

## SPECIAL PRESENTATION

The House Memorial Choir sang 'The Star-Spangled Banner' and 'My Country 'Tis of Thee' before the House in honor of the Pioneer Lawmakers Joint Convention.

The House rose and expressed its appreciation.

## COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE SENATE

Greiner of Washington moved that a committee of four be appointed to notify the Senate that the House was ready to receive it in joint convention.

The motion prevailed and the Speaker appointed as such committee, Greiner of Washington, Alons of Sioux, Mascher of Johnson and Mertz of Kossuth.

Greiner of Washington, chair of the committee appointed to notify the Senate that the House was ready to receive it in joint convention, reported the committee had performed its duty. The report was received and the committee discharged.

The Sergeant-at-Arms announced the arrival of the President of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate and the honorable body of the Senate.

The President was escorted to the Speaker's station and the members of the Senate were seated in the House chamber.

## JOINT CONVENTION PIONEER LAWMAKERS' FIFTY-EIGHTH BIENNIAL SESSION

In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 4 duly adopted, the joint convention was called to order, President Kibbie presiding.

President Kibbie announced a quorum present and the joint convention duly organized.

Iverson of Wright moved that a committee of eight be appointed to escort the Pioneer Lawmakers into the House chamber.

The motion prevailed and the President appointed as such committee Connolly of Dubuque, Zieman of Allamakee, Tinsman of Scott and Rielly of Mahaska, on the part of the Senate, and Greiner of Washington, Alons of Sioux, Mascher of Johnson and Mertz of Kossuth on the part of the House.

The committee escorted the Pioneer Lawmakers into the House chamber.

President Kibbie presented Senator Dvorsky, who welcomed the Pioneer Lawmakers on behalf of the Senate.

President Kibbie presented Representative Christopher Rants, Speaker of the House, who welcomed the Pioneer Lawmakers on behalf of the House.

President Kibbie presented the Honorable Don Shultz, member of the House who responded to the welcome.

The Honorable Don Shultz announced the 1985 class of legislators who were eligible to become members of the Pioneer Lawmakers.

Honorary members of the 2005 class were the following:

Donald G. Hauser, Michael Heller, Kay Henderson, Bernie Kobernick, David Smitherman, Todd Schulz and Dawn Vance.

Representative Don Shultz introduced Steven Rapp, Senior Prosecutor for the United Nations at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, who addressed the joint convention as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, colleagues, and friends.

You know that you have truly become an old-timer when you attend one of these biennial meetings and find that there are pioneer lawmakers who were first elected after you left office.

I see some of my fellow old-timers from the class of '73', from that year when a majority of legislators were new and many were young.

When we arrived the handful of veterans in these halls did not know what to expect. Three of us new Democrats, Tom Higgins, Mary O'Halloran, and myself, had originally been assigned to the full Appropriations Committee. But somebody in the leadership of the Republican majority feared that we would use our positions to push radical ideas, and we were re-assigned to the County Government Committee. This for me turned out to be a blessing in disguise-but at the time it was very well-disguised.

Being on County Government involved early morning meetings with our older rural colleagues, many of whom had already been up for hours. But there was no shortage of bills-stacks of them, most from the associations of counties and county officeholders. Soon I was working on the bills in subcommittee, trying to make constructive changes.

Not that I gave up on radical ideas. I made it my cause to push for the adoption of the three-factor formula for the corporate income tax—a bill that I was to discover had probably less chance of passage than the repeal of the right-to-work law.

But on County Government, I continued to work and by March I had a chance as minority member to manage a bill on the floor, House File 175, to raise the \$.70 meal allowance paid to sheriffs for the feeding of prisoners in small county jails. But my Republican colleagues knew what they were doing. It was not a "Non-Con." Indeed, when it reached the floor we heard that it would enrich sheriff's wives, while starving the prisoners. I discovered that I had been sent out into the battle between the rural and the urban, between Mom and Pop and the bureaucrats, and I was not on the expected side. In the end we worked out a compromise that was signed into law in May. It ended the possibility of profit, kept the sheriffs happy, and assured the prisoners their three squares a day.

Toward the end of that long session, I made the mistake of playing touch football, after doing nothing more strenuous for five months than lifting the Iowa Code. The result was announced in the House Chamber by David Stanley as a "3-factor fracture." After the ankle was pinned and I was wheeled out of the recovery room, I was pleased that my first visitors were my colleagues from the other party on the County Government Committee.

I do not want to give you the impression that I got along with all of my Republican colleagues. That first year I do not remember ever exchanging a greeting with Grumpy Fisher. However, in the second year, we teamed together to support no-fault automobile insurance. I recall the day when we defeated a killer amendment on a cliff-hanging vote that ended with a count of 49 to 48. Grumpy and I literally danced a jig in the back of chamber. Of course, then as now, it took more than 49 votes to pass a bill and even together we could not get there.

I discovered as well that it was possible to have good relations not just with sometime allies on the other side, but also with dedicated adversaries. In 1974, Chuck Grassley and I ran for the same Congressional seat, both in crowded primary fields. I remember sitting together on that back bench discussing how we could manage to win on shoestring budgets against better financed opponents. I recall one evening when we decided to save money by riding together to a joint event up by the Minnesota line. In the interest of cost-savings, we even let Jim Flansburg of the Register come along on the ride.

As you know, for the last four years I have been working in a very different arena. There I confront persons who were leaders of a state-the Republic of Rwanda. It is a state in which 800,000 men, women and children were butchered in 14 weeks from April to July in 1994. An average 8000 were killed each day-the equivalent of three World Trade Centers a day in a place one-fifth the size of Iowa. The murders were committed at a rate greater than that of the Nazi death machine at its most efficient.

We have 69 of these former leaders in custody. They were arrested in 26 countries, and brought to Arusha in Tanzania to stand trial, before a court constituted by the UN Security Council and finance by 191 nations, on indictments charging genocide and crimes against humanity.

There is a tendency in the West to see the Rwanda genocide as an episode of spontaneous violence in a primitive society. That is not true. Rwanda is certainly poor, but it is one of the most comprehensively administered societies in the world. The leaders who sit in the UN Detention Facility in Arusha are persons of education, who studied in Europe or in North America, and who held key positions in government, in politics, in business, in the media, in academia, in the military, and in the Church, both Catholic and protestant.

There is also a tendency to see the Rwanda genocide as something that could only happen in Africa. That is not true. We have only to remember the contemporaneous mass murders in the former Yugoslavia, and the genocide of the Jews and the extermination and enslavement of other national groups-crimes committed in living memory by persons with whom many of us share a common heritage.

In the trial of the Media leaders, I looked across each day and eventually cross-examined Professor Ferdinand Nahimana, a man who for a while had pursued an academic career in African history that one of his lawyers had compared to that of my wife Dolly. Now I often spend weeks dealing one-on-one with individuals who have confessed to their part in the genocide and who we hope, after submitting to the justice system themselves, will be witnesses against their former colleagues. Some were successful business men, persons devoted to their families, but who took the leadership in creating and financing the national youth group that became the killing corps of the genocide.

What motivated such individuals to become the organizers of mass murder?

There was first the sense that they were the victims. For decades, some say centuries, the minority Tutsis had dominated, and the majority Hutus had been oppressed. When the Hutus gained dominance at the time of independence in the early 1960's, forcing hundreds of thousands of Tutsis to flee, there was a fear that if the Tutsis were allowed even a share of power they would soon dominate again, and reduce the Hutus to slavery. This fear was greatest among those who had the most to lose. But they used it with great effect to rekindle the enmity between ordinary Hutus and Tutsis who in many cases had intermarried and built business and personal relations across the ethnic divide.

There was no hope that disputes would be decided fairly. Only power mattered. A small group of Hutus from the north held the political power, and their associates had been allowed to gain economic advantages, and amass great wealth. When that was

criticized they sent their supporters to violently attack their opponents, with no expectation that they would be punished for their conduct.

Those whose positions were threatened built support by demonizing the Tutsi minority group. In this they were aided by the fact that the country was at war with a rebel force that was dominated by the children of the Tutsi refugees that had fled in the 1960's. They diverted attention from the fact that one small group of Hutus had all the power and wealth, by calling on all Hutus to unite against the eternal enemy the Tutsis. Those Hutus who would ally themselves with the Tutsis were the worst, and in the genocide were the first victims, because they were traitors to their own kind.

There was a willingness to use any means. The unemployed youth were recruited, and armed, and trained and eventually unleashed. They were the most avid killers, but they were only part of the killing force. There was the military, the national police, the local administration, but also hundreds of thousands of ordinary civilians who took their place on barriers that each few yards crossed every street and highway, and enlisted in night patrols, identifying and flushing out their Tutsi neighbors and sometimes joining in their slaughter. As they did they listened to the propaganda. It praised them for working, as killing was known during the genocide. It told them that the work was necessary because the Tutsis had dug a grave for the Hutus, they must fill it with the Tutsis or the Hutus themselves would be the victims. It mocked and dehumanized the Tutsis, as cockroaches, and snakes, and in an overwhelming Christian country it was even said that the Virgin Mary has appeared to say that the Tutsis deserve their fate. It put people in fear that if they opposed the killing, even if they did not at least appear to participate, that they themselves would be targeted, the names of themselves and their families read on the radio to the hearing of thousands of machete-wielding killers who would be awaiting their arrival at the roadblocks.

It is a long way from Iowa to Rwanda. But both the killers and the victims were humans like we are. Close up one can see that even the killers were motivated by similar desires for security for themselves and their families and were intensely fearful of anything that could take it away. They made choices. As humans we all make choices, whether to seek common ground, or sow division; whether to build or to tear down; whether to settle disputes by peaceful means or by violence; whether to do good, or to do evil.

Thinking of these choices I am reminded of the lessons taught and the lessons learned here in the halls of this Iowa Legislature. One learned that the winner who takes all will likely lose all on another day, that the best solutions often involve compromise, that an adversary today can be an ally tomorrow. One learned as well that differences are often superficial, that persons of widely different backgrounds can find common elements in their experiences, and that even adversaries can be just as well-motivated as oneself and can sometimes even have it right. Of course, one also came to know that even as one writes the law, there are rules that cannot be changed, and lines that cannot be crossed, the violation of which will earn the disapproval of friend and foe alike.

Of course we were not in civil war in 1973, or in 2005. But in our history we have had groups victimized, we have had regional conflict that took generations to heal, we have had social tensions that erupted into violence. We have learned that the best answer lies in institutions like this one, where conflicts are fought with words, where

interests are balanced, where resolutions are reached that we may not like but that we can accept.

Seeing what can happen in the world, underlines not just necessity of this process, but also of its fragility. Preserving it requires us to each day make the choice not to cross the line, not to make adversaries into enemies, not to demonize the opposition, and while pushing hard for what one knows is right, to remember that each has his or her own view of what is right that is entitled to our understanding and respect.

Gipp of Winneshiek moved that the joint session dissolve at 2:49 p.m.

The House resumed session at 3:10 p.m., Speaker Rants in the chair.

### IMMEDIATE MESSAGE

Jacobs of Polk asked and received unanimous consent that **House File 748** be immediately messaged to the Senate.

### Regular Calendar

**House File 797**, a bill for an act relating to the establishment of a promotional program for national historic landmarks and certified cultural and entertainment districts, was taken up for consideration.

Wilderdyke of Harrison offered the following amendment H-1098 filed by him and moved its adoption:

H-1098

- 1 Amend House File 797 as follows:
- 2 1. Page 1, line 12, by striking the words
- 3 "located in".

Amendment H-1098 was adopted.

Wilderdyke of Harrison offered the following amendment H-1115 filed by him and moved its adoption:

H-1115

- 1 Amend House File 797 as follows:
- 2 1. Page 1, by striking lines 18 through 20 and
- 3 inserting the following: "districts, as established