 13, 1995

The Supreme Court's decision sets a new legal standard for judging affirmative action, but it must not set us back in our fight to end discrimination and create equal opportunity for all.

Despite great progress, discrimination and exclusion on the basis of race and gender are still facts of life in America. I have always believed that affirmative action is needed to remedy discrimination and to create a more inclusive society that truly provides equal opportunity. But I have also said that affirmative action must be carefully justified and must be done the right way. The Court's opinion in *Adarand* is not inconsistent with that view.

It is regrettable that already, with the ink barely dry, many are using the Court's opinion as a reason to abandon that fight. Exaggerated claims about the end of affirmative action, whether in celebration or dismay, do not serve the interest all of us have in a responsible 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