

so they can get by on a couple hundred dollars a month for their food and utilities and housing, and the like, but that is not math that I think adds up.

We need to address this issue in a bipartisan way. The Snowe-Wyden legislation does that. I was particularly encouraged by the President's remarks last week on prescription drugs because I think, through the conciliatory approach that he took, making it clear that he wants to work with all parties to get this addressed, we now have a window to climb through to get the job done and provide a real lifeline to millions of older people. That is some good news for our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. First, I congratulate, again, the good Senator from Oregon for his leadership in the area of prescription drugs. His effort to achieve a bipartisan move in this direction is very critical to the Nation. I commend him for it.

I thank him for truncating his remarks a few minutes so I might have a few minutes. I hope I can complete this in 2 or 3 minutes. But if I do not, perhaps I could ask my good friend on the other side of the aisle to be able to extend it a minute or two beyond the appointed hour of 1 o'clock.

#### SECRET EVIDENCE SUSPENSION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, our Nation's commitment to due process has been placed in doubt by the use of secret evidence in immigration proceedings.

Until recently, the Department of Justice's use of secret evidence was not well known to the general public. Secret evidence was known only to some immigrants who have been held for months, sometimes years, without any opportunity to confront their accusers or examine the evidence against them.

As the Washington Post of October 19, 1997, put it, the process is authorized by:

[A] little-known provision of immigration law in effect since the 1950s allows secret evidence to be introduced in certain immigration proceedings. The classified information, usually from the FBI, is shared with judges, but withheld from the accused and their lawyers.

The use of secret evidence in immigration proceedings threatens to violate basic principles of fundamental fairness. The only three Federal courts to review its use in the last decade have all found it unconstitutional. Yet the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the INS, continues to use it and to do so virtually without any limiting regulations. Under current law, the INS takes the position that it can present evidence in camera and ex parte whenever it is classified evidence relevant to an immigrant's application for admission, an application for an immigration benefit, a custody determination, or a removal proceeding.

The Attorney General herself has expressed concern over the use of secret evidence—and for good reason.

In October 1999, a district court declared the INS' use of secret evidence to detain aliens unconstitutional. Five days later, the INS dropped its efforts to deport a man it had held for over a year and a half on the basis of secret evidence.

In November 1999, the Board of Immigration Appeals ruled that an Egyptian man detained on secret evidence for 3 and-a-half years should be released, and the Attorney General declined to intervene to continue his detention.

Earlier in 1999, the Board of Immigration Appeals, the BIA, granted permanent resident status to a Palestinian against whom the INS had used secret evidence and alleged national security concerns. In all of these cases the government claimed that national security was at risk, yet in none of them were the individuals even charged with committing any criminal acts.

The Attorney General has promised to promulgate regulations to govern the INS's use of secret evidence, but has not yet done so. In May of 1999, the Attorney General came to my state of Michigan to meet with Arab-American leaders and members of the Michigan Congressional delegation to discuss concerns about the use of secret evidence. At that meeting, she said she would implement a new policy, one in which the Department would implement a higher level of review, and take extra precautions before using secret evidence. She said she would have those regulations relative to the use of secret evidence within a reasonable time.

In December, the Attorney General visited Michigan again. She had still not promulgated the promised regulations. She told us that she was dedicated to resolving this issue, and she was actively reviewing draft regulations, but that she was uncomfortable issuing those regulations in the form they had been presented to her by her staff.

Mr. President, the Attorney General may eventually offer the promised regulations. But at the current time, she is not capable of putting a process in writing that is satisfactory even to her. It has been almost nine months now since the Attorney General agreed to look in to this matter, and promulgate regulations that will govern the use of this process. Under these circumstances, when the Attorney General cannot even satisfy herself that a fair process is in place, the use of this secret process should be suspended until she can, and I urge the Attorney General to do exactly that: suspend the use of secret evidence in immigration proceedings immediately until she can promulgate regulations relative to its use.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. What section are we in now, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senate is in morning business until 2 p.m.

#### THE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will take a little time to talk a bit about our agenda and the things I think most of us hope we will accomplish during this coming legislature.

There are some who believe we won't accomplish much. It seems to me that is not a good prognosis. The fact is, we should put some priorities on the many issues that are there and, indeed, make a special effort to accomplish a good deal. I think we can. Many of the issues have been talked about a great deal already. We know what the backgrounds are.

I think now our commitment is to decide what the priorities are for this country, what the priorities are for this Congress, and to set out to accomplish them.

We heard the President last Thursday make a very long speech, including a very long list of ideas and things he is suggesting we consider. I don't believe he is suggesting certainly that they all be done. He knows very well that will not be the case. I think it is up to us, particularly the majority party, to establish an agenda of those things we believe are most important.

I read in the paper that some Democrats in the House are saying we aren't going to accomplish anything unless we set the agenda, and we will talk our way through that. I am very disappointed in that kind of an idea. Of course, it is possible to continue to raise all these issues that one knows are not going anywhere. I suspect that is not a new idea even in this body. But we need to have a set of priorities.

The President had 100-plus ideas that, I suppose, were set forth to lay out a political agenda, maybe largely for this election. That is fine. It is not a brand new idea. I am surprised the agenda pointed in a different direction than that with which the President has sought to characterize himself over the last several years. He talked about the leadership council and starting towards the center, saying, I think some time ago, that the era of big government is over. One would not have suspected that, as they listened last Thursday night to his view, that the era of big government is over.

It was a very liberal agenda laid out, I am sure, for conduct of this session of Congress. I suggest that is not the direction we ought to take. Expenditures of some \$400 billion in additional programs, \$400 billion in spending, some \$4 billion a minute during that process, with very little detail, of course, as to how it is done but, rather, here are the things we ought to do, sort of in a broad sense.

We need to ensure that the description of what we are going to do does not interfere with us doing something. We have an agenda. Much of it I am