

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE IDEA IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1996

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1996

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the renewal of America's special education law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA] Improvement Act of 1996.

This measure is the product of 16 months of work, building consensus to improve this law that has transformed the lives of children with disabilities. For 20 years, children with disabilities have been assured a free, appropriate public education. But as one of my Democrat colleagues said in one of our IDEA hearings, we no longer question whether children should be educated, but how well their education is being done. We see and know that education transforms individuals who were once thought to be helpless into productive, working, tax-paying citizens.

This legislation, which I will summarize, is based upon certain foundational principles.

First, we need to improve IDEA because children with disabilities can and should have a fighting chance to achieve the American dream. We need to make the system work better for children and their families, for teachers and schools, and for the taxpaying citizens who work hard to pay the bill. We want quality education for children, not just a process.

Second, where we recognize that resources are tight, we direct more money to schools to provide services to children. We also reduce paperwork and other administrative burdens, freeing more resources to educate young people.

Third, where we find unnecessary and costly conflict and discord, this legislation renews a focus on education and cooperation.

And fourth, where we have identified confusion in the process of educating children with special needs, we have sought to provide certainty and understanding, based upon consensus and common sense. The area of this law that has probably drawn the most attention is the area of discipline. The IDEA Improvement Act of 1996 contains clear procedures for removing dangerous students from the classroom, with instructions to determine whether the behavior is a manifestation of a student's disability. If a child's wrongdoing has nothing to do with his or her disability, schools should have authority to discipline in a manner consistent with the way they discipline other children. Schools need authority to maintain safe classrooms, and children with disabilities need protections against arbitrary discipline.

Let me say a few words about the process which has brought us to this point, and where we go from here. For 16 months, through three staff drafts, numerous hearings and public and private meetings, we have sought to find agreement in the many difficult issues affecting renewal of our Nation's special edu-

cation law. This bill represents much of that consensus, but not all of it, and certainly not the end of it. And while I believe this is an excellent bill, no individual or organization will wholeheartedly support it all. That is the nature of this process. But the process thus far has given me, and should give all Americans, hope for a successful conclusion.

For the past several weeks, my friend from Michigan, Representative DALE KILDEE and I have been negotiating on many issues in this bill. We have come to many agreements which are reflected in this legislation. There are some issues reminding. Between today and the House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families markup, scheduled for Wednesday, April 24, Members and committee and personal staffs from both parties will continue seeking to resolve issues. Some may be completed in time to be included in a chairman's mark. Others will be held for possible bipartisan amendments, in subcommittee or full committee.

In the interest of citizens and Members who wish to review this bill, its text will be available most quickly on the House Opportunities Committee World Wide Web site, which is "<http://www.house.gov/eoo/>", and soon through the Thomas service of the Library of Congress. I welcome comments and cosponsors, encourage citizens to understand that this is a work in progress, and urge Members to support the bill.

Following is a summary of how the IDEA Improvement Act of 1996 addresses key issues of interest:

OVERVIEW OF THE IDEA IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1996 AS INTRODUCED APRIL 18, 1996

The following are the major improvements to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the IDEA Improvement Act of 1996:

1. Funding Formula (§611). The bill makes a ten-year transition from a "head-count formula based on the number of children with disabilities counted in the State, to a population-based formula with a factor for child poverty. The new formula would be based 85% on number of children in the State and 15% on State poverty statistics. Transition years would use a declining fraction (90% in FY 1997 to 0% in FY 2006) under the current formula and an increasing fraction (10% in FY 1997 to 100% in FY 2006) under the new formula.

2. Least Restrictive Environment and State Funding Formulae (§612(a)(4)). The bill requires States to use "placement neutral" funding formulae for distributing funds within the State.

3. Discipline/"Stay-Put" (§615). Under current law, a school cannot suspend or expel a disabled student for more than 10 days except where the student has brought a gun to school. With guns, the school may remove a student from school for 10 days, and then may place the student in an "interim alternative placement" for up to 45 additional days. During that period, the student's Individual Education Program (IEP) team must agree on a new placement. If the parents and school disagree, the student will remain in their interim alternative placement for the pendency of any due process proceedings.

This bill addresses the classroom safety issue, but maintains protections against arbitrary placement changes.

The student's IEP will include behavior management techniques to help avoid disruptive, dangerous, and inappropriate behavior.

The bill adds the following categories to the "firearms" category in current law, permitting removal from the classroom to an alternative educational placement for up to 45 days:

Bringing weapons to school;
Bringing illegal drugs to school or illegally distributing legal drugs;

Engaging in an assault and battery (striking another person with the intention of bringing about harmful or offensive contact which is not legally consented by the person); or

By proof of substantial evidence, representing a danger to oneself or others.

These terms and, in the case of the first three categories, which school official would have the discretion to remove the student would be defined through State law or policy.

The bill requires a review by the IEP team of whether the child's action was a manifestation of the disability. The team will consider the implementation of behavior management strategies in the child's IEP, the appropriateness of the placement, and other information presented by the parents. Where an action is not disability related, any school discipline policy applied to non-disabled students may be equally applied to the disabled student.

4. Mediation (§615(d)). Three-fourths of the states have established mediation systems on their own accord and have been successful in reducing the number of formal disputes. The bill requires states to offer voluntary mediation to parents prior to any administrative or judicial dispute. Attorneys would not be permitted to participate for either side in mediation, and attorney's fees would not be available for mediation proceedings.

5. Categorization/Eligibility (§602(3)(B)). The bill permits States to extend use of the "developmental delay" definition for children aged 3 to 5 (current law) up to age 9, but otherwise maintains the current categories.

6. Discretionary Programs (Part D). The bill reorganizes and consolidates the existing discretionary programs (currently Parts D-G, and I). Subpart 1 grants broad authority for national projects to the Secretary of Education. Subpart 2 permits State grants for reform and improvement of their special education and early intervention systems, with an emphasis on in-service and preservice professional development for general educators and special educators. Subpart 3 maintains the current Parent Training Center program.

7. Reduction of State Education Agency Funds Reservation (§611(c)). Current law only requires that at least 75% of IDEA funds flow through to local schools. The bill would require states to pass at least 90% through to LEAs, with the remainder reserved for administrative and statewide activities, unless the State seeks a waiver permitting retention of an additional 15%.

8. Restructuring of Parental Notice Requirements (§615(c-d)). IDEA currently promotes the use of consolidated notices that notify parents of a host of procedural and

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

other rights under the act. The prior written notice and the notification of procedural safeguards requirements in current law have been separated for the purpose of clarity. The prior written notice will only address actions proposed or refused by the local education agency (LEA). The new procedural safeguards notice provision details the frequency and content of the notice to be given to parents.

9. Attorney's Fees (Part B). The bill maintains the current law on attorney's fees by permitting them for parents who prevail against the school. Parents are required to have notified the school district of their concerns at some point prior to filing to obtain attorney's fees. In cases where there are multiple issues in dispute, the judge will be permitted to award fees only on the issues upon which the parents prevailed.

10. Policy Letters (§605(c)). Currently, many U.S. Dept. of Education "policy letters" are treated as having regulatory authority without being submitted to public comment or without having underlying regulatory authority. The bill limits the applicability of such letters to the parties to whom they have been addressed.

11. Parent's Right of Refusal for Initial Evaluation and Consent for Evaluation Not Construed as Consent for Services (§614(a)(1)(C)). The bill clarifies that the parents of a child who has been referred for an initial evaluation have the right to refuse that evaluation placing the onus of making an administrative appeal on the school district where it believes that a child needs special education services. This provision would also clarify that parental consent for a child's evaluation shall not be construed as consent for delivery of special education services based on that evaluation.

12. Commingling of Funds (current §613(a)(9)(A)). The bill maintains the requirement that funds must be expended for the benefit of special education students, but removes the prohibition on commingling of funds. This provision will only permit commingling of Federal and state special education funds. This change will not permit consolidation of Federal special education funds with other Federal funds or with other non-special education funds.

13. Personnel Standards and Personnel Development. The bill maintains the current requirement that States establish and enforce personnel standards (§612(a)(15)). In the bill's newly configured discretionary programs, the State Improvement Grant program will dedicate 75% of appropriated funds to personnel development (§674).

14. Narrow Exceptions for Maintenance of Local Education Agency (LEA) Effort (§613(a)(2)(B)). The bill permits school districts to reduce special education expenditures in the following limited circumstances: replacement of higher cost staff with lower cost staff, such as with retirement; departure of particular high-cost students from the LEA; decreases in special education enrollment; and one-time expenditures of funds by the LEA.

15. Payment for Placement of Students in Private Schools without the Consent of or Referral by the Public Agency (§612(a)(9)(C)). This change would prevent tax-payer financed private school education where the public schools have never been given the opportunity to determine if the child can be served in public schools. This section would require parents to give 10-day written notice to receive reimbursement private, special education school tuition without LEA consent.

The bill would establish that local schools must be permitted to conduct an initial evaluation of a student prior to publicly-funded private school placement. Exceptions would

include: (1) where parents are illiterate or cannot write English; (2) where providing notice would result in delay that would likely result in physical or serious emotional harm to the child; (3) where the school prevents the parent from providing notice; and (4) where parents did not receive notice of this requirement.

16. Disclosure of Evaluations and Recommendations (§615(f)). This provision would require schools and parents to disclose to the other party any evaluations and recommendations based on those evaluations 15 days prior to any due process proceeding. This change will ensure that both parties are given the opportunity to review evaluations of a child's special education needs that the other party intends to use in a due process hearing.

17. Modification of Requirements to Achieve Innovative Delivery of Services (§613(g)). This provision will apply to 10 LEAs or groups of LEAs selected by the Secretary of Education who have demonstrated excellence in providing services to students with disabilities and who have obtained the cooperation of parents of students with disabilities in the area. Selected LEAs will be permitted to modify existing Part B requirements for improving services to disabled students and for improving the operation of the local special education system. Analytic instruments will be developed to quantitatively determine the effectiveness of the modification, and determine the ability for replication of successful changes.

18. State Application for Part C (formerly Part H) (current §678). The bill essentially maintains the current Part H program as Part C. The bill will enable Part C funding applicants to reduce application process paperwork by eliminating the requirement that all State policies and assurances pertaining to Part C be filed with every application to the U.S. Department of Education. This language corresponds to the language in Part B.

PHOTOGRAPHIC TRIBUTE TO
FORMER ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER
YITZHAK RABIN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1996

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent exhibition of photographs—Yitzhak Rabin Remembered—which displays in pictures the life and accomplishments of assassinated Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. This superb exhibit is now on display in the rotunda of the Cannon House Office Building. Last January when my wife, Annette, and I were in Israel on a private visit, we saw an outstanding photographic exhibit about Prime Minister Rabin in the Israeli Knesset, and right there, Annette and I determined that we should make every effort to have those photographs brought here to Washington so that the Members of the Congress could have a greater understanding and appreciation of this great man of peace.

Through the efforts of the Speaker of Knesset, Prof. Shevach Weiss, and the Embassy of Israel here in Washington, we were able to arrange for these photographs to be displayed in the Cannon rotunda. Last night, we held a reception to mark the opening of this exhibit and to pay tribute to this most dis-

tinguished Israeli leader, this man of war who became a leader in the effort to bring peace and cooperation.

Those who paid tribute to Prime Minister Rabin last night were: Our distinguished colleague from Georgia, the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH; Pro. Shevach Weiss, Speaker of Knesset; Dalia Rabin Filosof, the daughter of Prime Minister Rabin; His Excellency Itamar Rabinovich, the Ambassador of Israel to the United States; and Walter Reich, executive director of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial. Those of our colleagues who sponsored this event, in addition to Speaker GINGRICH, were Senators ORRIN HATCH of Utah and JOE LIEBERMAN of Connecticut; Democratic leader of the House, RICHARD GEPHARDT; and our House colleagues Congressman BENJAMIN A. GILMAN of New York, the chairman of our International Relations Committee; Congressman JOHN PORTER of Illinois; and Congressman HOWARD BERMAN of California. A number of our colleagues joined us in paying tribute, including Congressman BILL MARTINI of New Jersey and HOWARD COBLE of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely appropriate that we pay tribute to Prime Minister Rabin for his contributions to the State of Israel, our only stable democratic ally in the Middle East, and for his contributions to the peace process in that region.

Yitzhak Rabin was born in Jerusalem in 1922. He was only 26 years of age when the State of Israel was proclaimed in 1948, and in many ways his biography is the biography of Israel. He has played pivotal roles throughout his country's history.

In the war of Israeli independence in 1948, Yitzhak Rabin commanded the Harel brigade, which opened the road to besieged Jerusalem. He served in positions of command in the Israel Defense Forces, culminating with his appointment as chief of staff in 1964, when he led IDF forces to victory in the Six-Day War. Following his retirement from military service in 1968, he became Ambassador of Israel to the United States for a period of 5 years.

In 1973 when he returned to Israel, he was elected a member of the Knesset, and a year later in June 1974 he became Prime Minister, serving until 1977. During this period, disengagement agreements were signed with Egypt and Syria, followed by an interim agreement with Egypt. These were the key agreements that prepared the way for Egyptian President Anwar Sadat's historic visit to Jerusalem. During the period of the coalition government, Rabin served as Minister of Defense from 1984–90.

In July 1992 he became Prime Minister for the second time and also Minister of Defense. This period in office was marked by major landmarks in the peace process. On September 13, 1993, he signed the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles on the South Lawn of the White House. On October 26, 1994, he signed the Treaty of Peace between Israel and Jordan. On September 28, 1995, he signed the Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement at the White House. In recognition of his major contributions to Middle East peace, he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in December 1994 along with Israeli Foreign Minister, now Prime Minister, Shimon Peres and PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat.

Few of us will ever forget the tragedy of his death on November 4, 1995. He was assassinated by an Israeli citizen shortly after

speaking at a massive peace rally in Tel Aviv. In tribute to his contribution to the peace, kings, presidents and other heads of state and government from around the world participated in a memorial service honoring him at his burial in Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to pause in the Cannon rotunda to see these photographs—Yitzhak Rabin Remembered—and to honor the memory and the outstanding achievements of this great man.

A TRIBUTE TO TARA SAKRAIDA

HON. WES COOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1996

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States recently concluded its annual Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. One of the winners of this year's competition is a bright young student from North Medford High School in Medford, OR. Tara Sakraida has won the first place award for the entire State of Oregon. Her submission, entitled "Answering America's Call," serves as a moving tribute to the type of civic-minded community involvement that has motivated so many of our Nation's veterans.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit Tara Sakraida's award-winning essay for the record. "Answering America's Call"—by Tara Sakraida of Medford, OR.

ANSWERING AMERICA'S CALL

Hi. You've reached 555-Americans, and we're either too busy or too lazy to answer the phone, so leave a message and we may call you back.

Hello? Hello? This is America, your country, calling. Is anyone home? Well, I needed to talk to someone . . . I'm feeling pretty low. People are burning my flag, Old Glory, as I speak. They are yelling and protesting that desecrating Old Glory is freedom of speech. Why are they doing this? After everything I have given them. A constitution, a democracy, freedom to make choices and decisions. I don't understand—they've chosen to dishonor me. Where are you, Americans? If you're sitting at home, please pull yourself away from the television and answer my call. We need Help.

When some people say the Pledge of Allegiance, they don't even place a hand over their hearts. They recite it unenthusiastically, like lyrics to an outdated song. And when my melodic, patriotic anthem is played, some do not stand or remove their hats, for they feel it is unnecessary or trite. The polls are no longer overflowing with anxious voters; many don't believe their vote makes a difference. And the meaning of Veteran's Day is often lost in the excitement of a vacation. Americans, are you doing something to solve these problems?

I'm asking each and every American to take time to listen and answer my cries. Begin by volunteering at a Domiciliary, giving blood to the Red Cross, or serving in the military. You can show patriotism by flying my flag; show your pride by standing when my anthem is played; and acknowledge those military crusaders by observing Veteran's Day. I hope you understand my message, Americans. I need you to come together as a community so my message can be heard.

I called Mr. Retired the other day. You know, your elderly neighbor across the

street? His social security checks stopped coming, and he can't afford his high medical bills after breaking his hip. He needs your help.

I called a grieving mother yesterday. Her sobs and tears rang over the phone as she described her young son's death after being caught in a gang cross-fire. She needs your help.

I called a lonesome, homeless teenager today. He told the violent story of being beaten at home and turning to the streets for refuge. He needs your help.

Now I'm calling you, Americans. Please answer the call of rising health care costs by electing officials who will work to change the system. Answer the call of crime by educating children about the dangers of drugs, guns, and violence. And answer the call of abuse by confronting the problem and volunteering for Crisis Intervention Organizations or homeless shelters.

You've heard my call, Americans. Now don't hang up on me . . . I need you. I have given everything I can, and now it is up to you. I hope to hear from you soon, Americans. Good-bye.

*If you don't answer America's call, you may be disconnected.

THE FARM BILL

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting my Washington Report for Wednesday, April 3, 1996 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE 1996 FARM BILL

Congress recently passed the 1996 farm bill, and the President signed it into law. This seven-year bill makes sweeping reforms toward a free-market agricultural system. It also includes agricultural research, rural development, conservation, nutrition, and agricultural export and food assistance programs. Saving more than \$2 billion, the bill passed with my support.

Passage of the bill was helped because Congress was months late. On January 1, the 1990 farm bill expired, and the 1949 "permanent law" came into effect. Everyone agreed that the expensive 1949 law would be changed before harvest, but Congress took no action, and farmers were forced to make important business decisions in the dark. The congressional leadership's decision last year to put farm legislation in the huge, omnibus budget bill was clearly a mistake, because it delayed action on this important, bipartisan measure.

CROP PROGRAMS

The heart of the bill is the so-called "Freedom to Farm" approach, which replaces commodity programs with a yearly payment to farmers—declining each year—based on their past production. The payment would be separated from specific crop production, letting farmers choose which crops to plant. Previous policy had used complicated payment formulas and required some land to be idled. Instead, the new bill gives farmers flat payments and independence. The only requirement is that farmers meet current conservation standards.

I have always supported a more market-oriented farm policy. This measure is a good step in that direction. The elimination of most planting restrictions will allow farmers to plant according to supply and demand, and to respond more efficiently to global markets. Reduced regulation will also ease the burden of paperwork on farmers.

DRAWBACKS

I agree with criticism of the Freedom to Farm approach that it fails to require farmers to farm in order to receive payments. This is a common-sense requirement, and it is disappointing that the leadership blocked an opportunity to vote on this issue. My suspicion is that farm issues will come back to Congress sooner than many expect. It was easier to pass major changes because crop prices are at their highest levels in decades. If falling prices threaten family farms, farmers may demand a better safety net in later years.

WETLANDS AND CONSERVATION

The final bill includes some limited wetlands reform, similar to a bill I helped introduce last year. Under current law, farmers are not allowed to farm on wetlands for environmental reasons. But it is difficult to determine exactly what a wetland is—particularly in tiny areas. An area that was dry one month might be wet the next, and two scientists can make different determinations. Moreover, farmers risk drastic penalties for even the smallest violation, even if they make a good faith effort to correct the situation.

The 1996 farm bill consolidates authority for agricultural wetlands in the Agriculture Department, and makes penalties proportional to any violation. The wetlands reforms in the farm bill are significant, but they fall short of the reforms that passed the House last year, but stalled in the Senate. This other measure addressed wetlands protection in a more comprehensive manner, narrowing the definition of wetlands, ensuring that the costs and benefits of regulation are analyzed with sound scientific evidence, and consolidating agricultural wetlands authority in USDA. Congress should revisit and pursue these important reforms.

The farm bill also reauthorizes the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). In effect, CRP leases environmentally sensitive farmland from farmers to reduce soil erosion, protect water quality, and promote wildlife. This program is credited for restoring numerous threatened species, including ducks and quail. CRP was not included in the original House bill, but it was added on the floor with my strong support. The new bill also includes provisions to assist livestock producers in protecting water supplies from animal waste.

EXPORTS

The 1996 farm bill includes an amendment I offered on the House floor to renew export and food assistance programs. Exports are critical to the average Hoosier farmer, who receives some \$32,000 in export sales each year. Export promotion and food assistance have been key to the success of U.S. agriculture in world markets.

The farm bill reauthorizes export and food aid programs through 2002 to help open new markets and counter unfair foreign subsidies. These efforts are especially important as we pursue additional reductions in foreign tariffs. We made progress in the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), but we must maintain our leverage to push our competitors to reduce their trade barriers further. The bill provides export credits for purchasing U.S. products, authorizes measures to help promote U.S. food products in tough foreign markets, and boosts the role of private entities in distributing U.S. farm products under food aid programs.

RESEARCH AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The new farm bill makes agricultural research and rural development a higher priority with a "Fund for Rural America". The fund would invest in rural infrastructure and

housing, and make competitive research grants for technological advancement. These efforts pay for themselves dozens of times over in economic growth, increased productivity, and innovative uses for agricultural products. Many Hooser farmers expressed their support for making research a higher priority, and I agree.

CROP INSURANCE

The farm bill includes provisions from a bill I cosponsored to allow farmers to waive crop insurance mandates if they forego future disaster payments. Under the old crop insurance program, farmers who chose to participate in USDA programs were required to purchase catastrophic insurance from the government, even if it made little sense for a particular farmer's crop or size of operation.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The new bill includes dairy reforms that phase out price supports and replace them with market loans. Unfortunately, the bill made only modest reforms to the sugar and peanut programs. These programs impose production quotas that protect a few sugar and peanut farmers at the expense of consumers. I voted to phase out both the sugar and peanut programs, but the effort failed.

CONCLUSION

The 1996 farm bill passed with broad bipartisan support. While not perfect, this legislation includes many important reforms. I believe it will strengthen the American farmer,

both at home and abroad, and maintain the U.S. food supply as the cheapest and safest food supply in the world.

SUSAN AND ROBERT H. FRIEBERT,
RECIPIENTS OF AMERICAN JEW-
ISH COMMITTEE'S HUMAN RELA-
TIONS AWARD

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 1996

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friends Susan and Robert Friebert on receiving the American Jewish Committee's 1996 Human Relations Award.

Susan and Bob Friebert, together and as individuals, have left a lasting mark on their community and have touched the lives of literally thousands of people in the Milwaukee area.

Susan Friebert, through her involvement in organizations such as the Quality Education Commission, the Wisconsin Council on Children and Families, and the White House Commission on Presidential Scholars, has made the education and well-being of Wisconsin's children a top priority. She is also very proud of her Jewish faith and heritage and has as-

sumed leadership positions in the National Council of Jewish Women, the Wisconsin Jewish Conference, the Milwaukee Jewish Council for Community Relations, and the Milwaukee Jewish Federation. Susan's involvement in these outstanding organizations has helped to ensure that Milwaukee's Jewish community remains an active and vital voice in Milwaukee's civic life.

Through his involvement in Wisconsin's legal community and the Democratic Party of Wisconsin, Bob Friebert has helped to shape our State's legal and political landscape. Bob was instrumental in organizing Wisconsin's State Public Defender's Office and also served as State chair of the Wisconsin Civil Liberties Union. While serving as chairman of the Wisconsin Jewish Conference, Bob helped to author and secure passage of Wisconsin's hate crimes law. He is also a leading Democrat and through the years, has played key roles in numerous local, State, and national political campaigns. Like his wife, Bob is also very proud of his Jewish heritage and has assumed leadership positions with organizations such as the Wisconsin Jewish council, the National Jewish Democratic Council, and the Milwaukee Jewish Council on Community Relations.

I commend Susan and Bob Friebert on receiving the 1996 Human Relations Award and on their outstanding service to our community.