

more serious consequences for their school in addition to giving it a public black eye.

"We never want to fall into the category where the school's 'in need of improvement' just because students didn't take the test seriously," said Arrowhead Superintendent David Lodes.

A REASON TO TRY

So this year, Arrowhead will give its students a reason not only to take the test but also to try.

The school is offering its students a chance to skip final semester examinations in their regular classes if they do well on their WKCEs—scoring at least at the proficient or advanced level in the subject area that corresponds with the class exam they want to avoid.

It's the first year Arrowhead High School has made such an offer, which has been announced to students but is still waiting for formal approval from the School Board.

Arrowhead students who do exceptionally well on the WKCE—scoring at the advanced level on all the tests—also will be allowed to spend their junior-year study hall classes in the senior commons in the pilot effort.

Other schools in the state offering exam exemptions include Big Foot High School, Hartford Union High School and Pulaski High School near Green Bay. Bay Port High School in the Howard-Suamico School District gives students a chance to drop a low-scoring test with a proficient score in the subject area.

"I think we should be able to come up with a way where we can get our students to give their best effort," Lodes said. "Everybody needs to do as best as they possibly can. Yet everybody wants to be rewarded."

Arrowhead students say they can see a difference.

"I'm actually trying a little harder now," said Zack Olson, a 15-year-old sophomore at Arrowhead, where testing began last week.

Previously, Olson said he might not have studied for the test at all. But with the lure of getting out of final exams and a nicer study hall environment, he said he's been doing the practice work that teachers have offered.

Another Arrowhead sophomore, Adam Moir, said he was even a little nervous the night before testing began because he wasn't sure what to expect.

He said a lot of students will be motivated to try to get out of their final exams. "But, in the same way, there are some students that could care less about school," Moir said. "I'm not one of them."

[From the La Crosse Tribune]

OUR VIEW: MAKE FEDERAL TESTING FIT WITH CURRICULUM

(By Tribune editorial staff)

Why are some school districts offering movie tickets and other prizes as an inducement to take the tests required under President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" law?

They are doing it because students have little incentive to participate in the testing, even though a bad result can result in a Federal Government listing as a failed school.

Under the Federal legislation, schools are required to subject students to testing once a year. If students do not participate, the school could face sanctions. For instance, if less than 95 percent of the students show up for testing two years in a row, the school could have to allow students to transfer elsewhere.

So, the stakes on the schools are high. But what about students? The test result doesn't appear on their transcript and it doesn't count toward a grade or graduation.

A story in Sunday's Milwaukee Journal Sentinel said that the Racine, Wis., School

District gives away movie tickets to get kids to show up. Another, unnamed, district is giving away a television set. Still another district—Arrowhead schools in Hartland, Wis., is letting students who take the test opt out of some final exams.

None of this sounds like it is educationally sound, but school administrators say they have little other incentive to get students to take the test. Isn't there a better way to judge school performance than using a test that has no other meaning than providing a potential for Federal punishment? Are there no other valid measurements of student performance?

Giving prizes as an inducement to take a test seems of dubious value. But maybe we ought to be looking for ways to reconcile the federal government's need for performance data with schools' existing curriculum and practices.

SYRIA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act takes important and valuable steps, and I would have voted for it had I been present, but I am concerned that it may not go far enough.

Syria has long been recognized as a state sponsor of terrorism. In fact, the Syrians themselves openly speak of their support for terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad. Intelligence reports and terrorism experts tell us that the next generation of terrorists is being trained in a network of training facilities that exist in Syria and the Syrian-controlled parts of Lebanon. These international terrorist organizations that run these camps already have the capacity to kill Americans, and they have state sponsors with access to weapons of mass destruction. Prior to 9/11, Hezbollah was responsible for the deaths of more Americans than any other terrorist group.

On September 18, 2001, the Senate passed S.J. Res 23, which authorized the President to use "all necessary and appropriate force" against those responsible for the attacks of 9/11. This authorization for the use of force is therefore limited to al-Qaeda. We ignore other terrorist networks at our peril—and at one point, President Bush recognized that. Nine days after the terrorist attack of September 11, the President declared:

"Our war on terror begins with al-Qaeda but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated."

In his State of the Union speech on January 29, 2002, President Bush restated our priorities:

Our nation will continue to be steadfast and patient and persistent in the pursuit of two great objectives. First, we will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And, second, we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world.

I supported those statements and hoped to help the President carry out

his pledge. Last October, Congress authorized the use of force against Iraq. I voted against this authorization because I believed it was a distraction from the war on terrorism. At that time, I attempted to amend the resolution to provide the president the authorization to use force against other terrorist organizations that met the following criteria: they have a state sponsor with access to weapons of mass destruction; they have a history of killing Americans; and they have the ability to strike inside the United States.

I remain concerned that the President does not have the necessary authorization to use force against these additional terrorist organizations. Without such authorization, he cannot fulfill the commitment he made in his January 2002 State of the Union speech.

I hope the administration will take this occasion to review its existing authorities and report back to Congress on where there may be deficiencies in its authorities to carry out the war on terrorism. Only then will we be able to hold Syria and similar states that sponsor or harbor terrorists truly accountable.

BUSINESS CLIMATE IN UKRAINE

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, as Co-Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I have closely followed developments in Ukraine including aspects of the human, security and economic dimensions. My desire is that Ukraine consolidate its independence by strengthening democratic institutions, including the judiciary, and undertaking reforms to improve the business climate essential to attracting much-needed foreign investment. Twelve years after independence, the people of Ukraine deserve to enjoy the fruits of freedom and prosperity, but obstacles remain. Bringing Ukraine more fully into Europe is both essential to the country's long-term economic success and important for European security. Accelerating Ukraine's movement toward Europe is timely and needed. While high-ranking Ukrainian officials pay lipservice to such integration, the jury is still out as to whether they are prepared to take the bold steps that will be required to advance such integration. An important barometer for the future will be the extent to which the country's moves to confront the corruption and crime that retard the process of democratization and economic liberalization and erode Ukraine's security and independence.

While those at the top say the right things, there is justified skepticism as to their sincerity. This is certainly the case concerning Ukraine's current President, Leonid Kuchma. The controversies surrounding Kuchma undercut his credibility with respect to the issue of combating corruption. Nevertheless, this should not detract from

the urgency of tackling corruption in the lead up to critical parliamentary elections slated for next year, and presidential elections to select Kuchma's successor in 2004.

Meanwhile, those serious about rooting out corruption and corrupt officials should take a hard look at the handling—or more accurately, mis-handling—of Ukrainian and foreign owned businesses. For example, United States-owned businesses have been victimized through expropriations, asset thefts, extortion and the like perpetrated or abetted by corrupt officials and courts in Ukraine. While new cases continue to occur, longstanding cases remain unresolved with investors unable to obtain the relief to which they are entitled under Ukrainian and international law.

Although the State Department has made repeated representations about these cases at senior levels of the Kuchma administration, Kyiv rebuffed repeated requests to resolve them in accordance with the law. At the same time it refuses to punish the perpetrators of the criminal acts or take corrective measures to prevent similar cases from arising.

If the victims are to ever achieve a measure of justice, it is essential that U.S. officials raise these cases at every appropriate opportunity.

In one especially egregious and illustrative case, well-connected individuals in Ukraine were able to orchestrate the seizure of all the assets of a successful pharmaceutical joint venture which was half owned by United States investors. When, 6 years after the theft the Ukrainian appeals courts finally dismissed the spurious claims to the assets on grounds that they were based entirely on forged and falsely fabricated documents, senior Ukrainian officials launched into action. Within weeks of these judicial decisions, the Ukrainian President reportedly convened a meeting of senior officials, including the cognizant senior judges and his own senior law enforcement and national security cabinet level officers, at which he made clear that he did not want the stolen assets restored to their rightful American owners.

The courts quickly complied, without explanation, and in disregard of the copious evidence before them, the judges reversed the decisions taken just two months earlier and held in favor of the claimants. Several months later longstanding criminal charges against the same individuals were dropped.

The circumstances surrounding this case and others involving United States investors are indicative of the far reaching scope of corruption and the rule of law deficit in Ukraine today. While the matter was repeatedly raised by the State Department several years ago, I am concerned that the Ukrainian side might assume that the matter is a closed case. I urge officials at the Departments of State and Commerce to disabuse Ukrainian Government officials of such an impression.

If the Kuchma administration is serious about rooting out corruption and advancing democracy and the rule of law, these cases provide a good starting point. Only time will tell if they are up to the challenge.

CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE OF GUATEMALA ON THEIR RECENT ELECTIONS

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, the people of Guatemala went to the polls on November 9 to elect a new President, Members of the Guatemalan Parliament, local officials, and representatives to the Central American Parliament.

These elections attracted attention, in large part, due to the candidacy of Efraín Ríos Montt, a former coup leader who under the Guatemalan constitution should have been banned from running for the Presidency all together. Ríos Montt presided over a troubled part of Guatemala's history, during which time too many innocent lives were lost.

Now these elections were not perfect. Long lines and confusion over where to vote made it difficult for many Guatemalans to express their political views. Some polling stations stayed open for as long as 5 hours after they were scheduled to close; other did not. The time period leading up to the elections was marked by violence and intimidation linked to some Ríos Montt supporters.

But in the end, these were important and hopeful elections for a number of reasons. Ríos Montt was defeated in the ballot box—and he accepted defeat. The willingness of losers to accept defeat is one sign of a maturing democracy. And the result of this defeat for Ríos Montt should not be overlooked; he will lose his immunity from prosecution for crimes committed under his watch.

There is much more to the story than Ríos Montt's candidacy, however. Approximately 60 percent of Guatemala's 5 million voters went to the polls on Sunday—the largest turnout since 1985. By turning out in such numbers, Guatemalans showed they understand the power of the ballot box. As one woman put it, "You have to vote if you want things to change."

Overall, these elections were fair and open. Ballots were not rigged, and vehicles carrying them were monitored by satellite.

Violence on election day was isolated. In spite of an insecure climate during the campaign season, threats of violence were not carried out on a large scale over the weekend. The violence many had feared—and some observers have come to expect from elections of this sort—did not take place. In the words of Guatemalan Nobel Prize winner Rigoberta Menchú: "This first round was about saying no to violence."

These elections also marked the first time a nation-wide network of over

3,000 independent election observers, Mirador Electoral, monitored Guatemalan elections—no easy feat in a country ravaged by 40 years of civil war. The group was so highly regarded, they were asked by the Guatemalan election commission to release their "quick count" projections of the winners. And the results of Mirador Electoral matched those reached by the election commission.

Guatemalans will go to the polls again on December 28, and will choose between top vote-getters Oscar Berger and Alvaro Colón to be the next President. I would call upon the Guatemalan Government to maintain their commitment to fairness, and to make adjustments to better prepare for a high turn-out of Guatemalans.

While Guatemala still has many problems, these elections give me hope for the future. I congratulate the Guatemalan people for their commitment to democracy.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING EDITH MILLER

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I recognize the outstanding contributions made by Edith Miller, outgoing Executive Director for the Vermont School Boards Association, VSBA.

Edie, as she is known to her colleagues, friends, and family, joined the Vermont School Boards Association in December 1997 after previously serving for many years as the director of the University of Vermont's Continuing Education Program.

Edie also served with great distinction on numerous boards dedicated to the arts and community welfare. Her participation in local government is noteworthy. She has worn many hats, from holding positions on the town zoning and planning commissions to her current role as Chair of the East Montpelier Select Board.

I also had the pleasure and benefit of having her husband, Martin Miller, on staff during my tenure as Vermont Attorney General from 1969 through 1972.

Over the years, various individuals have described Edie Miller as a strong and articulate voice in support of public education. She possesses a tireless work ethic and an ability to identify critical issues, analyze the information, and communicate that information not only to the VSBA members, but also to local State and Federal officials.

Edie was a driving force in the creation and implementation of the Vermont Education Leadership Alliance Project, VELA. She worked diligently with her colleagues in the Vermont Superintendents Association and the Vermont Principals' Association to address the critical shortage of principals, superintendents and school board members in Vermont. The program was designed to train and certify