of cocaine, a wave of methamphetamines and illegal hard designer drugs are coming into this country and affecting our youth, our schools, our cities and our streets.

Mexico has failed to extradite a single drug kingpin trafficker to the United States to stand trial.

The facts are that Mexico has failed to adopt a maritime narcotics agreement with the United States.

The facts are that the United States drug enforcement chief, the chief of our DEA, Tom Constantine recommended against certification of Mexico according to the Washington Post. Let me quote what he said in a confidential assessment by the Drug Enforcement Administration. It says that the country has had a continued impunity to arrest or to detain the country's biggest drug traffickers.

Let me quote. During the past year, the analysis reads, the government of Mexico has not accomplished its counternarcotics goal or succeeded in cooperation with the United States Government. The level of drug corruption in Mexico continues unabated. This is from the director of our United States Drug Enforcement Agency.

The Mexican government is involved in corruption from the street level to its highest offices and ministries.

Mexico has refused to authorize United States law enforcement agents to carry weapons for their own protection.

The scope of Mexican drug trafficking has increased significantly. This is not just my opinion, this is also the opinion of our Drug Enforcement Agency.

Again heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine continue to enter the United States in unprecedented quantities.

Let me tell my colleagues what this tidal wave of drugs is doing. We have 2 million Americans in prison. I am told that nearly 80 percent of those who are incarcerated in the jails and prisons of the United States are there because of their relationship to drugs, drug abuse or a drug-related crime. Heroin, cocaine and methamphetamine use by our youth has skyrocketed. We must decertify Mexico. I ask for Members' cosponsorship of this joint resolution.

SALUTE TO ROCKY FORD, COLORADO AND THE BOETTCHER FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Rocky Ford, Colorado is one of the greatest places on earth. Rarely do great families, prosperous entrepreneurs, genuine leaders and abundant agriculture coexist in such prodigious proportions as they do in Rocky Ford.

Rocky Ford was doubly blessed recently to receive an important private grant which promises to move a significant community project closer to completion. The objective of my remarks is to highlight this event and the people of Rocky Ford and to further call the Nation's attention to this great city and to the foundation which has made the municipality even greater.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Colorado's Boettcher Foundation, which has consistently improved the lives of Colorado's residents through grants for community projects and scholarships for students. The State of Colorado has clearly benefited by the work of the fine men and women of the organization and we all owe them a great debt of thanks. Today along with my constituents in Rocky Ford, I applaud the foundation specifically for its generous gift to the city and its people of funds to expand the Rocky Ford community center.

The funds donated to the city have allowed for a very special addition to the center. In order to complete the project, the city submitted a proposal and now that it has been approved, the grant will be sufficient to complete the new center, joining the new and old centers via a construction passageway. I join the city of Rocky Ford in extending our warmest thanks to the Boettcher Foundation.

Furthermore, I would like to offer my thanks to the Boettcher Foundation as a whole. The grant awarded my constituents in Rocky Ford is one of many that have aided projects across the State. Thanks to the foundation, dozens of Colorado programs serving thousands of its citizens have received funding. These programs range from athletic opportunities for disabled youth to housing services to community buildings. Every corner of our great State has at some point been aided by the helping hand of the Boettcher Foundation. We are all the better for it.

As we recognize the Boettcher Foundation and its many contributions, let us remember that it is individuals and groups such as this one that cause America to thrive. Their generosity and good deeds are a credit to the State of Colorado and to the Nation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the good people of Rocky Ford and our friends at the Boettcher Foundation.

FEDERAL COMMITMENT FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today all over America our schools are inadequate, overcrowded and literally falling down. In Miami students learn to read and write in temporary trailers. Here in our Nation's capital, schools have been closed for violating the fire code. In New York City, students dodge falling plaster and attend class in hallways and cafeterias. It is really extraordinary to me after having visited so many of the schools in the metropolitan region of New York that in the United States of America youngsters go to school with plastic actually holding up the ceiling. This, in the most prosperous and advanced Nation in the world. It just does not make any sense.

A 1996 GAO report confirmed the worst. Record numbers of school buildings across America are in disrepair. One-third of all schools serving 14 million students need extensive repairs. About 60 percent of schools need to have roofs, walls or floors fixed. With school enrollment skyrocketing, this problem will only get worse. It is time for the Federal Government to act. This is a local problem that demands a national response. Our school modernization bond proposal will allocate $19.4 billion for zero interest bonds to fix old schools and build new ones all across the Nation. This is absolutely an essential idea that is creating a partnership between the Federal, State and local governments. The Federal Government should not assume the total responsibility, but we have an obligation to build that partnership. If the Federal Government can help States build prisons and roads, then certainly they should be able to help build schools.

Just look at some of the numbers. Due to the baby boom echo, the children of baby boomers filling the schools, particularly the high schools across the country are once again bulging with students. The demand for school facilities will continue to be high. School enrollment is projected to continue to climb over the next several years, growing from 52.2 million in the 1997–98 school year to 54.3 million by the year 2006–07. With school enrollments rising at the same time that the budgets for building new classrooms have been constrained, overcrowding has become a common problem.

I say to my partners on the other side of the aisle, if we really want to keep down property taxes, then in addition to building roads and highways and bridges and prisons, we have a responsibility to help with our schools. Because of this partnership, it will keep down the local property taxes. This is everywhere.

In California, a 35 percent increase in high school enrollment is projected. In North Carolina, 27 percent increase. In Arizona, 25 percent. In Nevada, 24 percent. In Massachusetts, 23 percent. In Rhode Island, 21 percent. In Georgia, 20 percent. In Virginia, 20 percent. In Texas, 19 percent. And on and on. The bottom line is we have to build schools. The Education Department estimates that 6,000 new schools will have to be built over the next 10 years in response to this rapid growth in school enrollment.

What do poor building conditions have to do with our students' achievement? According to all the studies that have been done, there is a direct connection. For example, a 1991 study of

the District of Columbia public schools found a 10.9 percent gap in scores between students in buildings rated poor and ones rated as excellent, after accounting for other factors. The problem is not just an urban one. Studies in rural Virginia and North Dakota have found similar results.

Recently there was a study published in May 1996 by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University which concluded sufficient data exists to state that the condition of a building does result in a difference in students' scores and action.

Mr. Speaker, this is urgent. Education is the key to the strength of the United States of America. I would hope that we can work together to pass this bill this year, because we are doing it for our youngsters, for our families and our futures.

□ 1415

UNITED STATES DRUG POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, one of the most startling statistics you are ever going to see, at least that you are going to see in the next year or two, and I hope it is not repeated, is the fact that teen drug use in the United States has doubled since 1992. Doubled, drug use among teenagers.

That is not acceptable. It is not acceptable for many reasons. Society cannot stand having our young people become more and more involved with narcotics that dull their senses, habituate them, get them involved not only with marijuana, but leading on to harder substances, cocaine, heroin, et cetera, that can lead to life-endangering, if not career-ending types of involvement.

It is not acceptable in the sense of the crime that is involved with drugs and how it permeates society and reaches down to the ghettos, as well as up to the higher-income people. It is a very, very bad situation in our country today.

Many who talk about the drug situation like to put a good face on it, a happy face. I do not think there is a happy face.

Yes, we can say that if you compare drug use overall in the United States to something 10 or 20 years ago, it is overall down. Or we can say it is a little better on the treatment side hither and yon than it was before. But the reality is among the people we care the most about, among our children, drug use has doubled since 1992, and we have to do something about it.

Now, I am all for having an Office of Drug Policy, and I am all for that Office of National Drug Control Policy having a strategy, and General Barry McCaffrey is someone who I personally admire, and I believe he is very sincere in his efforts to try to work to eradicate the drug problem in this Nation. But I cannot agree that the strategy which he promulgated with the President a couple of weeks ago is adequate.

I have in my hands the national drug control strategy, 1998, a 10-year plan. There are some things in here that are very good. I particularly commend the drug czar's office for establishing criteria that we can measure progress by. It has been missing. We need to do it just like businesses measure progress hither and yon in their business.

We find in this drug plan all kinds of goals and objectives in detail about how we fight the drug scourge with prevention and treatment and so forth. But in the context of getting to the solution, the 10-year plan has some very serious problems to it.

The reality is that it is too shortsighted, in my judgment. We need to come up with a plan that says, yes, we will attack the demand side and the supply side. We are going to have a balanced approach. We have known that for years. We have talked about it for years. But we really have not come to the consensus, either in the Nation or in Congress or in our national leadership, on precisely what it is going to take and how soon we can get the resources it is going to take to actually stop this entire process of drugs coming into our country like they have been recently.

I am disturbed by the fact that in this drug strategy, up front, it says we should no longer talk about fighting the effort against narcotics as a war. This strategy at the very beginning of it says that war is not an appropriate metaphor, that it is misleading. In essence, the administration in producing this plan is saying we can never defeat the scourge of drugs gripping our Nation and killing our youths. Our only hope is to contain it, and the quote from the drug strategy is, to check the spread and improve the prognosis.

By saying this, they are, in my judgment, yielding and waving a white flag in the efforts we have. We should be conducting a war on drugs, and a war on drugs means a strategy that says, here is what we can do to stop it, here is when we are going to do it, here is how we are going to do it, here is the timetable to do it, and yes, this is a 10-year plan.

What is the ultimate goal of the 10-year plan? It is to reduce the availability and use of drugs in the United States by 50 percent in 10 years. But the teenage drug use in the United States has doubled since 1992, so if we reduce the use by 50 percent in 10 years, we will have only gone back to where we were in 1992. Is that acceptable? I suggest no, it is not acceptable.

In addition, what is meant by the word ''availability''? That is a pretty darn broad word. It is defined in here in a way that one might conclude it means the flow of illegal drugs into the United States, but it could also mean law enforcement and a lot of other things that go on to reduce the availability, the opportunity to buy drugs on the streets, I presume.

But nowhere in this drug strategy is there a goal or target that says what our objectives should be to reduce the flow of drugs coming into the United States at our borders or before they get to our borders. That is of paramount importance.

One of the reasons we have so much trouble with our prevention programs and with our law enforcement efforts in fighting narcotics today is because drugs are in more plentiful supply and cheaper than they have ever been. Both cocaine and heroin, in particular, fall into that category.

Heroin, for example, killed more young people in my hometown of Orlando a year or so ago than anywhere else in the United States; more than in Los Angeles, with a population many times the size of Orlando.

In the last two or three weeks, I have seen at least three or four articles in my hometown newspaper about arrests connected with heroin, a couple of them dealing with teenagers in our high schools there, things perhaps unheard of a few years ago being uncommon now.

Why is that? It is because heroin is now coming into the eastern part of the United States from Colombia, and it is purer than ever before, it is better quality and it is cheaper, and we are not really doing anything significant to stop that flow. The same thing can be said in many ways for cocaine and for marijuana and for the other narcotics that we are trying to fight.

That is not to say that Drug Enforcement Administration is not working hard. It is not to say the Coast Guard is not working hard. It is not to say that our State Department and our Defense Department people who are in charge of working in their respective areas are not attempting to do their jobs. It is not to say that Customs is not doing what it is supposed to be doing.

But the reality is the sum of this is insufficient, inadequate, and there is no leadership saying precisely what it is that we need to do and how we are going to do it, to stop the flow of drugs coming in in this alarming amount that has the price so low and the quantity so plentiful, that so many young people are using it that it is hard to get our arms around it.

All of our experts say we need to reduce the flow of drugs into this country by at least 60 percent, if not more, in order to raise the price up and make it more difficult for young people to buy it and afford it and get it and thereby reduce the pressures at the street level.

That is not the only thing we need to be doing. Again, we need to be educating, we need to be on television. Some of the things suggested in this strategy are good about that. I think we are going to spend quite a few million dollars we have appropriated very soon on