anyone who employs a minor in drug trafficking activities. The section also establishes a sentence of mandatory life imprisonment for a second offense.

Sec. 7. Mandatory Minimum Sentences for Persons Convicted of Distributions of Drugs to Minors

Section 7 establishes a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 years' imprisonment for anyone 21 years of age or older who sells drugs to a minor. The section also establishes a sentence of mandatory life imprisonment for a second offense.

Sec. 8. Penalties for Drug Offenses in Drug-Free Zones

Section 8 establishes new mandatory minimum sentences for drug offenses in drug-free zones which were omitted from the 1994 Crime Bill.

Sec. 9. Flexibility in Application of Mandatory Minimum Sentence Provisions in Certain Circumstances

Section 9 includes a narrowly circumscribed mandatory minimum reform measure that returns a small degree of discretion to the federal courts in the sentencing of truly first-time, non-violent low-level drug offenders. To deviate from the mandatory minimum, the court would have to find that the defendant did not finance the drug sale, did not sell the drugs, and did not act as a leader or organizer.

Sec. 10. Mandatory Restitution to Victims of Violent Crime

Section 10 amends 18 U.S.C. 3663 by mandating federal judges to enter orders requiring defendants to provide restitution to the victims of their crimes.

REGARDING S. 14, THE LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT OF 1995

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, year after year, billions of the taxpayers' dollars are larded across the Nation for pork barrel projects created at the behest of our fellow Members.

This is nothing new. Each session, Congress persists in passing appropriations bill groaning with this type of spending for individual projects in a Members home State or district.

Pork barrel spending has become a symbol of political prowess and effectiveness. Members can stump back home, claiming that they have the clout to deliver these projects to their constituents.

Although some of these projects no doubt have their merit, pork barrel spending has become an emblem of out of control spending. Pork is Congress' shameful scarlet letter.

Ideally, Congress should exhibit the type of self-restraint and sacrifice that would swiftly put this wasteful practice to an end. We owe that to future generations of Americans and to our commitment to continue to reduce the deficit.

However, I am a realist and I know that while some Members would voluntarily refrain from pork barrel spending, others would continue with business as usual.

Mr. President, the American people are fed up with business as usual. It's time to change the Nation's spending habits.

The President is also faced with an enormous dilemma. These pork projects are carefully woven into the appropriations legislation, or as Senators BRADLEY and DOMENICI have rightly observed, through targeted tax credits and expenditures in revenue acts. The President cannot simply pull out one thread without unravelling the entire bill. He does not have that authority.

The President must look at each bill as a whole, determining whether to accept the bad with the good—whether the bad outweighs the good. More often than not, it's a case of the President holding his nose and signing the spending bill.

The obvious solution is to grant the President the line-item veto. Today, 43 of the 50 State Governors have some form of veto authority. As Governor of the State of Nebraska, I was privileged to have the line-item veto authority. To me, it was an invaluable weapon in my arsenal to effectively control the spending of my State legislature.

I have long believed that the President too should have this power to challenge wasteful Government spending and keep us on the path of deficit reduction. All but two Presidents in the 20th century have supported some type of line-item veto authority. It's not time; it's past time we granted the President this power.

Mr. President, in previous years, I have championed efforts to amend the Constitution to allow for a line-item veto. I have led the charge to give the President enhanced rescission powers.

Over 7 years ago, I worked with then Senator Dan Quayle in sponsoring a porkbuster enhanced rescission proposal. I also supported an amendment by my distinguished colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN that would have granted the President greater rescission powers.

It is a somewhat melancholy task to come to the Senate floor year after year seeking these powers for the President and then to come away empty handed. The McCain amendment garnered only 40 votes—far short of the 60 votes needed to break the filibuster that would surely occur on any such proposal.

I have come to the sad conclusion that proposals such as these stand little if any chance of becoming law. But that does not mean that we should allow the perfect to become the enemy of the good. Through compromise—a bipartisan compromise—we can still move forward on this issue. As such, I am an original sponsor of the legislative Line-Item Veto Act.

The bill would change our current rescissions process by giving the President the authority not to spend specific funding included in the appropriations bills.

Upon making a decision to rescind certain spending, the President would then be required to seek congressional approval. If Congress does not agree by at least a majority vote—not a super majority—in both Houses, the funding is released.

Members are less likely to pile on the pork in the appropriations bill if they know that they might have to defend each item on its own merits.

Mr. President, there are some critics who argue that the savings reaped from such a proposal will not make a significant dent in the menacing budget deficit; but that is a feeble excuse to oppose these efforts.

Of course, a single bill is not going to solve the budget deficit in and of itself, or erase a $4.5 trillion debt. These problems did not occur overnight and they will not be solved overnight. There are no quick fixes, silver bullets or panaceas. We should not rise to these shiny lures.

I believe that those who think clearest about reducing the budget deficit realize that we will solve the problem in an incremental fashion. We will solve it in a bipartisan fashion.

In the coming weeks I look forward to working with the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee Senator DOMENICI to move this legislation. I also plan further discussion with Senator BRADLEY of the Finance Committee as to whether we should include rescission authority over tax expenditures as well.

What is demanded of us now is to push the process forward to a speedy and successful conclusion. This bill is the vehicle of compromise that will carry us to the finish line.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE RETIREMENT OF SENATOR BENNETT JOHNSTON

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I was greatly saddened to learn yesterday of the decision of my friend and colleague BENNETT JOHNSTON of Louisiana not to seek reelection to a fifth term in the U.S. Senate.

BENNETT JOHNSTON has been a leader in the Senate. Indeed, when I first entered the Senate in 1979, he already had a long record of accomplishment. He has long been established as one of the Senate's most knowledgeable and respected voices on energy policy, and also as a persuasive voice on a broad range of issues. He was, during the Reagan administration, for example, one of the foremost opponents of the excesses of the strategic defense initiative.

I know that my good friend has made a difficult decision. I hope that he has made the right one for him and his family. I know that it is one which will leave the Senate diminished. Over the years he has been constant in his decency, his independence and his openness. We are all going to miss him and his many fine qualities.

While I look forward to 2 more years of productive work alongside the senior Senator from Louisiana, I know that I will sorely miss BENNETT JOHNSTON when he leaves this body at the end of the 104th Congress.