AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

they thought it was actually acceptable to shoot someone if they treated you with disrespect.

As long as there are stories like this, as long as young people are more likely to be both the victims and the perpetrators of crime, as long as casual drug use among our children is rising even as overall hard drug use goes down, as long as there are children who have never been taught the difference between right and wrong, we'll all have more work to do.

And that's why I'm troubled by so much of what's going on here in Washington. We have to balance the budget, all right, but there are some in Congress who would do it by tipping the balance against law enforcement. They would replace our efforts to put 100,000 new police officers on the street with a block grant that doesn't require a single new officer to be hired. They want to cut 23 million students out of our safe and drug-free schools initiative—out of the programs that so many of you bring to our schools every day all across America. And literally, they want to shut down the National Office of Drug Control Policy.

We can't give up on the war on drugs. And we can't back off of our support for law enforcement. And the truth is, we don't need to sacrifice these national priorities to balance the budget. We can continue to implement the crime bill and balance the budget. The only thing we'd have to do is to give up on an unnecessarily huge tax cut and to take a little longer to balance the budget. Now that luxury seems a small price to pay for necessities like balancing the budget and strengthening law enforcement at the same time.

And believe it or not, there are still some in Congress who want to repeal the Brady bill and lift the ban on assault weapons. Let me be clear: These attempts to roll back the clock are misguided. We cannot turn back in the fight against crime. There are still too many streets in America where our children are afraid to stand at a bus stop, too many neighborhoods where our seniors are fearful of going to the grocery store, too many communities where families are scared to head outside for a walk on a warm summer evening.

So those in Congress who would attempt to repeal the Brady bill or the assault weapons ban or our pledge to put 100,000 new police officers on the street, let me say one more time: You're going nowhere fast. If you do succumb to the political pressure from extremist groups to repeal any of these measures, I will veto them in a heartbeat.

On these issues I have a simple pledge. I won't let any bill pass my desk that hurts you or the people you protect. That's a good American standard. We all ought to judge our conduct by it.

You know, this has been a difficult period for law enforcement. You seem to be under assault from many fronts. Like people from every walk of life, police officers sometimes do make mistakes and have to deal with the consequences. But unlike other citizens, you also put your lives on the line for the rest of us every day. I'm reminded of a T-shirt that people in Oklahoma City made after the terrible bombing there. It read, "A society that makes war against its police had better learn to make friends with criminals." That's the fact.

I'm sorry I can't be with you in person today, but I want you to have no doubt I am still standing shoulder to shoulder with you in the battle against crime and violence. It threatens us all every day, every night, and you're trying to do something about it. As long as you are, I'll be with you for as long as I'm here.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at 12:45 p.m. from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building to the FOP conference in Virginia Beach, VA.

Statement on Proposed Telecommunications Reform Legislation

August 1, 1995

My administration is committed to enactment of a telecommunications reform bill in this Congress. Such legislation is needed to stimulate investment, promote competition, provide open access to information networks, strengthen and improve universal service, and provide for flexible regulations for this

important industry. Consumers should receive the benefits of lower prices, better quality, and greater choices in their telephone and cable services, and they should continue to benefit from a diversity of voices and viewpoints in radio, television, and the print media.

Unfortunately, H.R. 1555, as reported by the Commerce Committee and amended by the managers' amendment, does not reach any of these goals. Instead of promoting investment and competition, it promotes mergers and concentration of power. Instead of promoting open access and diversity of content and viewpoints, it would allow fewer people to control greater numbers of television, radio, and newspaper outlets in every community.

H.R. 1555 with the managers' amendment would:

—allow a single owner to acquire television stations that can reach 50 percent of the Nation;

—allow the acquisition of an unlimited number of radio stations in every community and across the Nation;

—repeal the newspaper/broadcast and broadcast/cable cross-ownership bans that currently exist;

—permit the Bell Operating Companies to offer long distance service before there is real competition in local service, with less-than-minimum structural safeguards and without requiring a determination by the Department of Justice that entry will not impede competition;

—allow an excessive number of in-region buyouts between telephone companies and cable operators, substituting consolidation for competition and leaving consumers in rural areas and small towns with no rate protection in most cases and no foreseeable expectation of competition;

—deregulate cable programming services and equipment rates before cable operators face real competition and without providing any consumer protection provision after deregulation;

—preempt the States from implementing certain rate regulation schemes and opening their local phone markets to certain types of competition as they choose; and

—not include the V-chip proposal the Senate adopted.

The cumulative effect of these provisions would be to harm competition and to weaken the benefits to the public. If H.R. 1555 with the managers' amendment is sent to me without deletion or revision of a significant number of these provisions I will be compelled to veto it in the best interests of the public and our national economic well-being.

Memorandum on Timber Salvage Legislation

August 1, 1995

Memorandum for the Secretary of the Interior; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Secretary of Commerce; the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency

Subject: Implementing Timber-Related Provisions to Public Law 104–19

On July 27th, I signed the rescission bill (Public Law 104–19), which provides much-needed supplemental funds for disaster relief and other programs. It also makes necessary cuts in spending, important to the overall balanced budget plan, while protecting key investments in education and training, the environment, and other priorities.

While I am pleased that we were able to work with the Congress to produce this piece of legislation, I do not support every provision, most particularly the provision concerning timber salvage. In fact, I am concerned that the timber salvage provisions may even lead to litigation that could slow down our forest management program. Nonetheless, changes made prior to enactment of Public Law 104–19 preserve our ability to implement the current forest plans' standards and guidelines, and provides sufficient discretion for the Administration to protect other resources such as clean water and fisheries.

With these changes, I intend to carry out the objectives of the relevant timber-related activities authorized by Public Law 104–19. I am also firmly committed to doing so in ways that, to the maximum extent allowed, follow our current environmental laws and programs. Public Law 104–19 gives us the discretion to apply current environmental standards to the timber salvage program, and