

## Statement on Signing Legislation Rejecting U.S. Sentencing Commission Recommendations

October 30, 1995

Today I reject United States Sentencing Commission proposals that would equalize penalties for crack and powder cocaine distribution by dramatically reducing the penalties for crack. The Sentencing Commission would also reduce the penalties for money laundering by combining the guidelines on money laundering with those on transactions in unlawfully acquired property. I am opposed to both of these changes.

Since I took office, my Administration has fought to stop drug abuse and to stamp out the crime and violence that are its constant companions. We are battling drug traffickers at every level of their networks—from the very top to the very bottom.

The Cali Cartel, which pumped drugs into America with seeming impunity, is now on the run. We have intensified our efforts to work with drug producing countries to stop drugs from coming into the United States and to capture major drug traffickers. We told criminals convicted time and again for serious violent crimes or drug trafficking that from now on, it's three strikes and you're out. And we established the death penalty for drug kingpins, because they should reap what they sow.

We are putting 100,000 police officers on America's streets. We banned assault weapons because America doesn't want drug dealers to be better armed than police officers. We are helping schools to rid themselves of guns, and we are also helping schools to prevent teenage drug use by teaching children about the dangers of drugs and gangs. And we support schools who test student athletes for drugs.

All of this is beginning to work. For the first time in a very long time, crime has decreased around the country. But we cannot stop now.

We have to send a constant message to our children that drugs are illegal, drugs are dangerous, drugs may cost you your life—and the penalties for dealing drugs are severe. I am not going to let anyone who peddles drugs get the idea that the cost of doing business is going down.

Trafficking in crack, and the violence it fosters, has a devastating impact on communities across America, especially inner-city communities. Tough penalties for crack trafficking are required because of the effect on individuals and families, related gang activity, turf battles, and other violence.

Current law does require a substantial disparity between sentences for crack as compared to equal amounts of powder cocaine. Some adjustment is warranted, and the bill I am signing today, S. 1254, directs the Sentencing Commission to undertake additional review of these issues and to report back with new recommendations.

Furthermore, the sentencing structure should reflect the fact that all crack starts as powder. When large-scale cocaine traffickers sell powder with the knowledge that it will be converted into crack, they should be punished as severely as those who distribute the crack itself. I have asked the Attorney General to immediately develop enforcement strategies to bring about this result. As I said before, we *are* going after drug traffickers at every level of their networks.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,  
October 30, 1995.

NOTE: S. 1254, approved October 30, was assigned Public Law No. 104-38.

## Remarks on the Balkan Peace Process and an Exchange With Reporters

October 31, 1995

*The President.* Good morning. I have just met with Secretary Christopher and our Bosnia nego-

tiating team, led by Ambassador Holbrooke. As you know, they are preparing to leave for Day-

ton, Ohio, in just a few moments. There, the Presidents of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia will start direct negotiations which we hope will lead to a peaceful, lasting settlement in Bosnia.

I want to repeat today what I told President Tudjman and President Izetbegovic when we met in New York last week. We have come to a defining moment in Bosnia. This is the best chance we've had for peace since the war began. It may be the last chance we have for a very long time. Only the parties to this terrible conflict can end it. The world now looks to them to turn the horror of war to the promise of peace. The United States and our partners, Russia, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom, must do everything in our power to support them. That is what I have just instructed Secretary Christopher and our team to do in the days ahead in Dayton. We will succeed only if America continues to lead.

Already our military strength through NATO and our diplomatic determination have advanced the possibility of peace in Bosnia. We can't stop now. The responsibilities of leadership are real, but the benefits are greater. We see them all around the world, a reduced nuclear threat, democracy in Haiti, peace breaking out in the Middle East and in Northern Ireland. In Bosnia, as elsewhere, when the United States leads we can make progress. And if we don't, progress will be much more problematic.

Making peace in Bosnia is important to America. Making peace will end the terrible toll of this war, the innocent lives lost, the futures destroyed. For 4 years, the people of Bosnia have suffered the worst atrocities in Europe since World War II: mass executions, ethnic cleansing, concentration camps, rape and terror, starvation and disease. We continue to learn more and more even in the present days about the slaughters in Srebrenica.

The only way to stop these horrors is to make peace. Making peace will prevent the war from spreading. So far, we have been able to contain this conflict to the former Yugoslavia. But the Balkans lie at the heart of Europe, next door to several of our key NATO allies and to some of the new, fragile European democracies. If the war there reignites, it could spread and spark a much larger conflict, the kind of conflict that has drawn Americans into two European wars in this century. We have to end the war in Bosnia and do it now.

Making peace will advance our goal of a peaceful, democratic, and undivided Europe, a Europe at peace with extraordinary benefits to our long-term security and prosperity, a Europe at peace with partners to meet the challenges of the new century, challenges that affect us here at home like terrorism and drug trafficking, organized crime, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. A peaceful, democratic, undivided Europe will be that kind of partner.

In Dayton, our diplomats face a tremendous challenge. There is no guarantee they will succeed. America can help the parties negotiate a settlement, but we cannot impose a peace. In recent weeks, thanks to our mediation efforts, the parties to the war have made real progress. The parties have put into effect a Bosnia-wide cease-fire. They have agreed to the basic principles of a settlement. Bosnia will remain a single state comprised of two entities but, I repeat, a single state. There must be free elections and democratic institutions of government at the national and regional levels.

Now, beyond this, many difficult issues remain to be resolved. These include the internal boundary between the Bosnia-Croat Federation and the Serb Republic, the status of Sarajevo, the practical steps that need to be taken to separate hostile forces, and the procedures for free elections. That's just a few of the difficult issues this team will have to confront beginning today.

I urge the parties to negotiate seriously for the good of their own people. So much is riding on the success in Dayton, and the whole world is watching. If the parties do reach a settlement, NATO must help to secure it, and the United States, as NATO's leader, must participate in such an effort.

Again I say, there is no substitute for American leadership. After so many years of violence and bloodshed, a credible international military presence in Bosnia is needed to give the parties confidence to live up to their own agreements and to give them time to begin the long, hard work of rebuilding and living together again. NATO is the one organization with the track record and the strength to implement a settlement.

And as I've said many times, the United States, the source of NATO's military strength, must participate. If we don't participate in the Implementation Force, our NATO partners, understandably, would reconsider their own com-

mitments. We would undermine American leadership of the alliance. We would weaken the alliance itself. And the hard-won peace in Bosnia could be lost.

American troops would not be deployed—I say this again—would not be deployed unless and until the parties reach a peace agreement. We must first have a peace agreement. And that is what I would urge the American people and the Members of Congress to focus on over the next few days. They would, if going into Bosnia, operate under NATO command, with clear rules of engagement and a clearly defined mission. They would not be asked to keep a peace that cannot be kept. But they would make sure we do our part in helping peace to hold.

As the peace process moves forward I will continue to consult closely with Congress. If a peace agreement is reached I will request an expression of support in Congress for committing United States troops to a NATO implementation force. Our foreign policy works best when we work together. I want the widest possible support for peace.

But now it would be premature to request an expression of support because we can't decide many of the details of implementation until an agreement is clearly shaped and defined. Let me stress again, we aren't there yet; there are still difficult obstacles ahead. The focus on Dayton must be on securing the peace. Without peace there will be nothing for us to secure.

Earlier this month in New Jersey, I had the privilege of spending time with His Holiness Pope Paul—Pope John Paul II. At the end of our meeting, the Pope said something to me I would like to repeat. He said, "You know, I am not a young man. I have lived through most of this century. This century began with a war in Sarajevo. Mr. President, you must not let it end with a war in Sarajevo."

All of us must do our part to hear the Pope's plea. Our conscience as a nation devoted to freedom and tolerance demands it. Our conscience as a nation that wants to end this mindless slaughter demands it. Our enduring interest in the security and stability of Europe demand it. This is our challenge. And I'm determined to do everything I can to see that America meets that challenge.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, what is the effect of the House resolution on these talks? And do you feel hemmed in by them?

*The President.* No. No, I wouldn't expect it to have any effect on the talks. I think we have to get the peace agreement first. I expect to consult intensively with the leaders of Congress, beginning—I believe tomorrow the congressional leadership is coming in, and I expect to talk to them about Bosnia in detail and then to keep working with the congressional leadership and with Members of Congress who are interested in this right along, all the way through the process. And I expect them to say that they want to ask questions and to have them answered before they would agree to the policy that I will embark on.

Q. Mr. President, looking back at the advice that General Colin Powell gave you on Bosnia when he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was that bad advice, his reluctance to use air power to force the parties into negotiations?

*The President.* Let me tell you, today we're starting a peace process. And we have done things that have brought us to this point. I believe we have done the right things. But I think the American people should be focused on peace and on the process and the work before us.

#### *Debt Limit Legislation*

Q. Mr. President, are you going to make peace with the Republicans tomorrow and strike some sort of debt extension agreement?

*The President.* Well, I look forward to having the opportunity to discuss that with them. I know Senator Dole and Leon Panetta have had a brief conversation about it. I know that a lot of others are contacting the Congress about it. So we'll have a chance to talk about that tomorrow as well.

Q. Are you willing to accept a short-term, through November 29th, as has been suggested, extension?

*The President.* I think any responsible extension is a move forward. I think the main thing is we want to send a message to the world and to our own financial markets and to our own people that America honors its commitments, that we are not going to see the first example in the history of the Republic where we don't pay our bills.

Thank you very much.

Q. Mr. President, have you been briefed on the Aldrich Ames damage assessment?

*Canadian Referendum*

Q. Are you happy about Canada?

The President. Yes.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:35 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Franjo Tudjman of Croatia and President Alija Izetbegovic of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Message to the Congress on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

October 31, 1995

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 1995, to the *Federal Register* for publication. Similar notices have been sent annually to the Congress and the *Federal Register* since November 12, 1980. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on November 1, 1994.

The crisis between the United States and Iran that began in 1979 has not been fully resolved. The international tribunal established to adjudicate claims of the United States and U.S. nationals against Iran and of the Iranian government and Iranian nationals against the United States continues to function, and normalization

of commercial and diplomatic relations between the United States and Iran has not been achieved. Indeed, on March 15 of this year, I declared a separate national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and imposed separate sanctions. By Executive Order 12959, these sanctions were significantly augmented. In these circumstances, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities that are in place by virtue of the November 14, 1979, declaration of emergency, including the authority to block certain property of the Government of Iran, and which are needed in the process of implementing the January 1981 agreements with Iran.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,  
October 31, 1995.

NOTE: The notice is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Statement on Signing Biotechnology Process Patent Legislation

November 1, 1995

I am pleased to sign into law S. 1111, a bill to provide enhanced protection of biotechnology process patents. This bill will update current patent law to provide the protection American biotechnology companies need to continue developing new products. American consumers will benefit from improvements in the diagnosis, cure, or treatment of disease and from the production of healthier, more abundant foods.

Process patents are especially important in biotechnology, since part of the genius of that field is to produce commercial quantities of breakthrough products through new and inventive processes. If the innovative process used to make a biotechnology product is not protected by patent, American biotechnology will remain vulnerable to foreign imitation. This bill will provide necessary new protection for proc-