

PARLIAMENT OF ZIMBABWE

Thursday, 4th June, 2026

The National Assembly met at a Quarter-past Two o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

(THE HON. SPEAKER *in the Chair*)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE HON. SPEAKER

EXTENSION OF 26 BUSINESS DAYS TO CONSIDER

STATUTORY INSTRUMENT NO. 77 OF 2026

THE HON. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that in terms of Standing Order No. 33 (7) (a), the Parliamentary Legal Committee sought and was granted an extension of 26 business days to consider statutory instrument No. 77 of 2026.

There is a request on a point of national interest and I will allow one. Yes, Hon. Shamu.

HON. SHAMU: Thank you Mr. Speaker Sir. I rise to congratulate His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Zimbabwe, Dr. Emmerson Dambudzo Mnangagwa, the Government and the people of Zimbabwe on our historic election as a non-

permanent member of the United Nations Security Council for the year 2027 to 2028 – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] –

Mr. Speaker Sir, this achievement is far more than a diplomatic accolade. It is a recognition of Zimbabwe's growing influence in international affairs and a testament to our nation's commitment to multilateralism, peace and international cooperation. Zimbabwe assumes this responsibility at a pivotal moment in global affairs.

The world continues to grapple with enduring disparities between the global north and the global south where the distribution of wealth, influence and opportunities remain profoundly unequal. Developing nations, particularly in Africa, have, for decades, contributed immensely to the global economy through natural resources, yet often remain Mr. Speaker Sir, on the periphery of global decision-making and economic benefit.

Zimbabwe's presence on the Security Council provides an important platform to advance the African agenda and advocate for a more equitable international order. At a time when Africa possesses many of the strategic minerals required to power the global economy and the green energy transition, our voice will contribute to the

growing call for value addition, beneficiation and economic justice for resource-rich nations.

As a nation forged through the struggle for self-determination, Zimbabwe is uniquely positioned to champion the aspirations of Africa and the broader Global South. Our election offers an opportunity to support calls for a more representative system of global governance and to ensure that the interests of developing nations are accorded the prominence they deserve.

Hon. Speaker Sir, this is not merely Zimbabwe taking a seat at the table. It is Zimbabwe carrying the hopes of a continent determined to convert its vast resource endowments into shared prosperity, industrial transformation and sustainable development.

I would like, therefore, to commend His Excellency the President, our diplomatic corps and the people of Zimbabwe on this momentous achievement, which places our nation at the forefront of shaping a more just, balanced and inclusive global future. So, I submit.

THE HON. SPEAKER: Thank you very much Hon. Shamu.

Your statement did not mention the overwhelming support, which appears not to be appreciated by other people – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] –

Out of 190 votes, Zimbabwe attained 182 votes and therefore, short of only eight to make the 100 percent mark. That was a resounding success. We thank you Hon. Shamu for making that statement accordingly.

SECOND READING

CONSTITUTION OF ZIMBABWE AMENDMENT (NO. 3)

BILL [H. B. 1, 2026]

First Order read: Adjourned debate on motion on the Second Reading of the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 3) Bill [H.B. 1, 2026].

Question again proposed.

HON. MATEMA: A very good afternoon to you Hon. Speaker. Thank you very much. I want to thank you for affording me this opportunity to make my submissions with respect to the Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3 that is before the House at a

very critical and defining moment in the legislative history of the Parliament of Zimbabwe and our great nation, Zimbabwe.

As I stand here, Mr. Speaker, I want to put it on record that I arrived here with a constitutional mandate to represent the people of Buhera Central Constituency and therefore, my submission this afternoon is a reflection of the voice of the people of Buhera – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*]-

HON. GUMBO: Point of order Mr. Speaker Sir. The Hon. Member cannot debate while he is on WhatsApp. We keep seeing him scrolling his phone and debating – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

Just debate your issues. He is on Twitter or something because he keeps doing this and we are seeing it while he is debating.

HON. CHIKOMBO: As if he has been hacked – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

HON. GUMBO: He keeps on scrolling his phone; we have seen it from the screen and he must just *ga-ga-ga* – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

HON. CHIKOMBO: Mr. Speaker, close the lacuna, there is now a gap – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

THE HON. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. Member, you do not address the Chair while seated down. Can you apologise for that!

HON. CHIKOMBO: I duly apologise Hon. Speaker.

THE HON. SPEAKER: Thank you. I will allow Hon. Matema to proceed and say *ga-ga-ga ga* – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

HON. MATEMA: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker Sir. I stand here in agreement with CAB 3 in its entirety – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*]- I will speak to just two provisions. Number one, the election of the President as captured in Clause 3 of the Bill and number two, the need for a referendum or leg thereof but before I do that, it is pertinent. Mr. Speaker Sir, to highlight that constitutional amendments are made in the face of obtaining social, political, economic, technological and or ecological considerations and realities.

Therefore, constitutions are not set in stone. They respond to the demands of the day and season. Amendments are therefore inevitable

in light of the above, as we work towards reforming, reinforcing, strengthening, clarifying, aligning and or harmonising certain provisions and prescriptions of existing statutes in their text and CAB 3 is doing exactly that.

Mr. Speaker Sir, context is everything. Allow me to go into history so that we depart from a point of evidence. The road that we are walking is not new with respect to how a President is elected. In the advent of our independence, Parliament elected both the President and the Prime Minister.

Constitutional Amendment 7 of 1987 had the effect of introducing the direct election of the President beginning in 1990. Mr. Speaker Sir, universal adult suffrage speaks to giving people the right to vote as provided for in Section 67 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe, which is very explicit in terms of who is entitled to vote. It does not say how people vote and therefore, how the Executive is selected. It is historically and legislatively obtuse and false to present and claim direct Presidential elections as some sacred liberation war inheritance.

Our first two elections post the liberation struggle gave us both the President and Prime Minister *via* Parliament. It is no debate that

for the past three decades, we have had contestations around the election results with respect to the President and for no reason other than political posturing and grandstanding – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*]-

In the face of the posturing that I referred to, Mr. Speaker Sir, how do we negotiate our way to an election that cannot be challenged? We need to retrace our political footsteps back to 1980, recalibrate, realign, reposition and relaunch. This is what CAB 3 is prescribing, an indirect election of the President *via* a joint sitting of the Senate and the House of Assembly, with legislators carrying the voices of their constituencies making that representation. This is what obtains in other jurisdictions that are used as models of perfection on matters legislative. The United States of America, the United Kingdom, India and closer to home, the Republic of South Africa and Botswana. Mr. Speaker Sir, this route aligns with the provisions of Section 97 of the Constitution and will definitely bring in some balance.

Section 97 gives the Senate and the National Assembly, the power to remove or recall the President. Those who are given to basic

accounting will know that there is a T-account. When you debit, you credit – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*]-

Our legislative T-account demands, in our circumstance, according to the provisions and prescriptions of CAB 3, that we appoint and recall the President should there be a need to do that. Given the toxicity that has punctuated our elections for the past three decades, we need to right this wrong and thanks to this amendment, such contestations are going to be a thing of the past.

Coming to the issue of the referendum, those that are not given to the truth; those that are economic with the truth and to the uncircumcised on constitutional provisions. – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*]-The current Constitution is unambiguous. In its text and provisions, Section 328 is very clear with respect to where and when a referendum is required, as captured in Section 328 (6) (a). It is required only for amendments affecting Chapter 4 with respect to the declaration of rights, Chapter 16 with respect to agricultural land and to Section 328 itself. It must be made very clear that not every Constitutional amendment requires a referendum but only three scenarios are captured above.

Mr. Speaker Sir, Parliament has the constitutional authority to amend other provisions through the prescribed parliamentary processes, as we are here doing and we are in the correct constitutional space with respect to CAB3.

In conclusion, as we sit in this august House, it should never escape us that this is our legislative zero hour, our defining hour, our turning point, our rubicon moment. We do not have any other route but to cross over with this constitutional amendment for the greater good. Posterity will judge us well for standing in defence of that which is good for both the current and future generations. We have taken the correct path under the circumstances and we have done that within the confines of the law. Speed does not matter when the vectors are wrong. I am glad that we got our legislative vectors right. The drafters were thorough and the Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Committee was meticulous in their work.

The best legislative decision we will ever make is to support this Bill in its entirety. I call upon this House and the Hon. Members to apply their minds and not their hearts as we debate. Let us support this Bill for history to judge us well. Let us be measured, deliberate

and intentional in this legislative process, one process that puts our legislation on equal footing with other progressive jurisdictions, taking us up the scaffold of democratic governance and sustainable growth and development.

As I take my seat, I want to highlight and underline the fact that CAB3 is our shortest route to our sound legislative destination and the implementation thereof. On account of that, I call upon this august House to lend its support to CAB3 for our own sake and for posterity. I so submit and thank you so very much.

HON. MAKUMIRE: On a point of privilege Mr. Speaker Sir.

THE HON. SPEAKER: I beg your pardon?

HON. MAKUMIRE: I have a point of privilege.

THE HON. SPEAKER: You must proceed by way of a point of order. The Hon. Member has just sat down now after delivering his speech.

HON. MAKUMIRE: It is not a point of order Mr. Speaker because it relates to the list that you are using to give Hon. Members an opportunity to speak.

THE HON. SPEAKER: On that one, talk to your Chief Whip.

HON. MAKUMIRE: The list is not posted on our platform. We are having problems accepting that list.

THE HON. SPEAKER: Order! You have not informed me that you no longer have a Chief Whip but I see the Chief Whip is here. So, whisper to him.

***HON. P. ZHOU:** Thank you Hon. Speaker. May I please speak whilst I am seated...

Hon. Members having been moving around and making inaudible interjections.

THE HON. SPEAKER: Order! Order! Hon. Hwende, please take your seat. – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*]

THE HON. SPEAKER: Order! Order! Hon. Members, take your seats. Order! Regardless of this list, all are entitled to speak. So, I respect the list given to me by the Whips and if your name does not appear here, you still have a chance to speak. You will not be excluded. Thank you.

***HON. P. ZHOU:** Thank you Hon. Speaker for giving me this opportunity to debate on the Constitutional Amendment Bill Number 3 of 2026. We prayed for this occasion, for this very day. I thank God

for allowing us to reach this day and I am happy because I am one of the first Hon. Members to add my voice concerning the Constitutional Amendment Bill Number 3 of 2026. I want to thank the Minister for Justice and Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, Hon. Z. Ziyambi for giving us a profound speech, which he clearly explained to us. Before people went to public hearings, there was enough explanation and even the Chairperson of the Committee on Justice and Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, Hon. Zvobgo, gave a very conclusive and informative report. I also thank the Committee of Justice and Legal and Parliamentary Affairs and all the committees that were involved during the public hearings and the compilation of the report. This clearly indicated that a thorough job was done because of the presentations, which were done by the Minister of Justice and the Chairperson of the Justice Committee.

Let me also take this opportunity to thank all Zimbabweans who attended the public consultations and those who gave written submissions, who listened and gave their views on the Constitutional Amendment Number 3. On the report which was presented by the Justice and Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Justice Committee, Hon.

Zvobgo, many people flooded different venues, gave their opinions and they were and not restricted. They were free to put their opinions on what they liked about the Bill and what they do not like about the Bill. Looking at the province where I come from, males who gave their views were 22 120 and women were 32 111. The total number of people who attended the hearings was 54 000. In this august House, I am representing the women. May you understand that 32 000 women clearly indicated they now understand their rights. They do not remain in the kitchen preparing meals but they know how developmental projects are being done.

Hence, I am thanking all who helped women to know their rights and also have their voices be heard. They went and contributed very positively and accepted the Bill. Those who are accepting the Bill are women and if women say something is going to happen, it will happen. The father and the children will follow suit; hence I am saying congratulations to the women of Midlands and all women from other provinces. They did a very brilliant job. Those living with disabilities, 2 485 attended the consultations. They were not left behind. Some of them were assisted, some used cars to travel from

different areas to the venues of public hearings. This clearly indicated what His Excellency said, leaving no one and no place behind and people really used their rights fully.

Our elders said *chati homu chareva* and it clearly indicated that many voices must be listened to without looking at the status of the person. I am saying *chati bwege chanzwika*. These things were discussed in the rural areas and in the towns. We are here today as the Members of Parliament so that we can debate on what we heard from the report presented by the Chairperson of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, Hon. Zvobgo. Our singer, Aleck Macheso said, *zvido zvenyu kunyanya ndizvo zvaita kuti tive pano nhasi*. Hence, we are here today to discuss the Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3 so that we can put our minds together and come up with a good solution.

The President of the Republic of Zimbabwe, Dr. E. D. Mnangagwa said ‘the voice of the people is the voice of God’. What was said by the people is what was compiled in the report. Nothing was removed and nothing added. We want to listen to what people said. That is the only thing, which will link us to God. I believe everything that was said by the people was compiled in the report,

which was presented by Hon. Zvobgo who is the Chairperson of the Justice Committee. I strongly support everything that was presented by the Chairperson of the Justice Committee.

I want to start with Clause 3 which talks about the power to be given to Hon. Members to select the President. I strongly support this point. It is important for the President to be voted into power by the Members of Parliament because these Members of Parliament are voted into power by people from different constituencies. It is the voice of people or the choice of people who have voted the Member of Parliament into power. The Member of Parliament is not in position by accident. We have a total of 210 constituencies. We also have 60 women from the Women's Quota. We have also have mixed Senators. We have 16 chiefs. We also have two who are representing people living with disabilities and also 10 youths, with one from each province. All these Hon. Members represent us from all different areas, rural or urban areas. Hence, I am saying I agree that these people must be given power to vote for the President of Zimbabwe.

They must be given power to select the President because they are the ones who come to this august House and make laws for the

good governance of the country. For these people, making laws is one of their duties. That is one of the things, which we are pleading for because they are already in Parliament to make laws and to do other roles like oversight and representation. I strongly support this Bill and support this clause. If we look at where we come from, the councillors are voted per ward and they go to their council but they do not know who the Mayor is and who is going to be the Chairperson. When they arrive at the council, they are going to be told that you are the ones who are representing your places and they are now given the power to vote for the Chairperson or the Mayor.

So, why are we differentiating it when it comes to the President? We are Hon. Members who have power. I strongly support this Bill and this issue is not new in Zimbabwe. We had once done this but we were seeing some problems. We saw that there are more benefits than disadvantages. Hence, we must repeat it. This issue of parliamentarians voting for the President is being done by our neighbouring countries like South Africa and Botswana. Most of the people who are in Zimbabwe will be admiring what is happening in Botswana and South Africa. So, we must take the opportunity to copy

something which is right and meaningful from other countries. Things are moving smoothly and peacefully in these neighbouring countries and it also reduces the issue of violence. It promotes peace and tranquility in the country.

So, those few who are representing the people from different constituencies must be given the opportunity to finish the job by voting for the President, which means the Hon. Members in this august House and those in the Senate must vote for the President. We have been given this tag by those who have voted us into power, who are at home in different constituencies. So, the adage that I said alludes to something that has already happened. We cannot go back.

Now, looking at Section 97 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe, Members of Parliament have the power to appoint a President. Members of Parliament should be empowered to vote for the President because they also have the power to impeach the President also from operating in office. This is what was discussed. Clauses 4, 9 and 10, I also support these clauses which seek to extend the period a President will be in office from five to seven years. Seven years is a blessed number, which we find in the Bible. There are issues related

to marriages that happened within that period and also, there is a story of a drought, then after that, a bountiful harvest. The progress that we see and the development that we see as a result of the new dispensation being led ably by His Excellency, President Dr. E. D. Mnangagwa, indeed, this is profound.

This is something that is pace-setting. It is something that has never happened before. Despite the existence of sanctions and those who imposed the sanctions are still alive, and the new dispensation performed well despite COVID-19, the restrictions and the lockdowns. Despite all that, the new dispensation performed well, even after Cyclone Idai, there is development in Zimbabwe.

At one point, some were talking about spaghetti roads. We have seen the Trabablas Interchange. You go to Robert Gabriel Mugabe International Airport and look at what has happened. Come to this august House, this new Parliament Building and the Trabablas Interchange; they are quite a marvel and we all see the beauty. Because of that, we say that the term should be extended from five to seven years so that these projects can be completed.

President Dr. E.D. Mnangagwa and the Second Republic are doing a good job, and the hand of God is being seen through him. He is leading like David, conquering Goliath with just one stone. We see the development and the transformation of different projects. We see unity and singing from the same hymnbook which is in this august House. The report, which says “forward with CAB Number 3 Bill,” is being appreciated by many people. It will not be surprising that there will be some who would not believe in the same approach but the majority will do so.

We are proposing something that is happening in so many countries. Among the Commonwealth countries, 36 out of 56 countries are already using this approach. They have more than five-year terms and some have seven or more years. The Commonwealth countries, including the United States of America, the so-called beacon of democracy, is doing that and people believe that it is good. I am sure that we all believe that this is good. I am sure we all agree that the President’s term, Members of Parliament and Councillors should be extended to seven years from five years.

We need to appreciate the good work that is being done by His Excellency and the Second Republic. So, why not allow Mbappe to continue striking? Let him continue striking as a striker so that he scores many goals even as we envision in 2030? It is not far. Can we stop Lionel Messi and substitute him while he is scoring? Let us continue in that trajectory. Let us work together as we build Zimbabwe. Let us forget about the pressure of elections, divisions and fights but let us work together.

Let me now talk about the Gender Commission. I believe that when changing things, we need to introspect and look at how we are changing, why we are changing and whether we are changing it for the better or not. The Gender Commission started operating in Zimbabwe in 2016. Many women were working together with men in the Gender Commission because women were disadvantaged in terms of opportunities compared to men. So, the Gender Commission is responsible for ensuring gender balance and mainstreaming gender.

From 2016, the Gender Commission did a good job in terms of empowering women, giving them equity and equal access to opportunities. Those who have been following the news, the President

has been promoting and empowering women in different arms of the State as a result of the Gender Commission. When we look at the Gender Commission and how much money they use, you all know that we participate in budgeting in this august House. The Gender Commission has never been given 1% of the Annual Budget. Sometimes it is less than 1%, and most times it is zero point something. This means that the Gender Commission does not use much.

So, if we stop the Gender Commission from operating and put it under the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission, it could be possible but what is the purpose? What would we save by so doing? The Gender Commission cannot build bridges and dams but it can bring equity, fairness and justice between the two genders, the male and the female.

The Gender Commission was quite pleasing. We were happy that it had a Chairperson and the Commissioners looking at the development and human rights in the gender aspect, it was quite impressive as the Gender Commission. If it were swallowed by the Human Rights Commission, it would just be a department without

much value. I fear the unknown and I have questions about whether the Human Rights Commission would operate the way the Gender Commission was operating. So, it is quite good to put it under the Human Rights Commission but I believe that it was performing very well as a separate entity. I request that it be left as it is.

I want to thank you very much Hon. Speaker for giving me this opportunity. I also implore this august House to support the Constitutional Amendment Number 3 Bill. I thank you.

HON. MUWODZERI: Thank you Hon. Speaker. I rise to address this august House in opposition to the Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3, 2026 – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] - I do so conscious of the gravity that attaches to any proceeding, which seeks to alter the supreme law of this land. The Constitution is not just a legislative instrument. It is the covenant between the State and its citizens, the foundation architecture of our republic, the embodiment of the aspirations of the people who fought, bled and sacrificed their sovereign self-determination. A social contract between the people of this land; to amend it properly is a constitutional betrayal of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I have studied the report of the Joint Portfolio Committees laid before this House. I commend the Committee for the diligence it has brought to process this constitutional magnitude. I begin with commendation for the only right where the Committee has been correct; this House should say so loudly.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the Committee's commendation on Clause 21 should not be abducted and that status quo on the political neutrality of traditional leaders should be preserved. It is constitutionally sound and democratically principled and worthy of praise.

Section 281 of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, read together with Sections 163 (1) (f), 165 (4) (a) and 283 (c) (iv), establishes a coherent and deliberate constitutional scheme. The scheme is premised on a fundamental truth that traditional leaders serve communities, not political parties. They are the custodians of the customary law and communal justice. They preside over matters of inheritance, land allocation and community dispute resolution in their capacity as judicial officers under our constitutional framework. To permit them to engage openly in partisan political activity is not just ignorant but it is a constitutional contradiction. Mr. Speaker, Section

165 (4) imposes upon judicial officers a duty of impartiality that is non-negotiable.

Traditional leaders who exercise judicial functions cannot simultaneously hold political allegiance without destroying the neutrality upon which the legitimacy of their judicial role depends. A chief who campaigns for a political party at a rally on Saturday cannot credibly adjudicate a boundary dispute between a ruling party supporter and an opposition member on Monday – [HON.

MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] - Mr. Speaker, the Constitution understood this, the Committee has understood this and the House must understand it.

Furthermore, in the rural communities where traditional authority is most deeply felt, political partisanship by chiefs creates conditions ripe for cohesion, intimidation and the prosecution of political minorities. The villagers who are most dependent on the goodwill of traditional structures for access to land and communal resources would be rendered most vulnerable. The Committee must reject and correct this clause and the House should affirm that rejection with a resounding vote to say no.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to a matter of physical logic and institutional coherence, specifically the proposal to establish yet another Constitutional Commission, the Zimbabwe Delimitation Commission. The Committee, in recommending the abdication of Clauses 11, 12 and 13, has accepted the argument that a specialised boundary drawing board is necessary. Mr. Speaker, I reject that reasoning.

We are a nation that struggles to fund the Constitutional Commissions it already possesses. The Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission, the Zimbabwe Anti-Corruption Commission, the Zimbabwe Gender Commission, institutions established under Section 12 of the Constitution which promise adequate resources, all operate in a state of chronic underfunding. The Committee itself, in Clauses 18 and 19, heard the testimony from the Zimbabwe Gender Commission, which operates on a mere 0.02% to 0.04% of the national budget.

That is the physical reality in which we live. Yet, Mr. Speaker Sir, the proponents of this Bill ask this nation to create another commission with its own secretariat, commissioner, deputy

commissioners, office infrastructure, operational budget, staff establishment and its own procurement requirements to perform the function of Section 161 of the Constitution which is already invested in ZEC and which ZEC has institutional competence and existing capacity to perform. If the concern is that ZEC delimitation exercises have been imperfect, the answer is to reform, resourced and enhancing accountability, not the proliferation of constitutional bodies. Every new commission is a new line item on the national budget. Every new commission is a new bureaucracy. Every new commission creates new patronage.

Mr. Speaker Sir, a nation that cannot properly fund the commissions should not create commissions it does not need. Additionally, the Committee has corrected not necessarily what it described as meticulous coordination between ZEC and the proposed delimitation commission. It puts into this House, if the two bodies must coordinate so closely, what precisely is the utility of their separation? You have taken one institution, split it into two, doubled the administrative costs and called it efficient. This is institutional manipulation masquerading as reform.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed transfer of voter registration and maintenance of the voters' roll from ZEC to the Registrar-General represents one of the most constitutionally alarming provisions in this Bill. The House must not have a short memory. The very reason voter registration was removed from the Registrar-General and placed in ZEC was institutional credibility. The voters' roll under the Registrar-General was to use the most restrained available language; the subject, profound public concern regarding manipulation, partisan management and executive interference.

ZEC was established under Section 238 of the Constitution as an independent constitutional Commission precisely to insulate the electoral process from the executive. The Shona have a saying *tavakukanganwa chazuro nehope*.

Section 235 (1) (b) of the Constitution mandates that independent commissions must be independent and must not be subject to the direct control of anyone. The Registrar General is a Government department is headed by a public servant who answers to the Minister and to the President. There is no constitutional independence whatsoever. To invest the voters' roll, the very

instrument of electoral participation in such a body is to subordinate the right to vote to executive discretion, *tatokanganwa vaMudede*.

Furthermore, it has on record opposed this transfer. ZEC has invested substantially in biometric voter registration systems and a poll-based voting architecture introduced in 2018. They are not rival investments; they represent the national infrastructure of electoral integrity. To dismantle and transfer the infrastructure to a body with no equivalent technical capacity, no equivalent constitutional independence and no equivalent track record in biometric electoral management is to trade institutional advancement for institutional regression. This is not efficiency. This is Executive capture addressed in administrative language.

The argument that the model reduces electoral violence in the admission of institutional failure is not a constitutional solution. If our Presidential elections are violent, the answer is to elect a reform-strengthened law enforcement in the prosecution of perpetrators of electoral violence. The answer is not to remove the vote from the citizen altogether. You do not cure electoral violence by abolishing elections.

Mr. Speaker, Clauses 4 and 9 tend to propose the extension of the electoral cycle from five to seven years with explicit application to the incumbent holder of the office of the President and Members of Parliament. On this point, the Constitution speaks with unmistakable clarity. Section 328 (7) provides in express terms, that any amendment to a provision of the Constitution that extends the term of office of the President shall not apply to the person who holds the office at the moment the amendment is done. – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] -That provision is not ambiguous. It admits no judicial interpretation that would permit its circumvention. It was placed in the Constitution as a deliberate safeguard against precisely the kind of term manipulation that has disfigured so many African constitutions.

Section 328 (7) is not a preference. It is a prohibition of what we see being attempted in this august House. The Parliament can amend the Constitution but the Parliament cannot amend a constitutional provision by passing an amendment that violates the very terms of the provision. An amendment in breach of Section 328 (7) is not only politically questionable; it is constitutionally *void* and *ab initio*. A Parliament that purports to pass it and an Executive that purports to

benefit from it, are acting in defiance of the supreme law of the land. Whatever this House takes as desirable 7-year term as a matter of policy, I have strong reservations even on that score. The application of those terms to the incumbent President is constitutionally impermissible. The Committee has failed to address this with seriousness in its demands. The House must not repeat that failure and gain a vote emphatically no in this amendment.

The functions of the Defence Forces, Clause 16. Mr. Speaker Sir, I come now to what I regard as the most constitutionally dangerous provision in the entire Bill, Clause 16, which proposes the amendment of Section 212 of the Constitution governing the function of the Defence Forces. Section 212 of the current Constitution mandates that the Defence Forces of Zimbabwe exist to defend Zimbabwe, to protect its integrity, its territory and sovereignty and to uphold its Constitution. The Constitution's fidelity obligation of the Defence Forces is not incidental. It is fundamental. It is what distinguishes professional defence from a partisan instrument of political power.

The amendment proposes to limit and reconfigure the functions of the defence forces in ways that the proponents claim will reduce undue military influence in civilian governance. Mr. Speaker Sir, I put it to you and to this House, this amendment does not reduce military influence in governance. What it does, what should alarm every Member of this House regardless of political affiliation, is to strip the defence forces of their constitutional mandate to uphold the Constitution itself. Consider what that means in practice. The obligation to uphold the Constitution is the legal basis upon which the defence forces may, in extreme cases, resist unconstitutional conduct, including unconstitutional conduct by the Executive itself. It is the provision of the anchors of the military that the constitutional rather than purely political framework, removes the obligation and you have a defence force whose loyalty must run not to the Constitution of Zimbabwe but to whosoever issues the command. This is dangerous. This is not a military theory, Mr. Speaker Sir. This is a matter of constitutional architecture. A defence force that is no longer constitutionally mandated to uphold the Constitution becomes, by

necessary implication, a force accountable only to its command hierarchy.

Command hierarchies are appointed by and answerable to the President. The consequence of this transformation of the constitutionally anchored military into an instrument of executive will. The minority submissions on this clause warned correctly that the amendment would dilute the military's fundamental commitment to uphold and protect the supreme law of the land. Mr. Speaker Sir, dilute is too general a term. The removal of constitutional fidelity obligation does not dilute the commitment it extinguishes. It converts the constitutional duty into a discretionary act. Furthermore, the argument that the amendment is necessary to prevent military interference in civilian Government is constitutionally secular. The existing constitutional framework already delegates the powers of law and defence forces. The principle of civilian supremacy over the military is already embedded in our constitutional order. If there are instances of improper military conduct in civilian affairs...

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, order Hon. Member, you are left with two minutes.

HON. MUWODZERI: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think in two minutes, I will be done. Furthermore, the truth amendment of this is necessary to prevent military interference if civilian Government is constitutionally secular. The existing constitutional framework already delegates the proper role of the defence forces. The principle of civilian supremacy over the military is already embedded in our constitutional order. If there are instances of improper military conduct in civilian affairs, those instances are governed by existing law, by the principles of the civilian oversight and accountability mechanisms of Parliament itself. They are not cured by removing the constitutional foundation of military loyalty to the supreme law.

I say to this House with the utmost gravity, a Government that disempowers its own military from the constitutional obligation to defend the Constitution is a Government that has something to fear from a constitutionally faithful military. As well, a Government that fears a constitutionally fearful military is a Government that intends to act unconstitutionally. This House will reject Clause 16 in its totality.

Presidential appointment of judges, Clause 15. Mr. Speaker Sir, Clause 15 proposes to invest the appointment of judges in the President to be exercised in consultation with the Judicial Services Commission (JSC). The word 'consultation' in constitutional law carries a specific and well-understood meaning. It does not mean concurrence, it does not mean approval, it does not mean the President must hear the views of the JSC, he is entirely free to disregard them. This is not a safeguard; it is an appearance of safeguard without the substance of one...

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order Hon. Member, unfortunately your time is up.

HON. MUSHORIWA: Mr. Speaker Sir, I move that the Hon. Member's time be extended. –[HON. CHIDUWA: *I object.*] –

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, Hon. Members. You moved for the extension.

HON. MUSHORIWA: I moved for the extension of only five minutes Mr. Speaker Sir - [HON. MEMBER: *I Object.*] –

HON. KAPOIKILU: I second.

HON. CHIDUWA: I object. - [HON. MEMBER: *I Object.*] -

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, order! Hon.

Members, we have ways of dealing with these things. If somebody proposes an extension, allow the Speaker also to look for the objections, if they are there. There is an objection, Hon. Muwoderi, you cannot continue.

HON. CHIDUWA: Thank you Mr. Speaker Sir for giving me this opportunity to add my voice to the debate on the Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3. I would want to start by addressing those who fear change. Hon. Speaker, I rise with unshakable conviction to affirm a simple but vital truth. No Constitution is immune to change. A Constitution is not a sacred relic that is frozen in time. It is a living instrument created by human beings to serve the needs of society. When it fails to adapt to changing national realities, it risks becoming a barrier to progress rather than a shield of justice.

That is precisely why Constitutional Amendment No.3 is not merely desirable but it is necessary. Honorable Speaker, the 2013 Constitution itself proves this point. It was not born as a perfect and final document but as a negotiated compromise during the Government of National Unity, shaped by concessions between

ZANU-PF, the MDC and other political actors. It reflected the demands of that moment, not the permanent and settled destiny of our Republic and because that Constitution emerged from compromise, it inevitably carried provisions that were transitional, incomplete or designed more to preserve political peace than to secure long-term national efficiency and development. Zimbabwe has since moved forward and our constitutional framework must move forward with it.

Amendment No. 3 is a mature recognition that the nation now requires stronger governance, greater judicial efficiency and constitutional arrangements that speak directly to present challenges and future aspirations. Hon. Speaker, successful democracies teach us that strong constitutions are not those that never change but those that adapt wisely to national needs. Germany's Basic Law, one of the most respected constitutions in the world, has been amended more than 60 times, while India's Constitution has been amended over 100 times to respond to development, justice and governance challenges.

Zimbabwe must learn from these examples. Constitutional amendment is not a dangerous departure. It is a responsible step towards a more practical, responsive and forward-looking

constitutional order. I might want to give you specific examples of respected democracies that have amended their constitutions. The United States' Constitution is 236 years old and has been amended 27 times, which is an average of one amendment in nine years.

Germany's Constitution is 74 years. It has been amended 63 times, which is an average of an amendment per year, yet it is a European leader.

India's Constitution is 73 years old. It has been amended 105 times, which is an average of an amendment in every eight months yet it is the rising superpower. France's Constitution is 65 years old and it has been amended 24 times, which is an average of an amendment every three years. France is a country with a huge global influence. South Africa's Constitution is 27 years old and it has been amended 17 times and I decided to round up the average, which is an average amendment of two years, yet it is our continental leader.

Hon. Speaker, from this presentation, the strongest democracies embrace constitutional evolution and the weakest democracies that we are being told we should not change our Constitution have got rigid, unchangeable constitutions that snap under pressure. The power to

amend a constitution is not a loophole for abuse. It is the clearest expression of popular sovereignty exercised through elected representatives.

Let us therefore, choose evolution over stagnation, progress over paralysis, and national advancement over attachment to compromise arrangements of the past. For these reasons, Hon. Speaker, barring one proposal that I will explain later, I strongly support Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3 as a necessary step towards a more effective, modern and development-oriented Zimbabwe.

So, Hon. Speaker, let me pick a few proposed amendments. The first one is the increase of the duration of the term or the length of the electoral cycle from five to seven years. I support the amendment of increasing the term of office from five to seven years. Hon. Speaker, a nation that is serious about development must give its leadership enough time to plan, implement and deliver meaningful results. The issue before this House is not merely political. It is fundamentally about development time. In practice, five years is often too short.

A Government loses valuable time in transition, policy formulation, institutional adjustment and early implementation. Just

when programmes begin to take root, attention then shifts again to the next election. The cycle weakens continuity and encourages short-term politics instead of long-term national progress. A seven year term gives Zimbabwe a better opportunity to move beyond promises and to focus on delivery, stability and measurable outcomes. Hon. Speaker, development is not a sprint.

Development is a long and demanding journey. Roads, hospitals, schools, power generation, agricultural reform, industrial recovery, rural industrialisation, mineral beneficiation that we are talking about and improving living standards cannot be fully achieved within a rushed political cycle. These require consistency, discipline and sustained leadership. This amendment must therefore, not be misunderstood as an extension for its own sake. It is an extension for national work, for national progress and for national results.

The people of Zimbabwe are not asking for endless campaigns. They are asking for jobs, infrastructure, functioning public services and a government with enough time to complete what it begins. For these reasons, Hon. Speaker, I strongly support this amendment as a

practical and forward-looking reform that can give our nation the stability and time it needs to build lasting development.

Hon. Speaker, let me transition to the clause dealing with the President being elected by Parliament. I want to state from the onset, that I strongly support the amendment that provides for the President to be elected by Parliament.

This voting model promotes stability, accountability and mature democratic governance. Just to bring light on this one, democracy is not measured only by a national contest. Democracy is measured by whether the system produces legitimate leadership, strong institutions and effective governance. The people elect Members of Parliament to represent their will, make laws, approve budgets and hold the Executive to account.

If Parliament carries the people's mandate in all these critical matters, then it also has the democratic legitimacy to elect the President on behalf of the nation. This is not a denial of democracy; it is representative democracy in action. Hon. Speaker Sir, direct presidential elections often deepen polarisation, personalise power and turn national leadership into a contest of slogans rather than

substance. A parliamentary election of the President encourages consensus, cooperation and responsibility among elected representatives. It is also a model that is used in respected democracies in the region such as South Africa and Botswana.

In India, the President is elected indirectly by an electoral college made up of elected Members of Parliament and State legislatures. They use proportional representation and the single transferable vote. In the United States, the people do not vote directly for the President. The decisive choice is made through the electoral college, which means the public vote is filtered through a constitutional intermediary rather than a direct presidential vote.

In Ireland and Sri Lanka, the Head of State is also chosen through indirect and parliamentary-style mechanisms rather than a direct nationwide presidential race. For Zimbabwe, this amendment offers a more stable, practical and institutionally sound path to national leadership and for this reason, I fully support the amendment.

I transition to the Gender Commission. Hon. Speaker, I listened to the presentation and submission that was given by Hon. Z. Ziyambi and the reasons that he proffered for subsuming the Gender

Commission in the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission. I would want to go along with the submission by Hon. P. Zhou. I strongly support the retention of a separate Gender Commission and the non-inclusion of gender affairs within the Human Rights Commission.

Gender equality is too important to be diluted inside a broader institution. A standalone Gender Commission gives focused attention to women's rights, gender-based violence, discrimination and equality monitoring. These are serious and persistent challenges that require specialised expertise, clear visibility and dedicated accountability. If we merge gender functions into a general human rights body, we risk reducing urgency and weakening the institutional focus needed to confront these issues effectively.

Hon. Speaker, a separate Gender Commission is easier for citizens to identify, approach and for Parliament to hold accountable for results. Gender-related violations are often under-reported, normalised or ignored and that is exactly why a dedicated institution is necessary. If we are truly committed to protecting women and advancing equality, then we must strengthen and not weaken the machinery designed for that purpose. For these reasons, Hon.

Speaker, I strongly support the retention of an Independent Gender Commission.

Allow me to transition to the registration of voters being done by the Registrar-General. Hon. Speaker, from the onset, I want to state that I fully support the proposed amendment transferring the responsibility of voter registration and the management of the voters' role from ZEC to the Registrar-General. A credible election begins with a credible register. The voters' roll is not just an election roll. It is a vital national record that depends on accurate identification, proper record-keeping and constant updating as citizens are born, relocate or pass away. These are functions that naturally fall within the administrative expertise of the Registrar-General whose office is built to manage civil records with continuity and efficiency. By placing voter registration where the core population data is already maintained, this amendment can reduce duplication, improve verification, speed up updates and strengthen the accuracy of the roll.

Hon. Speaker, this reform is not about weakening elections. It is about improving the administration foundation on which electoral credibility rests. For these reasons, I fully support this amendment as

a practical, logical and necessary step towards an efficient and reliable electoral system in Zimbabwe.

Let me transition to the Zimbabwe Electoral Delimitation Commission. Hon. Speaker, the drawing of electoral boundaries is not a mere technical exercise but a cornerstone of democracy itself. Fair boundaries are essential for fair representation, political legitimacy and public confidence in the electoral process. If constituency lines are drawn unjustly, the will of the people can be distorted before a single ballot is cast. A nation that values democracy must ensure that every vote carries equal weight and that constituents reflect population realities, geography and community identity. That is why delimitation must never be treated as an afterthought or as a side function buried within an overburdened institution.

It requires a dedicated body with a clear mandate, technical competence, transparency and unquestionable integrity. Establishing a specialised commission would ensure that this critical function is handled with the seriousness it deserves and, in doing so, it would strengthen the foundation of representative democracy.

As I conclude Hon. Speaker, history will judge us not by whether we kept our Constitution unchanged but by whether we had the wisdom to make it serve our people effectively. I would therefore urge the House to support the motion on the basis that CAB No. 3 is about continuity. It is about efficiency, stability and long-term national planning. Zimbabwe's people deserve a governance system that is focused, cost-conscious and capable of delivering sustained development. I thank you and submit Hon. Speaker.

+HON. MACHANGU: Good afternoon, Hon. Speaker. I stood up to support, as I contribute to CAB No. 3, the Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3 of 2026. I will start by saying that we heard the narration of the Bill that was done by the Hon. Leader of Government Business about CAB No. 3, which the Hon. Minister aspires to.

I also listened to the report which was presented by the Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee. I noted that during public consultations, there were a lot of people who participated in this exercise. Indeed, we are here to deliberate but the consensus is already there from the public consultations. Let me also say that for

those who participated in this exercise of public consultation, there were 540 000 who wrote to Parliament expressing their views.

Parliament teams gathered that the majority of the people were supporting CAB No. 3. The issue is that figures do not lie, which means that the majority of our people support Constitutional Amendment No. 3.

Indeed, some can question why there is a need to change the Constitution. Some would say that in other countries, this is done annually. However, in Zimbabwe, sometimes we take quite some time before reviewing the Constitution. Let me add by saying that a Constitution is people-driven and it must not be a Constitution that is against the people but it must be for the people, by the people because we are the ones who write the Constitution. We cannot say it is cast in stone; it cannot be changed. Yes, it can be changed because it is ours.

Hon. Speaker, let me start by saying that I support standing and representing the people of Lupane and Matabeleland North. I concur that indeed, it must be amended accordingly. I want to add by saying the term of the President should increase from five to seven years. Even for Parliament, the same should be obtained.

Let me go to the Bible; the number seven is sacred. Even when the people of Israel, the Israelites were sent to attack the walls of Jericho, they were instructed to circle the walls of Jericho seven times and they did that. As we deliberate on this issue, I believe that seven is quite an appropriate number of years because it is going to give us ample time to expedite our duties with due diligence. This will speak to the crafting of the plans and the implementation.

In Matabeleland, we are building the Gwayi-Shangani Dam, which is a long-term project that cannot be done in five years. Probably, it can extend from 10 to 13 years or so. I believe that given enough time to complete such projects would be quite critical. It would be quite important because this would be good for the development of Zimbabwe.

As we approach different projects, it becomes easy for us to complete the projects. Those who have started from the conception of the project idea will be able to complete such projects in seven years. From the Chairperson's presentation, he said that if we put our own restrictions, at times we failed to realise our aspirations because of limiting ourselves.

I believe that seven years is ample time for the President to complete his projects and it is quite common that people have elections every five years. This is a common situation where you find that after five years there is violence, unfulfilled promises, unfulfilled projects and there are squabbles. Let me say, let us embrace seven years so that people can work and complete different projects. This will eliminate electoral violence and electoral volatility which comes from the short five-year term. This is going to culminate in a situation where people will be building schools, bridges and other projects that have been affected in the past by short electoral periods.

When looking at this, I believe that if elections are held every seven years, the Minister of Finance, Economic Development and Investment Promotion would have enough time to pull resources that could be used in developing Zimbabwe. The President normally says no place will be left behind but the five-year term was limiting us to focus more on elections. Sometimes we would have three years of action and two years of campaigning.

I believe that the additional two years would ring-fence development and five years would be meant for different projects.

The President's vision, Vision 2030, is good and quite brilliant. We need to support Vision 2030 so that we reach that brilliant vision.

I want to look at Clause 3, which speaks to the election of the President by Parliament. This is a good clause because Parliamentarians are representatives of different constituencies. As I stand here, I represent Lupane East and I am speaking on behalf of the people of Lupane East because they agree with this point. In the same vein, I believe that it is good that Members of Parliament be responsible for electing a President because they are also empowered with impeachment powers.

We have never seen a situation where there is an impeachment. Parliamentarians are going back to the villages or to the constituencies to say that we want to do this but we have seen that Parliament is responsible for impeachment and election of a President. What this means is that the voice of Hon. Members of Parliament is the voice of the people. This is not unique to Zimbabwe...

HON. MUTSEYAMI: On a point of order!

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER (HON. J. TSHUMA):

Order! Hon. Machangu. What is your point of order?

HON. MUTSEYAMI: Hon. Speaker, I am really worried about time management. I remember the last Parliament was so transparent because there was a lighting system. You could see red, green, amber. You could tell that your time is running out and for now, basically I am not sure how you are managing your time. I think it is very important to do fairness in terms of time management.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Timekeeping is done by the Clerks here. - [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*]- I am talking and you can not be talking like that. Hon. Hlatywayo, we only do that when we are in beer gardens but here we cannot. Timekeeping is done by the Clerk's desk and if you have noticed from the past two Hon. Members that were speaking, you would notice one of the clerks coming up here to show me that the time left is so many minutes. So, it is very transparent. I am not even keeping time myself at the Chair. It is being kept right there by the Clerk's desk. So, it is very transparent and it is very prudent.

HON. MUSHORIWA: On a point of clarification.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: What do you want to clarify?

HON. MUSHORIWA: Mr. Speaker, Hon. Mutseyami mentioned something, which is key. In the old ancient Parliament that we had, we had a light there. We are in a modern Parliament. Do we not have that system in place? It would be amiss to say that we do not have that system in this Parliament.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Thank you very much Hon. Mushoriwa. It is well noted. I think with seven-year extensions, some of these things will be fulfilled.

HON. MOLOKELA-TSIYE: On a point of order!

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, Order! Hon. Molokela, please take your seats.

HON. MOLOKELA-TSIYE: I have a point of order.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Hon. Molokela earlier on, you were the one who shouted to say you want an extension of 50 years. I heard you. So, I do not know why you are standing on a point of order.

HON. MOLOKELA-TSIYE: On a point of order, Hon. Speaker. It is my right to have a point of order. Every Hon. Member of Parliament has a right to have a point of order.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, Hon. Molokela. You want to make a point of order on my ruling or what?

HON. MOLOKELA-TSIYE: No, no. I want to do a point of order. Are you stopping me from making a point of order?

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

HON. MOLOKELA-TSIYE: My point of order is that the principle of neutrality is a fundamental principle for any chairperson of the presiding office. You cannot as an Hon. Speaker, talk about a seven-year extension on the same Bill that you are debating. It is unacceptable, Hon. Speaker. It is not acceptable. You have to withdraw. You cannot talk about a seven-year extension when you are the Chair. What kind of neutrality is that? We are still debating. You have to withdraw.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Are you done? Thank you. You may take your seat. Hon. Machangu, please continue.

+HON. MACHANGU: Thank you very much Hon. Speaker, for protecting me. I was saying that this is not unique to Zimbabwe. It is not novel that the President is elected by Members of Parliament. We have countries like South Africa, Mauritius and Botswana, which have the same system. In the same vein, I want to say that we copy from the best because they will guide us on how to do this. Let me add on by saying that we quote a certain scholar who spoke in 2020, Professor Lovemore Madhuku when speaking to the Zimbabwe Hills Trust, he said that Parliament can be an electoral college because Parliament is made up of representatives of different constituencies. So that is why we concur with this postulation.

Let me also say that the registration of voters should go back to the Registrar General's office. When we were growing up, we knew that voter registration was done by the Registrar General's office. It was the Registrar General's office's responsibility because it has the expertise; this is the office, which has all the key documents. It also issues the birth certificate, national identity card and upon the unfortunate demise of a person, it issues the death certificate. So, it is easy for the Registrar General's office to...

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order! Hon. Member, you are left with only three minutes to finish your debate.

+HON. MACHANGU: The Registrar General's office should be responsible for voter registration because it becomes easy for them to capture all the data because at 18, they can communicate with a citizen. That citizen is now of age and that citizen can participate in elections and upon death, when issuing a death certificate, it can then remove those who have passed on from the voter's role.

Let me also go to the issue of participation of chiefs. I believe that chiefs should be active and they should say where they stand because chiefs are politicians. They hold a political office because they also participate in elections. They vote. I agree with that. The Delimitation Commission should be in place so that they look at the delimitation exercise in different constituencies, where you would find that sometimes people might be under different headmen. At times, they are in other wards; you find that they are in the voter's roll whilst they fall under a particular ward. So, I believe that the delimitation exercise should clearly set out boundaries.

The other issue that I support is that Vice Presidents should be clear where they stand because in the past, it was as if they were ranks in terms of Vice Presidents.

I want to say thank you very much Hon. Speaker, for giving me this opportunity. I believe that most of these developments are going to bring development in the country and I believe that investors who come to invest in Zimbabwe would have enough time to participate in developmental programmes in the country. I thank you.

HON. NGWENYA: Point of order Mr. Speaker. I am just worried about the composition of this Parliament, the sharing. We are actually three to one, so I believe that ratio should be used for a fair time to debate for everyone because with the two to one, I do not think it is a proper ratio – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] -

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order! I think that issues that you are bringing are only good enough if it is brought to your Chief Whip and it becomes administrative.

HON. ENG. MHANGWA: On a point of privilege, we can bring this House to disrepute for not being able to calculate Maths

correctly. If we allow it to be referred, two out of three means two thirds is yours, one third is ours, so you get two shares and we get one share. It cannot be anything else.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: It is not a matter of debate; I think we have passed that one.

HON. MGUNI: I rise on this Bill because I am sent by the women of Bulawayo that I represent. The women of Bulawayo are saying sometimes a change is inevitable but on that note, they are wondering whether this Bill will bring them more suffering or it shall bring them peace.

I want to say something about myself before I continue. I have worked before I came to Parliament as a nurse and a midwife. Before I came to Parliament, I sat at the bedside of these women in Bulawayo who had been through things that no constitutional document fully captures, like violence, dispossession and silence. For that reason, women of Bulawayo need visibility. They need a door where they can find someone to help them.

My concern is the gender mandate; this Bill removes the Zimbabwe Gender Commission from the Constitution. The rationale

offered is institutional rationalisation. The functions can be absorbed into the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission and the founding commitments to equality and non-discrimination survive untouched. I accept some of those points but the right remains on paper only. My dispute with what happens between paper and the women, for example, in Cowdray Park in Pumula, in Nkulumane and Nketa do not...— [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] -

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order Hon. Members!

Please, can you lower your whispering voices. They are becoming too high and drowning the current Member who is on the floor. Let us keep our voices down.

HON. MGUNI: My dispute is with what happens between the paper and the women in Cowdray Park, in Nkulumane and Nketa for example. It does not begin with the engagement with the state for a constitutional diagram. It begins from a lived problem. The transferred mandates will not merely be the same independent and it does not guarantee that it will protect every woman in Bulawayo. What is not coherent on paper is how this mandate will be protected from the thing that quietly kills constitutional commitments.

Here is what the Bill does not do. It does not create a dedicated Gender Commissioner. It does not ring-fence a budget line for the gender mandates. It does not require specialist investigators trained in gender-based discrimination. It does not mandate a provincial agenda so that a woman in Nkayi, Binga or Tsholotsho can reach the institution without travelling to Harare or Bulawayo. It does not establish a reporting line to Parliament specific to the gender mandate. In my experience as a nurse, I have watched what happens when a responsibility is assigned without the architect to carry. What is told, it now covers maternity as well as pediatrics. No additional beds, no additional staff and no additional drugs. The women's organisations that appeared before Parliament were not theorists. They were people who have tried to use these institutions. The Masvingo Women Rights Advocacy Group said plainly that these proposals would strip the Commission of its independence, its expertise and its dedicated funding.

My second concern to the Minister: he wrote about something important. The 2013 Constitution did not establish the National Peace and Reconciliation Commission as a permanent institution. The

Constitution gave it a 10-year life and the architects knew it was transitional. The Bill does not invent that expiry, but it reflects it on that reading. The Minister is on solid ground knowing that the institution was temporary does not tell us whether the work it was created to do is finished. That is a different question and I ask that this Hon. House should not allow the first to swallow the second. The Constitution's founding commitment to national unity, peace and reconciliation which this Bill leaves untouched, is not a ten-year obligation. It does not expire with the Commission. So, what this Bill truly puts before this House is not a technical question about constitutional lifespan. It is a political and moral question. When the institution ends, where does the duty go?

The Bill removes the Peace and Reconciliation Commission from the Constitution and as it stands, it does not say what comes next. The Zimbabwe Catholic Bishops Conference and the Zimbabwe Council of Churches have both raised this in their submissions and I associate myself with them.

Let me speak to what this means away from the constitutional text. I have sat in rooms in Matebeleland with families still carrying

questions that no official process has answered. I know that the record shows the Commission was operationalised in 2018. It held limited hearings. It produced no binding recommendations on *Gukurahundi* and no reparation framework. I do not dispute that record but I draw the opposite conclusion from it. I am also conscious of the order granted by Justice Mafusire in 2019, which held that the Commission should run for 10 years to the 5th of January 2028. That order was later contested and set aside on appeal, and I do not rest my case on it. Before the House passes this Bill...

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, Hon. Mguni.

HON. MAKUMIRE: Mr. Speaker, can the Hon. Member be heard in total silence? Can you please protect the Hon. Member? Please ensure that those on your right-hand side observe the silence that is required in this House. Thank you.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Hon. Makumire, I see you have a desire for this chair but you cannot macro-manage the Chair. I spoke to that earlier on. Order, we are not answering each other here. I want to teach you one fundamental advantage of this Chair. It is that I speak and you keep quiet, and when you speak, I keep quiet. We do

not sing. Hon. Members, please let us have Hon. Mguni heard in silence. You may continue.

HON. MGUNI: Thank you Mr. Speaker Sir. My position is that I do not completely oppose the Bill because the Commission must exist forever. It was not designed to. I question it because constitutional expiry and national abandonment are not the same thing. This Bill, as drafted, does not draw that distinctly enough for the people of Matabeleland to trust it.

I will conclude by saying, before this House passes this Bill, the women of Bulawayo agree that change is sometimes inevitable but it is always best to raise your concerns. I ask the Minister one question on behalf of families like Tsholotsho, Lupane, Nkayi and Binga who have waited for years for an answer. When the Peace and Reconciliation Commission is removed from the Constitution, what exact successor mechanism will the Government establish? With that mandate, on what timeline, with what budget, what provincial presence and with what specific authority...

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, Hon. Mguni. You have 1 minute and 30 seconds to finish. You may continue for 1 minute and 30 seconds. Are you done?

HON. MGUNI: I was almost done. It was just one last sentence.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Okay, go ahead.

HON. MGUNI: I was saying with what mandate, on what timeline, with what budget, with what provincial presence and with what specific authority to address *Gukurahundi*, so that the end of this Commission does not become the end of the State's commitment to the people that it was created for. Thank you.

HON. HAMAUSWA: Point of privilege Mr. Speaker.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Yes, what is your point?

HON. HAMAUSWA: Thank you for giving me this opportunity. I am very worried about the list that you are reading, the list that contains debaters. I am personally suspecting that our Chief Whips are being bullied to the extent that when they submit the list, it is being rearranged. We had many occasions and I know they are reasonable enough; they are good people who cannot rearrange the

names that would have been submitted to them. I was thinking we revert to a situation where we submit two lists. One list from that side and the list that is submitted by our Chief Whip will stand alone. I stand guided Mr. Speaker Sir, so that we maintain the integrity of this House.

HON. KAPOIKILU: I second.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Hon. Hamauswa, when the Speaker was in this Chair earlier on today, I think in response to Hon. Gumbo's inquiries, he clearly stated that everybody in this House shall have a chance to debate, whether they are in this list or not. So, I do not think you have any worries at all. You are going to have your chance to air your voice on this matter. So it is a done deal. You do not need to worry about that.

HON. HAMAUSWA: It is a perpetual worry because it has been happening. I was suggesting that we separate the list as we are separated by our political parties. I am not ZANU-PF; they are not CCC. Let us have lists that reflect the composition of this House.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order Hon. Hamauswa. We are going to discuss that with the Chief Whip outside this House.

Secondly, the Chief Whip brings his list from your side and the Chief Whip brings his list from their side, and they simply combine them. We are not going to waste time on that. That is administrative. Let us carry on with our debates.

HON. PINDUKA: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker for giving me the opportunity to debate this very important Bill before us in this august House today. The Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3 [H.B.1, 2026] is a Bill that I can describe as pregnant with the multiple wishes of the people of Zimbabwe in their diversity, shortened as Constitutional Amendment Bill (CAB 3). The Bill is responding to the evolving wishes of the people of Zimbabwe who are peaceful, progressive, patriotic and ready to support the Bill towards the realisation of an upper-middle-income society by 2030 and beyond.

I rise not merely just to support the Bill, but to rally support and commend the consistency and continuity of policies being implemented by the able Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe. As a youthful MP, representing the aspirations of young people across the nation and in particular, representing the people of Guruve North

Constituency in Mashonaland Central Province, I am expressing the wishes of the people of Guruve North Constituency.

On my own behalf Mr. Speaker, as I debate to secure the prevailing consistency, continuity, stability, sovereignty and democratic maturity of our motherland, Zimbabwe, under the able leadership of His Excellency, President Dr. Emmerson Dambudzo Mnangagwa., let me be clear from the onset. Being a Member of Parliament who went out to listen to the views of the public during the public hearings conducted from the end of March to early April 2026, the views of the majority of Zimbabweans across all provinces reflected the overwhelming will of the voice of the people. The people have spoken and their message is clear that CAB 3 should be enacted into law with pride, and the onus rests upon us as Members of this august House.

Constitutions are not relics frozen in time. A constitution is not a cast-in-stone document; it is rather an instrument of governance, a rule book for running the affairs of the country and an instrument of legitimacy, giving authority and rights to the Government of the day and its institutions to make the laws, with the august House being

mandated to consult the public on their views about the Bill in question, which was done to the book. Hon. Zvobgo, Chairperson of the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, did justice by giving inspiring statistics that have over 540 000 consulted views. Out of 540 000 views, over 537 000 registered their consensus to support the Bill and applauded Parliament for the job well done – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] -

Hon. Speaker Sir, the Constitution must evolve as nations evolve. It must adapt to challenges and it must strengthen institutions where weaknesses have been exposed. We, as a nation, that is Zimbabwe, should not be trapped in the jaws of institutional *inertia*, a tendency of being stagnant and doing the same things the same way, even when change is needed or makes sense.

Mr. Speaker Sir, contemporary politics, contemporary democracies and contemporary diplomacies request that as a nation, we should not remain rooted in the past but refine the governance of the day to avoid institutional *inertia* as well as being left behind in terms of globalisation. We need to refine our systems and reform our institutions, policies and Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3 as a

vehicle for a timely task before us. I therefore humbly call every Hon. Member of this august House across the political divide, to support the Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3 is not an act of regression, it is an act of refinement and responsible governance. There are 22 effective clauses in the Bill. In my debate, Mr. Speaker Sir, I will focus only on the major refinements, reforms or clauses in this Bill, that is Clause 3 that speaks to the election of the President.

I will also speak to Clauses, 4, 9 and 10 combined, that speak to the terms of office, duration of Parliament and the timing of elections. I will also speak to Clauses 11, 12 and 13 combined, which speak to the establishment of the Zimbabwe Electoral Delimitation Commission. I will start with Clause 3, which speaks to the election of the President by Parliament.

Mr. Speaker Sir, across the continent and beyond, experience has shown that directly contested presidential elections, while democratic in form, often generate acute polarisation, zero-sum political psychology and social fragmentation. This normally refers to

societies emerging from liberation histories or concentrating political energy around personalities rather than programmes, encouraging adversarial mobilisation with risks, destabilising governance cohesion. Clause 3 proposes that the President be elected by Parliament, the collective body of representatives chosen by the people. That is the Parliament of Zimbabwe; therefore, it seeks to recalibrate the election selection away from polarisation, national plebiscite towards institutional consensus-building within the legislature. In this model, Mr. Speaker Sir, sovereignty remains rooted in the electorate but its expression is mediated through representative deliberation rather than direct personality-driven contestation, thereby moderating the destabilising effects often associated with the winner-takes-all presidential races.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the Parliamentary election of the Head of State and Government is neither novel nor undemocratic. It is a well-established constitutional mechanism within respected democratic systems. Over 36 countries in the Commonwealth consortium are already utilising this hybrid parliamentary election of the Head of State and Government.

Coming closer to home, in South Africa and Botswana, the President is elected by Parliament under the constitutional order shaped for decades by the African National Congress, in the case of South Africa. It is itself a liberation movement that transitioned into governance while preserving democratic legitimacy. South Africa's democracy has not collapsed under this arrangement. The Executive authority remains structurally accountable to the National Assembly, which possesses the constitutional power to elect, oversee and where necessary, remove the President. This demonstrates that parliamentary presidential selection can co-exist within constitutionalism.

Electoral competition and rights protection reinforce that democracy is defined not by the method of executive election alone but by the broader architecture of accountability and representation. Mr. Speaker Sir, when a President's tenure depends on continuing confidence of Parliament, the Executive is inherently bound to legislative scrutiny and national consensus. Policy direction must remain responsive to Parliamentary oversight, coalition dynamics and representative debate, ensuring that governance reflects institutional will rather than personal mandate.

This dependence strengthens checks and balances by embedding Executive legitimacy in an ongoing relationship with elected representatives rather than a single electoral event separated from subsequent legislative accountability. The Executive cannot ignore the legislature because its authority is constitutionally derived from it. Thus, accountability operates continuously rather than episodically. Such a system depends on democratic maturity by aligning Executive action with representative governance, reinforcing the principle that national authority is exercised through institutions rather than concentrated in individuals.

We must therefore resist the romanticisation of electoral models that elevate personalities into singular national symbols while weakening institutional depth. Systems centred on direct Presidential charisma can foster personality-coupled politics, destabilise certain norms and diminish the role of representative bodies. By contrast, electing the President through Parliament elevates institutions above individuals; normalises leadership transition within constitutional procedure and anchors political legitimacy in collective structures.

Mr. Speaker Sir, I will move to the term of office, duration in Parliament, as well as the timing of elections. Hon. Speaker, five years pass quickly like a short season. A shorter season may be characterised by hunger and food insecurity. A longer season is inclusive and accommodative of all varieties of crops. The same with longer terms of office, like the seven-year proposed term in Constitutional Amendment Bill Number 3. It is a longer season that characterises a bumper harvest. By the time policies are formulated, budgets are approved and projects initiated, the next election cycle begins. This toxicity associated with elections should be termed out. We cannot build dams, smart highways, establish economic zones and industrial corridors, or modern agricultural systems on a five-year political mandate. That is, it limits the opportunity for accelerated development. In support of the seven-year term, I want to submit my four-point plan, Mr. Speaker Sir.

Number one, it reduces our campaign hysteria. Extending the term length of office for the President, allowing Members of Parliament and local authorities mandates to seven years, would substantially temper the cycle of near-permanent campaigning that

often characterises shorter electoral intervals in the Republic of Zimbabwe. When elections recur frequently, political actors are incentivised to remain in mobilisation mode, amplifying rhetoric, polarising constituencies and prioritising electoral positioning over governance delivery. This perpetual campaign atmosphere heightens political temperature, strains administrative focus and diverts national discourse from development to contestation. A longer electoral horizon reduces the immediacy of political survival pressures, allowing representatives and leaders to govern rather than campaign, institutions to function without partisan turbulence and citizens to engage in national issues outside the charged length of imminent elections. In this way, the seven-year term moderates political volatility by structurally lowering the frequency and intensity of electoral mobilisation.

Point number two, it reduces national tension. Point number three, it promotes long-term cooperation and point number four, it encourages policy consistency, continuity and stability.

Mr. Speaker Sir, I will move on to Clauses 11, 12 and 13. The restructuring of electoral administration proposed in this

Constitutional Amendment Bill Number 3, is grounded not in the pursuit of control but in the pursuit of institutional clarity, efficiency and credibility. Electoral governance is a complex national function encompassing voter registration, boundary delimitation, election management and results administration. Each requires distinct technical expertise in a single procedural body. Risk of overload, duplication and operational capacity can arise, potentially weakening public confidence. By recalibrating institutional responsibilities through Constitutional Amendment Bill Number 3, Zimbabwe seeks to ensure that each electoral function is executed by a body structurally designed and resourced for that specific mandate. Such differentiation reflects a mature constitutional design. Institutions are not multiplied arbitrarily but aligned with a functional coherence so that electoral processes remain transparent, professional and publicly trusted.

Hon. Speaker, Zimbabwe's constitutional evolution must also be understood within the historical arc of liberation movements that transformed from forces of independence into custodians of State and nationhood. The nation was not born in negotiation chambers but

through sacrifice, solidarity and struggle. That legacy carries a responsibility to balance freedom with stability in governance design. Across the continent, countries like I have alluded to in the paragraphs above, constitutional systems over time need to be recalibrated to protect sovereignty, unity and national development while consolidating post-liberation State institutions...

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, order. You are left with four minutes.

HON. PINDUKA: Thank you Mr. Speaker Sir. The Constitutional Amendment Bill Number 3, is about stability over chaos, institutions over individuals, long-term development over short-term politics and efficiency over duplication. We must not allow emotions to derail structural reform. History will judge us on whether we chose stagnation or progress.

In conclusion, today in history, we choose progress. I therefore call upon Hon. Members of this august House to support the Constitutional Amendment, Bill Number 3, [H.B 12026], in the spirit of national and democratic evolution. Thank you so much for the opportunity to debate on this Bill. I so submit.

HON. DHANZI: Thank you for granting me this opportunity to add my voice in support of the report moved by Hon. Z. Ziyambi.

Firstly, allow me to express my appreciation to the Minister of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, Hon. Z. Ziyambi, for bringing before this House the Constitution of Zimbabwe, Amendment Number 3 Bill, 2026; a job well done. Mr. Speaker Sir, as a representative of the women of Masvingo Province, I rise to support this Bill, particularly the provisions relating to the election of the President by Parliament, the transfer of voter registration functions to the Registrar General, the extension of the electoral cycle from five to seven years and the expansion of the jurisdiction of the Constitutional Court. These reforms seek to strengthen governance, improve institutional efficiency and create a stable environment necessary for suitable national development.

Mr. Speaker Sir, I support the proposal that the President be elected by Members of Parliament sitting in a joint session because Parliament is composed of representatives elected by citizens from every constituency in the province of Zimbabwe. This ensures that the election of the President remains rooted in the democratic will of the

people through their elected representatives while promoting accountability, consensus building and collective responsibility in national leadership.

I also welcome the transfer of the voter registration, completion and maintenance of the voters' roll to the Registrar General who is already the custodian of national registration records and civil documentation.

Consolidating these responsibilities under one institution will improve efficiency, strengthen record management and enhance public confidence in the administration of the electoral process. The women of Masvingo Province whom I have the honour to represent in this House, have expressed strong support for the proposed extension of the electoral cycle from five to seven years. During my interactions with communities across the province, many citizens have indicated that development programmes require adequate time to mature and deliver meaningful results.

I have also taken note of the sentiments from several church leaders and congregants who view number seven as a symbol of compassion to women of Masvingo.

HON. DHANZI: Thank you for granting me this opportunity to add my voice in support of the report moved by Hon. Ziyambi. Firstly, allow me to express my appreciation to the Minister of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, Hon. Z. Ziyambi for bringing before this House, the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment Number 3 Bill 2026; a job well done.

Mr. Speaker Sir, as a representative of the women of Masvingo Province, I rise to support this Bill, particularly the provisions relating to the election of the President by Parliament, the transfer of voter registration functions to the Registrar General, the extension of the electoral cycle from five to seven years and the expansion of the jurisdiction of the constitutional court. These reforms seek to strengthen governance, improve institutional efficiency and create a stable environment necessary for suitable national development. Mr. Speaker Sir, I support the proposal that the President be elected by Members of Parliament sitting in a joint session because Parliament is composed of representatives elected by citizens from every constituency in the province of Zimbabwe.

This ensures that the election of the President remains rooted in the democratic will of the people through their elected representatives while promoting accountability, consensus building and collective responsibility in national leadership. I also welcome the transfer of the voter registration, completion and maintenance of the voter's roll to the Registrar General, who is already the custodian of national registration records and civil documentation. Consolidating these responsibilities under one institution will improve efficiency, strengthen record management and enhance public confidence in the administration of the electoral process.

The women of Masvingo province whom I have the honour to represent in this House, have expressed strong support for the proposed extension of the electoral cycle from five to seven years. During my interactions with communities across the province, many citizens have indicated that development programmes require adequate time to mature and deliver meaningful results. I have also taken note of the sentiments from several church leaders and congregants who view their number 7 as a symbol of completion, fulfilment and maturity.

These views are particularly significant in Masvingo, which is home to one of the country's largest faith communities under the leadership of Bishop N. Mutendi from the Zion Christian Church. Many community members believe that a 7-year cycle would allow government programmes, infrastructure projects and economic empowerment initiatives to be completed without the disruptions.

The women of Masvingo Province whom I have the honour to represent, believe that leadership must be judged not only by the promises it makes but by the projects it completes and the lives it transforms. Whether it is empowering women, improving agricultural productivity, strengthening healthcare systems, expanding access to education or redevelopment of critical infrastructure, meaningful transformation requires time, questions and commitment.

As I conclude, I am reminded of a profound statement from the President of the Republic of China, His Excellency Xi Jinping that says and I quote, "Every generation has its own long march and every generation must see that march throughout." Mr. Speaker Sir, our generation's march is the march towards Vision 2030, prosperity,

modernisation and improved livelihood. For all Zimbabweans, we have a duty to see that march throughout to its conclusion. It is for that reason I support this Bill and recommend it before this august House.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, Hon. Members, shall I remind you of the Standing Orders that we have. When a Member is on the floor, all other Members must be seated. Let us limit the movements so that we maintain the decorum of the House.

HON. MAKOMBE: Thank you very much Hon. Speaker for affording me the opportunity to hear my voice on this very important Bill. Mr. Speaker, change by nature is not something that is easily acceptable and always you find that there will be different views. The Bill before us has its own advantages and disadvantages. The people we represent expect us to come up with a true reflection of what they want; hence my contributions are from those that I represent in this House.

Hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, I understand that according to our rules in this House, we are not supposed to repeat some of the things that have been said by other Hon. Members. I, therefore, shall

concentrate on three issues. The first one, Mr. Speaker, is to do with voter registration. From what has been happening previously, ZEC has not been doing a good job when it comes to voter registration. In most cases, the process of registering voters was another way of rigging. Registration was being suppressed in areas where it was deemed to be a stronghold of the opposition. So, I think if we take the voter registration to the Registrar General's Office where registration would automatically take place as soon as someone turns 18 years and remove the deceased once it is registered in their offices, I want to believe that once a voter is registered at 18 years, it will be up to the voter maybe to change the constituency of work. So, I strongly support this proposal. Mr. Speaker.

I also want to touch on the issue of chiefs. Mr. Speaker, I come from a chieftainship set-up in my area and we enjoy a lot of respect from our subjects. Most of the time, whenever there are elections, as we all know that politics is a dirty game, we always want to try and bring each other down. I do not think this would be befitting our chiefs if they participate openly in partisan politics. Their office is a lifetime office; they cannot sell that lifetime office for a temporal one.

Let us leave our chiefs to do whatever they are doing. What I can only urge is for Government to uplift their welfare, not to get into politics.

Mr. Speaker, the other issue is about the Gender Commission. I want to believe most women have been happy to have this Commission in place because there are some successes that have been recorded when the Commission was in place, issues that deal with gender violence and the upliftment of women. These are some of the things that our women are proud of when they talk about the Gender Commission. In that regard, I want to strongly oppose the removal of the Gender Commission from its current setup. I want to believe that our women, even those that are in here in this House, would want the Gender Commission to remain as it is. Mr. Speaker Sir, I want to thank you for this opportunity.

HON. MUTANDI: Good evening Mr. Speaker Sir. I rise today to respectfully and firmly express my support for Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3, particularly the provisions contained in Clause 4 on the extension of the presidential term and Clause 11 on the establishment of the Zimbabwe Electoral Delimitation Commission. At the same time, I must register my concern regarding

Clause 18, which proposes the dissolution of the Zimbabwe Gender Commission and its absorption into the Human Rights Commission.

My position is grounded in constitutional order and national development. Contrary to some schools of thought, this amendment does not violate the Constitution of Zimbabwe. Section 91 clearly sets out the qualifications and limits of presidential tenure, and CAB 3 does not seek to add terms of office. Rather, it proposes to extend the duration of a single term by two years.

This distinction is critical: the intent of the Constitution to prevent indefinite rule remains intact, while the adjustment provides continuity in leadership and policy execution necessary for long-term national progress. Development is not an event, it is a process that requires stability, predictability and sustained leadership. Frequent elections disrupt this process. When the nation is in perpetual election mode, governance is distracted, society becomes divided along partisan lines and projects lose momentum.

Extending the presidential term creates a longer, stable window for Government and communities to work together toward common goals without recurring interruptions. It fosters unity and allows

development to transcend party politics. Moreover, elections are costly; they divert scarce resources from service delivery and infrastructure. Zimbabwe is recovering from the impact of illegal sanctions and every dollar must be channeled toward development. Frequent electoral cycles result in projects being abandoned midstream, wasting public funds and leaving citizens with unmet expectations. An extended term ensures value for money, accountability and completion of projects.

This proposal also strengthens the social contact between legislators and the people. Citizens vote for Members of Parliament with the expectation that it will deliver tangible results, which are roads, clinics, schools and other infrastructure. Term extensions allow the nation to consolidate the gains from NDS1 as we transition into NDS2 in pursuit of Vision 2030 towards an upper-middle-class society.

In my province of Manicaland, several projects are underway but remain unfinished. Extending the presidential term provides the continuity needed to complete these projects, ensuring that

communities benefit from investments already made. It is about honouring the trust placed in us by the electorate.

In addition, the Bill also addresses the issue of delimitation which is governed by Section 161 of the Constitution. Clause 2 seeks to improve this process by ensuring that delimitation is conducted in an orderly, credible and transparent manner by a specialised entity. Rushed or poorly executed delimitation creates boundary disputes, voter confusion and contested results.

Hon. Speaker Sir, a dedicated Electoral Delimitation Commission is vital for electoral integrity. When boundaries are clear and credible, public confidence in the electoral process grows. Citizens engage more fully, knowing their votes are secure and their representation is fair. Conversely, when people doubt the process, they disengage, weakening democracy. By supporting this clause, we protect the legitimacy of our elections and strengthen Parliament's ability to deliver on its mandates. A credible delimitation process ensures that legislatures can focus on development rather than disputes, fulfilling their social contracts with the people.

Last but not least, I must express my deep concern over Clause 18 of CAB 3 which proposes to absorb the Zimbabwe Gender Commission into the Human Rights Commission. While the intention may be to streamline institutions, this move risks undoing decades of hard-won progress in advancing gender equality. The Gender Commission was established as a specialised body precisely because gender issues require dedicated expertise, focus and visibility.

To dismantle it now would not only weaken our ability to demand accountability across ministries and agencies but also send a troubling signal that Zimbabwe is retreating from its commitments under international instruments such as CEDAW and the Beijing Platform for Action. These frameworks call for strong, high-level national machinery to champion women's rights, and our Commission has been that beacon. Its removal would erode confidence among citizens and partners alike, portraying Zimbabwe as backsliding on equality at a time when we should be consolidating gains.

As Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Women Affairs, Community, Small and Medium Enterprises Development, I cannot ignore the voices of women's organisations and members of the public

who have consistently emphasised the need for a stand-alone institution. Their fears are valid. Without a specialised monitoring body, both public and private institutions could more easily evade accountability for gender-based discrimination. The Commission has been the watchdog ensuring that gender mainstreaming is not just rhetoric but practice and its independence has given women across Zimbabwe a trusted avenue to seek redress.

To fold it into a broader human rights framework risks diluting its mandates and silencing those voices. I, therefore, respectfully urge this House to reconsider Clause 18 and to preserve the Zimbabwe Gender Commission as a distinct institution. In doing so, we affirm our commitment to protecting the dignity, rights and aspirations of women and girls and we safeguard Zimbabwe's reputation as a nation that honors its obligations and values equality as a cornerstone of its democracy.

CAB 3 is not about entrenching power. It is about entrenching development, unity and credibility. As legislators, we are bound by our social contract with the people. They entrust us with their votes, expecting completed projects, improved services and tangible

progress. CAB 3 provides the continuity and credibility needed to honor that contract. It consolidates the gains of NDS 1, prepares us for NDS 2 and moves us decisively toward Vision 2030.

I, therefore, commend CAB 3 to this House and urge all Hon. Members to support it. Let us choose continuity over disruption, completion over abandonment and unity over division. In doing so, we affirm our collective responsibility to deliver results, champion gender equality and equity while staying within democracy. I so submit.

HON. MUKOMBERI: Thank you Madam Speaker, for allowing me to speak and add my voice also on Constitutional Amendment Bill No. 3 (CAB3). The Constitution of Zimbabwe provides Section 328, which is very clear in stating that amendment of this Constitution is possible. On Subsection (1) of the same section, it is very clear; it defines a Constitutional Bill where it says, a Constitutional Bill is a Bill that seeks to amend this Constitution. In this, Hon. Speaker, CAB 3 is such a Constitutional Bill which seeks to amend the Constitution of Zimbabwe but following the procedure outlined under Section 328 of our Constitution. The same section

clearly highlights, under subsection (6), Hon. Speaker, on which items of the Constitution, if ever to be amended, shall require a referendum.

In subsection (6), it is quite explicit to say, where a Constitutional Bill seeks to amend the provision of Chapter 4, that is Declaration of Rights, Chapter 16, Agricultural Land, such a Bill should undergo a referendum. Also, this includes the attempt to amend Section 328 in terms of the text. It is that section which actually outlines how amendments are done. It is very clear that from the clauses contained in CAB 3 and the proposed amendments thereof, that no amendment is intended to alter Chapter 4, Chapter 16 as well as Section 328.

This Amendment Bill follows an amendment procedure which does not require a referendum at all. It was just a background to clear the claims of a referendum. Allow me also to dive into some specific clauses and proposed amendments contained in this Bill, which clearly unleash boldly transformational reforms that fortify constitutional governance, invigorate democratic institutions, sharpen institutional mandates and seamlessly align Zimbabwe with the proven best practices from the world's most progressive nations.

First and foremost, let me start with the proposed amendment of Section 92 as it is in Clause 2 of the Bill. The amendment seeks to shift the election of the President from direct popular vote to indirect parliamentary election, where the President is proposed to be elected by Members of Parliament in joint session by an absolute majority, being presided over by the Chief Justice in accordance with the Standing Orders.

The rationale of this amendment is very clear. It draws from Zimbabwe's pre-1987 parliamentary tradition and it really mirrors successful models in South Africa and Botswana, if you were to mention just a few in our region. It is consistent with the position and best practice in 34 out of 56 Commonwealth countries. To that end, allow me to play with the figures a bit and analyse to say 34 countries in the Commonwealth use the indirect election that we are proposing to also use. That is 6.7% of the Commonwealth countries where only 20 of such countries in the Commonwealth use direct election, that is 35.7%, which is a minority percentage compared to those that use the indirect election method and two of them use absolute; they are absolute monarchies, that is, without elections at all.

Hon. Speaker Ma'am, from this analysis, it is very clear and undeniable that indirect election of the Head of State through parliamentary processes is the settled norm across the Commonwealth, the very community that Zimbabwe is also striving to re-enter. This Commonwealth's proven norm and path is rooted in representative democracy, parliamentary accountability and indirect leadership selection and it proves to offer a more stable future in the national interest. It must be noted that this shift from direct election of the President to indirect parliamentary election preserves adult suffrage as enshrined in the Constitution Section 67.

Section 67 is one person, one vote and contains only the entitlement to vote, not necessarily the electoral system used. It must be understood as well that the shift is fully consistent with Section 88 (1) of the Constitution, which is very clear to say executive authority derives from the people of Zimbabwe and must be exercised in accordance with this Constitution. To this end, Executive authority will continue to derive from the people through their directly elected representatives as was practiced from 1980 to 1990.

It must be noted also that, from purely fair and reasonable grounds, if Section 97 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe actually gives Parliament power to impeach the President, why can we not in the same Constitution, amend to close the gap and give the same Parliament power to elect the same? This is evidence of a clear constitutional gap that existed in the Constitution of Zimbabwe that this Bill now proposes to close.

Allow me to also dive into another progressive amendment as proposed by Constitutional Amendment Bill Number 3; it is under Clause 3, which seeks to amend Section 95 to lengthen the Presidential election cycle from five to seven years. I think Madam Speaker, the misconception maybe lies on the word that is being used by people to say, to extend the length.

If we are to extend the length, it seems as if we are only extending the current term but we are talking about lengthening it and even applying it in the future. If we are extending even a building, we only extend it once but now when we are talking about lengthening, we are talking about something that is going to be used in the future, to say it is now from five to seven years.

The rationale of this proposal is that it is consistent with the Constitution as it does not alter the two-term limits as spelled out in section 91 (2). This addresses the damaging perpetual election mode that has caused political violence, endless electoral disputes, polarisation of society and massive economic losses during the campaigns. Therefore, by lengthening this period, we are saying we are now trying to address all those problems that we face.

Given our macroeconomic framework and objectives, this amendment comes at the right time to enable better policy implementation, infrastructure development and implementation of the National Development Strategy 2 to achieve Vision 2030 objectives as well as the future peace and development of the country.

This Bill, I mean in the current term, will align our politics with economics. Politics alone does not bring food on the table but economics is what brings food on the table. Hence, we mean to say, if we are guided in terms of economic development, we are guided by Vision 2030 macro-economic objectives and to achieve this upper middle income society, we should have a stable macro-economic environment but a stable macroeconomic environment is supported by

a stable political environment. However, having elections any time before 2030 will disrupt the smooth running of economic policies that will enable us to achieve Vision 2030 that we are to achieve.

Constitutionally, the amendment does not touch term limits but only term length, that is the election cycle, by adding two years to the five years, as section 95 rigidly states. In accordance with the provisions of section 91 (2), such five years can be adjusted either upwards or downwards as long as it falls within the minimum threshold of a term. According to this subsection, three years or more is deemed a term, which means part of this section does not give a ceiling to adjustment but three years is the minimum. What does that mean? This is likened to an analogy that I am going to give you, of a truck company. Let me give an example of a truck company owner who fixes the daily work of each driver to two trips per day but with a minimum mileage of three kilometers but without maximum kilometres. One driver may finish daily work by travelling two trips but of each trip of three kilometres, that driver will be said to have completed the two trips of the daily work but having travelled the total of six kilometers. The other driver may finish daily work by

seven kilometers of each trip, which will give 14 kilometers. Both drivers have travelled two trips but with different mileages. To this extent when we are - [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order! Hon. Members on my left, Hon. Makumire, may you allow Hon. Mukomberi to be heard in silence.

HON. MUKOMBERI: As I mentioned that this is an example that will make some people understand better, I am just calling some of my Hon. Members here that ... - [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order Hon. Makumire and Hon. Madzivanyika, may you allow Hon. Mukomberi to be heard in silence.

HON. CHIGUMBU: On a point of order.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

***HON. CHIGUMBU:** I request that Hon. Mukomberi speak as his statements are confusing us. He is not being clear in his debate and we would appreciate more clarity on his points.

HON. MUKOMBERI: Thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am.

What I am trying to do here is to help those who are confused to understand. However, if they do not wish to comprehend what I am saying, I cannot force them to do so.

HON. MAKUMIRE: Point of order!

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

HON. MAKUMIRE: Madam Speaker, there is no Honourable Member in this House who is confused. The Hon. Member must engage this debate with respect. His money amounting to USD100 was stolen.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Hon. Makumire, you are out of order. Hon. Mukomberi, you may proceed.

HON. MUKOMBERI: What I have been explaining is that extending the length of a single term to seven years in this case does not mean an additional term but simply increasing the mileage of a single term.

The third item that I want to touch on, that is linked to this one, is Clause 7 which is proposing to amend Section 143 of the Constitution that is trying to align Parliament's election cycle with the

new seven-year Presidential cycle to eliminate the structural cause of perpetual electioneering, the scourge of electoral disputes to enable sustainable governance, long-term infrastructure development as well as social progress. Clause 8 is also only supported - [HON.

MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, I am the Chair.

Order, you are not Chairpersons people from my left, I am the Chair.

HON. MUKOMBERI: I have been saying Clause 8 is also closely linked to this one to also extend the length of term of counsellors as guided by Section 158. Another progressive amendment that I also want to unequivocally support is under Clause 12, which seeks to transfer responsibility for voter registration and maintenance of the voter's roll to the Registrar General's office. This builds on the improved capacities of the Registrar General's office in the bio-data management and security as well as the successful innovation of small polling stations as specific roles that enhance electoral integrity and public confidence.

The proposal under Clause 9 is also very progressive as this established an independent Zimbabwe Electoral Delimitation

Commission in Chapter 7 to handle boundary delimitation impartially and transparently while freeing ZEC to focus on the organisation and conduct of elections to foster public trust in the country's electoral processes to eliminate the scourge of disputed elections and societal polarisation.

Madam Speaker Ma'am, given the foregone analysis, it is very clear that this Bill in question modernises and streamlines our constitutional architecture as a country while at the same time, faithfully upholding the enduring values enshrined in the 2013 Constitution. The Bill contains the amendments that mark a decisive leap in Zimbabwe's constitutional evolution, a confident strategic refinement of the governance structures that champion institutional efficiency, political inclusivity and unbreakable long-term national stability.

Let me conclude by saying CAB3 proudly positions Zimbabwe alongside Africa's most effective, resilient and widely respected constitutional standards, the models that have been proven to consistently deliver progress, harmony and lasting economic success. Madam Speaker Ma'am, with these submissions, I rest my case.

HON. MUREYANI: Thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am. Good afternoon. I rise to add my voice on the Constitutional Amendment Bill report that was tabled in this House by the Hon. Chairperson of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs after public hearings were conducted nationwide.

In relation to Clause 2 which speaks about voters' roll transfer. Returning the voters' roll and voter registration to the Civil Registration Department eliminates duplication. The Registrar General already holds our birth and death records. This ensures deceased individuals are decisively removed, freeing the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC) to focus solely on managing elections.

On Clause 3, Madam Speaker Ma'am, the amendment establishes a parliamentary method for selecting the President. Direct Presidential elections have historically bred political tension, violence and fiscal exhaustion. Electing the President, through Parliament, is a model successfully used by our neighbours in South Africa and Botswana... - [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER (HON. MAUNGANIDZE):

Order, order Hon. Members! Hon. Members on my left and Hon.

Members on my right! Order! May we have order in the House! Order Hon. Members! Hon. Gumbo! Order! May we have order in the House! I am going to count one up to three, whoever is standing is going to walk out of the House. Order Hon. Gumbo! May you put yourself to order. I am going to ask you to leave this House. May you allow Hon. Mureyani to be heard in silence. Everyone was debating and everyone has been given a chance to debate. You are going to get your own chance to air your views. May we have order in this House! Order! I want to see Hon. Mureyani only, she is the only one who is supposed to be standing... - [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] – May we have order!

Hon. Makumire, I never asked you to assist me. Hon. Madzivanyika, I did not ask you to assist me to Chair. I did not ask you to assist me in chairing. Hon. Members on my right, may you please take your seats! Hon. Members on my left...- [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] – Order, Order!

Some Hon. Members from the opposition started walking out of the Chamber.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: You may leave! Everyone who is standing, leave the House! Hon. Members on my left, everyone who is standing should leave the House! Hon. Mureyani, you may proceed.

HON. MUREYANI: Thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am. I will repeat myself due to the chaos that was in this House. – [HON.

MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] - On Clause 3, Madam Speaker Ma'am, the amendment establishes a parliamentary method for selecting the President. Direct Presidential Elections have historically bred political tension, violence and fiscal exhaustion – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] - Electing the President, Madam Speaker, through Parliament, is a model successfully used by our neighbours in South Africa and Botswana. It drastically reduces elections...

HON. MATAMBO: On a point of order Madam Speaker!

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, order, order! What is your point of order?

HON. MATAMBO: We cannot hear properly. There are still people who are standing there. You have made a ruling that if there is a person who is still standing, he should walk out of the room. So, I

see there are more than 10 people who are still standing on the other side of the House. Does your...

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: I have heard you. You may take your seat. Hon. Members on my right, may you allow the Hon. Member on the floor to be heard in silence. Hon. Mureyani, you may proceed.

HON. MUREYANI: Thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am. Electing the President, through Parliament is a model successfully used by our neighbours in South Africa and Botswana. It drastically reduces election costs and fosters harmony between the Executive and Legislature. – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] - If Parliament has the power to impeach, it only makes sense that it has the power to – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] – However, Madam Speaker Ma'am, the clause does not speak to the issue of strengthening accountability mechanisms. The President should be subject to mandatory times of accountability to Parliament.

Moving onto the seven-year term, Madam Speaker Ma'am, which is on Clauses 4, 9 and 10, five years is simply too short –

[HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] - Major developmental projects require stability.

HON. GUMBO: Point of order Madam Speaker!

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order Hon. Mureyani. What is your point of order Hon. Gumbo?

HON. GUMBO: Yes, her time is up! – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] – Her time is up. – [AN HON. MEMBER: *Can you add 30 Minutes more for her?*]

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, order Hon. Gumbo! We are not here to play games ... - [HON. GUMBO: *Yes, it is not a game!*] – Yes, I am not playing games with you. We are here for serious business – [HON. GUMBO: *No, I am not playing games!*] – May you take your seat! – [HON. GUMBO: *Her time is up!*] – Hon. Gumbo *manguri manyanya* to disturb the House! Hon. Mureyani, you may proceed.

HON. MUREYANI: Five years, Madam Speaker, is simply too short. Major developmental projects require stability. A seven-year cycle stops the perpetual campaign mode that slows our economy down every five years – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] –

Allow me, Madam Speaker, to focus on the repeal of the Gender Commission as proposed by the Bill. The repeal of the Gender Commission will lead to gender blindness and violate international obligations like the Beijing Platform for Action. The Zimbabwe Gender Commission only takes up to 0.02% to 0.04% of the national budget. Zimbabwe has been a champion of gender equality in the region due to its Constitution. This move would likely result in reputational damage, portraying the country as backsliding on gender equality. Preserving the Zimbabwe Gender Commission ensures dedicated advocacy for gender issues and compliance with both national and international commitments to gender equality and human rights.

As a signatory to several international treaties that specifically establish specialised institutions to eliminate discrimination against women and promote gender equality, Zimbabwe has an obligation to continue supporting the existence of an independent body that promotes gender equality and women's empowerment.

Madam Speaker, the proposed amendment risks dismantling the progress made towards a gender-just society. Transferring these duties

to the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission presents a strategic risk given its already broad and demanding portfolio. The Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission's institutional bandwidth may be stretched too thin to provide the thorough oversight and gender-informed demand that the Gender Commission has been providing. Without a dedicated body, we face the danger of gender blindness where the specific needs of women and girls are overshadowed by broader human rights concerns.

Madam Speaker, a merged overworked commission might struggle to meet the independent criteria and address the gender equality issues effectively. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the Zimbabwe Gender Commission remains a stand-alone institution. I so submit.

***HON. MAPIKI:** Thank you Madam Speaker for granting me the opportunity to speak today. I am truly grateful for this chance to express my thoughts. I am particularly pleased to reflect on the sacrifices made by our forefathers during the liberation struggle. They fought tirelessly for the right to be heard, ensuring that our voices would not be overshadowed by others.

I would like to extend my heartfelt appreciation to the Government led by President Mnangagwa, for actively taking the views of the people into consideration. Their efforts to engage with communities in rural areas and gather opinions demonstrate a commitment to inclusivity and representation. This is precisely what our brave predecessors fought for: the empowerment of individuals to voice their opinions and contribute to the democratic process.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the Bill, Constitutional Amendment Number 3 (CAB 3). It is a significant step towards honouring the legacy of those who fought for our rights and ensuring that every citizen's voice is valued.

Firstly, I would like to express my support for the clause regarding the extension of the Presidential term by two years. This extension will allow the President to effectively carry out his responsibilities. Many may question the necessity of this extension, but as my mother used to say, ‘why would you repair a ball that has no fault?’ Just like one would not attempt to fix a motor vehicle that is functioning well, it is prudent to consider the implications of rushing into elections without adequate preparation.

Madam Speaker, elections are challenging and require significant financial resources. For instance, in 2013, the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC) spent approximately \$420 million to conduct elections. In 2018, the estimated cost was between \$200 million and \$300 million. Most recently, in 2023, the expenditure was around \$188 million, which translates to an equivalent of 680 billion Zimbabwean dollars. Clearly, conducting elections is a complex and costly endeavour.

I have spoken with some donors who provide funding to opposition parties and they have expressed concerns about the strain that elections place on their resources. Unfortunately, the funds intended to support democratic processes can sometimes lead to violence and conflict among opposing factions. I witnessed a woman with a bandage on her hand, a victim of violence stemming from these tensions.

Reflecting on historical experiences, I recall a conversation with a leader, Muzorewa from the United African National Council (UANC) party, '*Dzakutsaku*.' After losing an election, he shared with me the difficulties of the election period, having invested in vehicles,

bicycles and campaign materials, only to face defeat. He emphasised that the election period is fraught with challenges, suggesting that it is better not to hold elections too frequently.

Therefore, I advocate for this extension, not as a means to prolong terms unnecessarily but to provide a more stable and conducive environment for governance. It is akin to adjusting the lining of a pair of trousers to ensure a better fit, rather than simply acquiring a new pair.

Madam Speaker, I would like to draw an analogy: when a bottle of beer is half-full and you are asked to top it up, it does not mean you are receiving a new bottle; rather, it signifies that more beer is being added to what you already have. In the same vein, we are being asked to extend the length of the Presidential term, not to create an entirely new term. I believe this is a matter that our legal experts should examine closely. For instance, if a village head requests an additional two metres, it does not imply that he is granting me two farms but rather extending the boundaries of what I already possess.

Secondly, I want to address the proposal for the election of the President by Parliament, which I wholeheartedly support. In the 2023

elections, we witnessed numerous individuals campaigning for the presidency, perhaps as many as twelve candidates, including Mteki, Madhuku and others. After their defeats, many of these individuals chose to join the Political Actors Dialogue (POLAD). If these candidates had been elected by Parliament instead, we would not have seen the waste of Government resources that often accompanies such campaigns.

Many who joined POLAD received vehicles and subsequently abandoned their constituencies, leaving their communities without representation. This raises important questions about the impact of elections on our nation. Some individuals have even left their political parties, only to be asked to return, creating a leadership vacuum within those parties. Hence, I propose that Members of Parliament should elect the President.

Let us consider the two dominant parties in Zimbabwe - ZANU-PF and CCC. Historically, these parties have elected their leaders through internal processes, often in secret *via* resolutions made during congresses and conferences. Even within the opposition, leaders are chosen based on resolutions reflecting their members' desires. If MPs

come to Parliament equipped with the resolutions from their constituencies, they can freely elect a President who truly represents the will of the people.

To oppose CAB 3, Madam Speaker, is akin to running away from one's own shadow. It is reminiscent of a situation where a woman claims she does not love a man despite knowing in her heart that she does. Many are publicly rejecting CAB 3 while privately recognising its necessity. So why not speak the truth openly? I felt it was important to express this perspective.

To say Members of Parliament must be allowed to elect the President...

HON. MAKUMIRE: On a point of order! I am requesting that Hon. Mapiki speaks on his behalf, not to say there are other people there who want it. We do not want it. He must speak on his behalf. So, Madam Speaker, may he speak on his behalf.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: I heard you Hon. Makumire. Hon. Mapiki, you may proceed.

***HON. MAPIKI:** Let me proceed Madam Speaker. The issue of the MPs electing the President, a person who had placed his parcel

on top of the bus, is the one who is supposed to take it down. MPs can impeach the President and remove him. If we have powers to impeach the President, we can also have the same powers to elect him. We must look at the CAB3 as it is. That is why I am supporting it because if this amendment was made later, we would have lost a lot of funds.

On the issue of term extension, as a rural MP, we were only working for one year because during the first and second years of elections, you will be fighting with your opponents. You will work for one year and during the fourth year, you are now campaigning for the next election. This has disrupted development. I heard some Hon. Members saying, I should have kept my views in my heart but they know very well that CAB 3 is a good development because there were no developments in the period of elections. Every MP will be...

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** On a point of order Madam Speaker.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** They are called elections.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Hon. Mapiki, you may proceed.

***HON. MAPIKI:** Thank you Madam Speaker. In every family, there is one person who, when he stands up to speak, people say, just be quiet. That is who he is.

I want to touch on the issue of ZEC. Yes, we were having some challenges because the office of the Registrar was the mortuary. The records of the deceased were being kept in the wrong department. The reason why it was changed in 2023, there was a view or some hatred from one called Mudede who was there. The roles of the Registrar General were then transferred. I want to thank the Minister for giving Caesar what belongs to Caesar.

Lastly, I want to debate the issue of the chiefs. Our chiefs are the custodians of our inheritance. When there are some mishaps in the issue of heritage, they are the ones who are responsible for that. You can see that the head of Chingaira is still out of this country. He is one of those who was killed and they are the ones who had worked so hard for the country. It is difficult to stop them from participating in politics. If we bar them from politics, how then are they going to work towards preserving our heritage? Even in Nigeria, the chiefs called the Igwe are given full powers. Here in Zimbabwe, when people want to

mine gold, they will engage the chiefs and perform some ceremonies first. It is difficult for us to then leave out the chiefs. We must not look down upon them. If we look at Chief Tangwena, they are the ones who raised us but when we are now depriving them of doing other things, we are then losing it.

Let us not focus on what happened way back. Let us know that we are now the old generations. The new generations will be looking up to us. Let us not only focus on the current generation. If there is need for spirit mediums, let them take their duties and roles. We saw some people whom we work with in Tanzania, Chimoio, Mozambique, the females were there defending their country. That is why I am in full support of this Bill. Also, residents of Shamva are in full support of the Bill and they want it.

Zimbabwe showed that 99 point something percent is supporting this Bill. If you are in a board meeting and everyone is opposing your view, why then would you continue the emphasis? The issue must be put to rest. Thank you Madam Speaker.

**THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE, LEGAL AND
PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (HON. Z. ZIYAMBI):** Madam

Speaker, I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and agreed to.

Debate to resume: Friday, 5th June, 2026.

On the motion of **THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE, LEGAL
AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (HON. Z. ZIYAMBI),** *the
House adjourned at Five Minutes to Six o'clock p.m.*