in our committee was the single biggest concern the FBI had in its capacity to adequately monitor what was going on among the terrorist community, those people who wish to promote terrorism. In the area of encryption we need a new regime. We need the cooperation of the community that is building the software, producing the software, and building the equipment that creates the encryption technology.

I have ideas how to do this so we do not undermine their activity to sell their product, and ideas that will allow us as a nation that wants to protect the civil rights of individuals and constitutional rights of individuals to do that, yet still allow our law enforcement community, when it sees a need, to be able to break a code. It allows the community to have the access to the keys to accomplish that under a strict structure which is legal and judicially controlled and therefore does not undermine the rights of the individuals who are producing this product or using the product but simply gets at the bad guys. I have a proposal to do that.

More important, we have to recognize this is not a domestic problem. These products are made internationally. I believe we have the right to use the market of the United States to leverage for the purposes of accomplishing the protection of America. We have a huge economic market in the United States. The people making these products want to sell their products in the United States, whether it is this product or something else they make. I believe we should use the leverage of the American market as a way to say, if you are going to sell this type of equipment anywhere in the world, and you want to sell something in the United States also, you have an obligation to comply with our needs for our national security under a strict legal judicial structure.

I am hopeful we can set up a regime that will be fair, that will be subject to the judicial controls necessary to protect the constitutional rights of people who are law-abiding but will also give our intelligence community the access to the information they need when they know there is somebody out there using encryption technology for the purposes of pursuing a terrorist act in the U.S. There is no excuse for anybody to be underwriting that type of activity in our country. That is the intelligence level.

The second level, as I mentioned, was the apprehension level. Apprehension is extremely difficult when you are dealing with the terrorist community. There is an entire law enforcement concept in this Nation that says we apprehend after the act occurs. Yet if we wait until after the act occurs in the area of terrorism, the harm is so extreme.

The simple fact is we are going to have to adjust our approach in the area of law enforcement to one of apprehending before the event approaches rather than after the event.

The second level, as I mentioned, is whoever is given the responsibility for managing our borders which allows the proper flow of individuals back and forth so we can have the access that people, for example, from Mexico wish to have to work in the United States. But we also have to have controls so we know who is coming into our country.

Again, I think the Guest Worker Program discussed and in the works is a way to address that. I have some thoughts in that area. This will be a key element of the United States of how we apprehend individuals who are bent on committing acts of terror in our Nation, getting control over our borders.

The third element involved is crisis management and consequence management. Here the Federal Government needs to get its act under control. We have 46 agencies responsible for some element of terrorism or counterterrorism. There is tremendous overlap; that is, regrettably, turf issues. There is often indecision and lack of communication of information. In fact, in the instance we had in New York, there may have been a specific lack of communication of information. We need a centralized management structure within our Federal Government.

We have proposed in the Commerce-State Justice bill it be divided for the purposes of domestic terrorist acts—no military but domestic terrorist acts—in two Justice Department appointment of a Deputy Attorney General of Terrorism, with a cross-jurisdiction responsibility. Unless you have budget authority for this individual, there is no point in having such an individual.

The Justice Department for crisis management, the Federal Emergency Management Administration for consequence administration, they would essentially be coordinators of the issue of how we handle domestic terrorist events here in the United States. They would function as coequals, and would be sequential, however, in their response to an event.

This is just a proposal for how to do it. It is one that passed this Senate and has been strongly supported, for example, by the assistant leader, Senator REID. I thank Senator HOLLINGS for his support and Senator WARNER and Senator SHENLEY, who participated in the hearings.

As I mentioned, this is just one approach to accomplishing this goal, but we need to accomplish this goal, and we need to accomplish it quickly. The key to accomplishing it, as I mentioned, is whoever is given the responsibility for managing the terrorist portfolio, that individual also has to be able to manage the budgetary responsibilities across departmental lines because the only way you control things in this Government is if you control the dollars. If you do not control the dollars, you are not going to be able to control the activity. With the drug czar, we saw a complete failure of just naming someone to a position and claiming he has responsibility when he never got the authority to do the job. We cannot afford that on the issue of terrorism.

This cannot be a public relations event. This must be an individual who has significant power and the responsibility and the capacity to carry out that responsibility because he has the power to do it.

My time has run out. I know there are other people who want to speak so I will yield the floor, but I do intend to speak further on this issue of how we manage our house on the issue of terrorism. There is a lot we need to do and a great deal that needs to be thought about in this area.

I especially thank the Senator from North Dakota for his courtesy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania. Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. SPECTER pertinent to the last conversation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, I request 10 minutes in morning business. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLORADO FEDERAL JUDICIAL NOMINEES

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak about an issue of great importance to the State of Colorado. This is the nomination and confirmation of Federal judges.

I am pleased to announce that recently the President nominated two outstanding individuals to fill vacancies on the Colorado Federal District Court.

The first is U.S. Chief Bankruptcy Judge Marcia Krieger of Denver, the other is Colorado District Court Judge Robert Blackburn of Las Animas. Both are extremely well qualified. Both are sitting judges with extensive experience. Both have had distinguished legal careers and are widely respected in our State. Both will make Colorado and the Nation proud as Federal judges.

Judge Krieger has been a Federal bankruptcy judge for the Bankruptcy Court for Colorado since 1994, and she was appointed Chief Judge for the Bankruptcy Court for Colorado last year.