

respondent in this case, the man we just elected Speaker, we cannot be rushed. And most importantly of all, to do justice to this House demands not only a higher standard of ethical behavior but a higher standard of work in rendering that justice. It cannot be done in 8 days. It may not take 8 months, or it may not take 8 weeks, but it cannot be done in 8 days.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RON PAUL, my former classmate from 1978.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my concern about some of the rule changes.

DRUG TESTING

We are now being asked to support rule changes that will require random drug testing of all members and staff. Drug usage in this country, both legal and illegal, is a major problem and deserves serious attention. However, the proposal to test randomly individuals as a method to cut down on drug usage is ill-advised and should not be done without serious thought.

The real issue here is not drugs, but rather the issues of privacy, due process, probable cause, and the fourth amendment. We are dealing with a constitutional issue of the utmost importance. It raises the question of whether or not we understand the overriding principle of the 4th amendment.

A broader, but related question is whether or not it's the Government's role to mold behavior any more than it's the Government's role to mold, regulate, tax, impede the voluntarism of economic contractual arrangements. No one advocates prior restraint to regulate journalistic expression even though great harm has come over the centuries from the promotion of authoritarian ideas. Likewise, we do not advocate the regulation of political expression and religious beliefs however bizarre and potentially harmful they may seem. And yet we casually assume that it's the role of government to regulate personal behavior to make one act more responsibly.

A large number of us do not call for the regulation or banning of guns because someone might use a gun in an illegal fashion. We argue that it's the criminal that needs regulated and refuse to call for diminishing the freedom of law-abiding citizens because some individual might commit a crime with a gun. Random drug testing is based on the same assumption made by anti-gun proponents. Unreasonable effort at identifying the occasional and improbable drug user should not replace respect to our privacy. Its not worth it.

While some are more interested in regulating economic transactions in order to make a "fairer" society, others are more anxious to regulate personal behavior to make a "good" society. But both cling to the failed notion that governments, politicians, and bureaucrats know that is best for everyone. If we casually allow our persons to be searched, why is it less important that our conversations, our papers and our telephones not be monitored as well. Vital information regarding drugs might be obtained in this manner. We who champion the cause of limited government ought not be promoters of the revolving eye of big brother.

If we embark on this course to check randomly all Congressional personnel for possible drug usage, it must be noted that the two most dangerous and destructive drugs in this country are alcohol and nicotine. To not include these in the efforts to do good, is inconsistent—to say the least.

I have one question. If we have so little respect for our own privacy, our own liberty, and our own innocence, how can we be expected to protect the liberties, the privacy and the innocence of our constituents for which we have just sworn an oath to do?

This legislation is well motivated, as is all economic welfare legislation. The good intentions in solving social problems—when violence is absent—perversely uses government power, which inevitably hurts innocent people while rarely doing anything to prevent the anticipated destructive behavior of a few.

The only answer to solving problems like this is to encourage purely voluntary testing programs whereby each individual and member makes the information available to those who are worried about issues like this.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I ask that the RECORD reflect my support of the rules and particularly in its maintaining its prohibition of proxy voting.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise as a member of the special investigative committee of the Ethics Subcommittee on this unfortunate case that we are looking into, and I rise in support of the motion to recommit.

There are many areas where I might have some disagreement with the rules package, but I am very pleased that the Democratic leadership has given us an opportunity to present the motion to recommit around the timetable.

With all respect in the world for our colleagues, and that means every single colleague in this House of Representatives, I believe that we need to heed the request of the special counsel for an additional amount of time for a few reasons.

First of all, and I say this without questioning the motivation of anyone on either side of the aisle about why the rules are in the package the way they are, the simple fact is that the special counsel, and by unanimous vote of the subcommittee, two Democrats and two Republicans, supporting the timetable that the special counsel has put forth, are making this request. And I believe that the burden is on those who would deny the special counsel that extended time.

Why do we need more time? Several things have happened that have not been addressed here yet, or forgive me if I have not heard them. I would like

to associate myself with those remarks.

First of all, one of the members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has decided to leave the committee, so it required the appointment of a new committee member who has to become familiarized with the facts in the case, because this is a facts-driven, facts-based case.

And without going into any of the material aspects of it or any of the substance of this case, but only to process and only to time, I thought I would never see the day when the chair of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct would come to the floor and say that she would turn down the request of the special counsel to the committee for a couple more weeks to complete the work of the committee. I say that very regrettably.

On our subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from Florida, Mr. PORTER GOSS, and with two Democrats and two Republicans, we have worked in a very bipartisan fashion all along and continue to in supporting the request of the special counsel.

I do not and never did think it was appropriate to have a vote on this important matter on Inauguration Day. Do my colleagues think that vote is going to take place without any debate? That would not be right.

So I say to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and I say this with the highest regard for the distinguished majority leader, not impugning any of his motives in this or anyone else on either side of the aisle, whatever we think about the resolution of the case, I think we must agree that if the special counsel says he needs a couple more weeks, we must give him those weeks unless we can prove why that should not happen. The burden of proof is with those who would vote against the special counsel.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, I also want to make another point as to why more time is necessary. Because of a flurry of accusations and representations about the confidential work of the subcommittee that came out, it required us to go down another tangent to deal with that, and it necessitated a statement by the special counsel that the reports that were floating out there were inaccurate.

So in 1 week the special counsel has had to deem those rumors inaccurate and come out with his own statement asking for more time, in which he says each member of the subcommittee has carefully considered this recommended schedule and agrees it is the best course on which to proceed.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to commit.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.