

PARLIAMENT OF ZIMBABWE

Tuesday, 9th June, 2026

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

PRAYERS

(THE HON. SPEAKER *in the Chair*)

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE HON. SPEAKER

NON-ADVERSE REPORT RECEIVED FROM THE

PARLIAMENTARY LEGAL COMMITTEE

THE HON. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I have received a Non-Adverse Report from the Parliamentary Legal Committee on Statutory Instrument Numbers 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80 and 81, published in the Gazette during the month of April.

VISITORS IN THE SPEAKER'S GALLERY

THE HON. SPEAKER: I wish to recognise the presence in the Speaker's gallery of members from the Institute of Young Women Development, General Agriculture and Plantation Workers Union, Gender and Media Connect and Women Coalition of Zimbabwe. You are most welcome. – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] –

FIRST READING

WHISTLEBLOWERS AND WITNESS PROTECTION BILL [H. B.
4, 2026]

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE, LEGAL AND
PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (HON. MAZUNGUNYE),**
presented the Whistleblowers and Witness Protection Bill [H. B. 4,
2026].

Bill read the first time.

Bill referred to the Parliamentary Legal Committee.

FIRST READING

DEPOSIT PROTECTION CORPORATION AMENDMENT BILL
[H. B. 2, 2026]

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF FINANCE, ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT PROMOTION (HON. D.
K. MNANGAGWA),** presented the Deposit Protection Corporation
Amendment Bill [H. B. 2, 2026].

Bill read the first time.

Bill referred to the Parliamentary Legal Committee.

SECOND READING

CONSTITUTION OF ZIMBABWE AMENDMENT (NO. 3) BILL

[H. B. 1, 2026]

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

Question again proposed.

***HON. CHOKURURAMA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir, for affording me this opportunity to air my views on the Constitution Amendment Bill No. 3. I represent Chirumhanzu-Zibagwe, and through their submissions, they supported CAB3 resoundingly. I think they brought in 12,378 submissions to show that they support what the Committee gathered and what was brought into this House, which means that Chirumhanzu-Zibagwe and the whole country are moving together.

I strongly support the Bill for the following reasons. Number one, we need to work for our country. We do not have to waste money on elections. The two years that have been added to seven years for the Presidential, councillors and Members of Parliament's term are very important because it gives people and the leader that they should work steadily, as five years is not enough for someone to work. Even

when you are building your house, you cannot build your house within two months, that is why you see some houses remain incomplete even after a long time and this is because of poor planning. So, when a leader has been chosen in this country, he needs time to work with people.

More often than not, the post-election period is characterised by violence and after five years, the Government has to look for money for another election. I propose that if we can have a ten-year term, this will bring peace into our country. We are not the first ones to do that. If you look at South Africa and Botswana, that is what they do. A leader is chosen by parliamentarians who have been elected by the people. Parliamentarians are given the power to choose the President from the august House. So, I support CAB3 resoundingly.

The people of Zimbabwe have seen it fit that Parliament should choose the President from this House because they are the ones who gave us the powers for us to represent them. By so doing, violence will be reduced if we conduct it that way. If you look back, you will find that there was a lot of violence because of the elections.

So, these two years are very good because I think it is God who has seen it fit that we should have peace in this country. During elections, there is a lot of violence and a lot of money is wasted. If that money could be channeled to other projects like road rehabilitation and construction of hospitals, this would enable the people of Zimbabwe to live peacefully. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the people of Zimbabwe who gave us the power to come and talk about this issue. I support this Amendment Bill resoundingly. I thank you.

***HON. CHINODAKUFA:** I feel very happy when I am debating in this House. As I stand here, I am supporting CAB3. I come from Shamva North Constituency and the people there are happy with CAB3 and I am happy that we have brought a good thing. Let me explain that when it comes to term extension from five years to seven years, we are supporting it because we get a chance to build our country. We get a chance to work for the country. Even those who follow, they will have a chance to work for their country. It is not implying to us only.

Coming to the selection of the President, the people from Shamva told me that once we have chosen you as our Member of Parliament, you should join others in electing the President for us because you would have saved many resources. I know that all of us here do not dispute CAB3 but if there is anyone who is not in support, I want to see if they will give up their seats.

THE HON. SPEAKER: Hon. Chigumbu, which is the rule of procedure that has been breached by the Hon. Member?

HON. CHIGUMBU: I think he is not telling the truth on behalf of us. I am one of those people who debated against the Bill. For him to say everyone in this House is for the Bill is a misrepresentation of facts.

THE HON. SPEAKER: I am not sure whether the Hon Member said everyone. I thought he said everyone who supports the Bill. Hon. Member, please continue.

***HON. CHINODAKUFA:** I want to explain that the voters' roll should be handled by the Registrar General because they are the ones who keep birth and death records.

In conclusion, I want to say that the chiefs should be given a chance to get into politics. For example, let me give an example of Hon. Togarepi. If we are with him here, he is a Chief Whip, but in his constituency, he is an MP and if he goes to his political party, he is a member of ZANU PF. If he goes home, he is treated as a father. The chief can also wear different jackets depending on where he is. With these words, let me say that I fully support CAB3. Forward with it.

HON. GUMBO: Thank you Hon. Speaker. I rise this afternoon to oppose Constitutional Amendment Bill (No. 3) (CAB3). I do so not out of partisan obligation, not out of political convenience or political expedience and certainly not out of hostility to constitutional reform. I do so because this Bill strikes at the very core of our constitutional democracy.

At the outset, let me debunk a notion that we have heard being advanced by the proponents of this Bill. A notion that the opposers of the Bill suggest that constitutional reform is a nullity or it must not happen in modern democracies. This is not the point we wish to make before this House today. Constitutional reform by its very nature must be progressive. Constitutions can and must indeed be amended in

order to suit the aspiration of the modern community and modern society.

So, the question is not whether or not constitutions must be amended. The question is, what sort of amendments must be entertained in modern democracy. The Constitution of Zimbabwe, as it currently stands, is not an ordinary statute. It is not a party manifesto or a Government programme. It is the supreme covenant between the people and those entrusted with the exercise of political power. The Constitution exists for one fundamental purpose: to limit power, distribute power and to make power accountable to the people.

The Constitution of 2013 was not handed to Zimbabweans by politicians. It emerged from struggle and sacrifice. It emerged from decades of demand for accountable Government, democratic participation, constitutional restraint and the protection of fundamental rights. The story of constitutional reform in Zimbabwe is written in the resistance against one-party state ambitions. It is written in the struggle for labour rights, democratic renewal and in the constitutional reform movement that culminated in the 2013 Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution understood a simple but profound truth. Democracy is strongest when power is limited, accountable and periodically renewed. CAB 3 proposes fundamental changes to the architecture of our democracy. It extends the term of office of the President from 5 years to 7 years. It also extends the life of Parliament from 5 years to 7 years. It postpones elections accordingly. It removes the direct election of the President by the people and bestows that power on Parliament. The Bill restructures electoral administration and expands executive influence within institutions of Government and it weakens or abolishes constitutional oversight institutions.

Taken individually, these clauses may appear technical but taken together they reveal a pattern. What pattern is that? It is the pattern of centralisation, concentration and reducing the frequency with which political power must account to the people. Democracy is not merely about elections. It is about accountability and accountability requires regular opportunities for citizens to review those that they put in power; that is why term limits, election cycles and constitutional safeguards matter.

The memorandum accompanying this Bill advances a number of justifications. We are told that the amendments are there and are necessary to promote stability, continuity, institutional efficiency, political inclusivity and long-term development. This is what we are told. Attractive as these words and promises might sound, constitutional democracies must always interrogate not merely the language of reform but the consequences of reform. History teaches us that constitutional changes aimed at extending tenure are rarely presented as projects for consolidation. They are almost always presented as projects of stability, continuity and development, as we are told in the memorandum to this Bill.

Mr Speaker Sir, the question that is before this House is therefore not whether development is desirable. The question that is before this House is whether development requires the weakening of institutions of democracy. The evidence from constitutional scholarship and I speak as a constitutional law expert.

Across Africa, countries that have respected constitutional term limits have generally built stronger democratic institutions than countries that have weakened or removed them. Research on

Presidential term limits in Africa demonstrates that constitutional succession contributes significantly to democratic consolidation and institutional development. The African Centre for Strategic Studies has observed that countries that weaken or circumvent constitutional term limits tend to experience higher levels of corruption, weaker accountability systems and increased governance challenges.

Constitutional development across Africa teaches one fundamental lesson: strong nations are built by strong institutions, not by extended incumbents. The framers of modern constitutions understood one thing, that executive...

HON. MURINGAZUVA: On a point of order. I just want to correct the Hon. Member. He had made a fallacy here. He says countries that have extended terms have actually gone down, according to, I do not know what language is used here, but that was the implication. When you look at Rwanda, it did the same thing and today Rwanda is one of the most developed nations in Africa. Thank you.

THE HON. SPEAKER: Order. Yes, we must be careful of generalising. As in Africa, the template is not the same across the

continent, in terms of term limits. So, if we say some countries in Africa.

HON. GUMBO: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I do understand that scholarly debate is difficult for some Members.

THE HON. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, that is an insinuation which is negative in terms of Hon. Muringazuva's debate.

HON. GUMBO: I withdraw Mr Speaker, for purposes of continuity. The allegation around the African context is not plucked from thin air. It derives from scholarly research by the Africa Centre for Strategic Studies. If anyone has an objection to that assertion or study they must present a counter-study and convince this House why this Bill is good. Constitutional development across Africa has shown that leadership renewal in many democracies occurs not because incumbents voluntarily surrender power but because constitutional safeguards require them to do so. This is precisely why term limits exist, not because leaders are necessarily bad, not because continuity is undesirable, but because democracy assumes that no individual, however capable they are, should become indispensable to constitutional order.

Mr. Speaker Sir, what are we told? We are told that Vision 2030 requires continuity. I respectfully submit that if national visions depend upon the continuity of particular office holders, then what we have is not institutional development but personalised development. - [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] - I also submit with respect that a national vision should belong to the nation. It should survive presidents, parliaments, changes in governance and any partisan government.

A bit of comparative constitutional debate. Botswana's development did not depend on one President. Ghana's democratic consolidation did not depend on one President. Mauritius' economic success did not depend on one President and the Hon. Speaker is well-travelled and knows these issues. Their progress was sustained by institutions capable of carrying national programmes across successive administrations. The Constitution should strengthen institutions so that national development survives leadership change. It should not alter constitutional safeguards so that leadership survives beyond ordinarily set term limits.

Moreover, there is another dangerous proposition embedded in the rationale advanced for this Bill. The suggestion is that democracy and development exist in tension and that constitutional limitations may be relaxed in pursuit of developmental objectives. With respect, that is a fallacy. It is a false dichotomy. Zimbabwe does not have to choose between democracy and development. Zimbabweans deserve both. Development without accountability is fragile. Development without constitutional restraint is unsustainable. Development without legitimacy ultimately undermines itself. The Constitution is not an obstacle to national progress.

The Constitution is one of the preconditions for national progress. The Constitution is the people's last line of defence. I am particularly troubled as I take this case to land. I am particularly troubled by the provisions relating to Section 328 (7). The framers of the Constitution deliberately inserted safeguards preventing incumbents from benefiting from amendments that extend tenure. They understood the temptation that power presents. They understood that those who possess authority often seek to extend it as we see today.

Section 328 (7) was therefore designed to ensure constitutional neutrality. That is what is threatened today, Mr. Speaker. It was designed to ensure that constitutional amendments do not become an instrument for self-extension. Yet this Bill seeks to provide that the very incumbents who are presently in office, the President, Parliament and councils, may benefit from the extension of tenure. We must cringe as a nation at such suggestions. We must ask ourselves honestly, if constitutional safeguards can simply be overridden whenever it becomes convenient, what purpose do they then serve? What then remains of constitutional restraint? What then remains of constitutional supremacy?

Furthermore, I also oppose the proposal to remove direct election of the President. This is one of the most profoundly consequential changes by this Bill. In a constitutional republic, sovereignty belongs to the people. The President derives legitimacy directly from the citizens. The people are not spectators in a democracy but are a source of authority. The right to choose the Head of State directly is not a procedural detail; let us be clear. It is a democratic principle. The people should elect the President.

Parliament should not replace the people as the source of presidential legitimacy. If there are deficiencies regarding electoral administration, we must strengthen electoral administration. However, we do not resolve challenges by removing citizens from the centre of the democratic process. I am equally concerned by provisions which weaken the independence of electoral administration in this country. We created, by national consensus, an independent institution for the running of elections; why? This is because we were coming from a history and a vicious cycle of disputed elections in this country.

We decided as a nation, let us allow an independent institution to run the way power is exchanged and the way power is renewed in this country. We seek to go back to the very ills that were cured by the creation of an independent commission. Mr. Speaker Sir, we stand here not because we are so happy with the commission's work in the past. Our cause of contention is the manner in which the independent institution has been capacitated to run elections, in the manner in which there has been undue interference with the running of elections.

The suggestion to have the Registrar-General run the voters' roll and keep it and register voters, puts the Executive back into electoral

processes. This is one thing which we fought against by coming up with the 2013 Constitution. The solution to institutional challenges is not to weaken...

THE HON. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, you have one extra minute, please.

HON. GUMBO: Mr. Speaker Sir, I will adhere to the one minute. Historically, the challenges that we have faced as a nation in as far as elections are concerned have been embedded in the overreach of the Executive in the function of ZEC. When we talk of an election, we go pre-election, during the election process and the post-electoral process. All these functions are anchored in the judgement of a free, fair and credible election. We must not be retrogressive in our proposal for amendments. I note that there is also a proposal to amend the function and role of the military in constitutional democracies and constitutional defence.

I must remind you that the Government of the day is a direct beneficiary of the clause that gives power to the military to uphold the Constitution. We must not forget that. Now, we see attempts at coup-proofing. We see attempts at limiting the role of the military to being

probably *ana mahobho*, Mr. Speaker Sir. We are opposed to that amendment. We believe that the Constitution of this country must be upheld. Whenever there is Executive overreach or an attempt by an Executive to interrupt the very structure and architecture of our Constitution, power must be given to those that can protect the citizens. That is, protecting the sovereignty and integrity of constitutionalism in this country. I know my time is up and I submit. Thank you.

HON. S. SAKUPWANYA: Thank you Mr. Speaker Sir and good afternoon. To know where we are going is to know where we have come from. Our well-documented history speaks to the triumphs and victories earned through a clear vision of a prosperous Zimbabwe. To achieve this, our first objective of independence was attained in 1980. Our second objective of unity was attained in 1987. The land reform phase addressed the ownership objective so that this country is not only ours in name but in real terms. Now we find ourselves going through the economic empowerment phase, ably led by our President, Dr. E. D. Mnangagwa.

Focus on economic development should not only be by word of mouth. Action must show in all areas of Government. We must be intentional about economic empowerment over political expediency. This, the President has been leading the way, spelling out the 2030 economic agenda, which has since become a household anthem. This Bill presents an opportunity for Parliament to push forward systems that allow us as a nation to strengthen the resolve that we must be an economic powerhouse. As such, being the youth representative for Manicaland Province, I fully support Constitutional Amendment (No. 3) Bill. In the spirit of economic prosperity, I will share my viewpoint as to why I support this Bill.

To illustrate the ideological shift, I take into consideration Clause 3, which speaks to the election of the President by Parliament. The direct implication of this clause means the contentious Presidential vote, which has been the main cause for post-election dissatisfaction, is done away with. Elections have historically been accompanied by economic stagnation and speculation. Businesses not only wait for results but also react to the particular Presidential vote, which means the country cannot truly move forward until all sides

have accepted the results as they are, something that some of us still grapple with to this day. This provision removes the prospect of a run-off, which, by historical records, breeds violence and uncertainty and increases Government spending on unending elections.

We have had one run-off in 2008 and I believe we are better off as a country without such circumstances happening ever again. That means once the election of the President is done in Parliament, the country moves forward instantly out of election mode and into nation-building. I have to address the misconception that we have taken away the right to vote from citizens. This Bill in no way removes the one-man-one-vote as set up by our war veterans pre-1980. Instead, it gives us an opportunity to test the organisational ability of the chosen candidate. Taking a look at our previous elections, in some instances, we had more than 20 candidates for President.

If we are to be honest with ourselves, the Presidency should not be reduced to an office of chancers. If one feels they are the better candidate, then by all means, they should show their ability to coordinate the majority of MPs in this House, which in itself is a fair balance of the country's regions. Mr. Speaker, our Government by

nature is a structure. It is impossible to lead the country if you do not believe in structures. This Bill will also test the ability of political parties to show their organisational capacities. If you cannot organise your political party to attain more than 50% of MPs in this House, then surely you do not deserve to be President of Zimbabwe.

I now bring to the attention of the House Clauses 4, 9 and 10 as I zone in on the newly proposed seven years. Too often, the country has had to focus on election after election, with less time attributed to meaningful development. Our President, His Excellency Dr. E. D. Mnangagwa, has been exemplary and has once again instilled the belief that we can indeed realise the vision of economic prosperity in our lifetime. Just taking a look at when he took over, we did not have a stable currency, nor did we think we would achieve one. Power cuts were a daily challenge, while our productivity levels were unsatisfactory. Fuel queues were considered a normal occurrence, and the roads were just not up to standard. Even our border posts were full only of passengers, nothing to import or export.

This is the reality we lived in 2017. Now look at the difference eight years later. It has made not only that on the things we see on the

ground, but even in the mentality of the average forward-thinking Zimbabwean. These years that I mentioned include the two years of slow growth due to COVID-19 and the two elections that we had to go through. Imagine what we would be if we went through this period without those two cycles of elections, eight years later. Where would we be right now? With our growth trajectory and an uninterrupted seven-year cycle, we can finally dare to dream that Zimbabwe can become a high-income economy by 2050.

Allow me to shift to the rights of traditional leaders as proposed in this Bill, Mr. Speaker Sir. I would want to say and highlight that the Bill does not require traditional leaders to be political participants or be politically active. It only proposes that if a traditional leader chooses to engage in politics, they must not be criminalised for doing so. What then does it mean to be politically active or to engage in politics? When traditional leaders go to vote that in itself is an act of engaging in politics because you have to pick one political party over another. Should we, therefore, then deny them the right to vote? I would go further and use the highlighted example by the Minister that said, he even mentioned that our chiefs are there in the Senate, the

Senate, which itself is political in nature. Should we therefore criminalise them for being in the Senate and voting for one Bill over another? Therefore, we should not take away their right to be politically active.

On the Gender Commission, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the coming together of the Gender and Human Rights Commission. I do, however, recommend that provisions be made to ensure priority for our women, as they are the most affected by human rights. To ensure this, I would propose a provision that the Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission be a woman and that at least 60% of the commissioners be female. Doing so ensures the focus of gender issues is not diluted and strengthens the idea that direct representation of our women within the Commission itself will keep gender matters at the forefront. I would want to make an example of the Ministry of Women Affairs, Community, Small, Medium and Enterprise Development. Though it focuses on women as per the name, it is not entirely focused on women's matters; hence the part of community small and medium enterprises. Shall we therefore make noise and say the Ministry should be a stand-alone and economic and Small and

Medium Enterprise should be stand-alone? If we can accept that the Ministry, coupled with other related matters, can stand, then surely, we can accept that the Gender Commission and the Human Rights Commission can be one thing.

As I rush to conclude, let me say that this is Amendment Bill (No. 3). This means to say that we had Constitutional Amendment (No. 1) and Constitutional Amendment (No. 2). I stand before you today as a beneficiary of Constitutional Amendment (No. 2) amongst many others here in this House. Yet, there was no such thing as a referendum. Constitutional Amendment (No. 2) brought about young Parliamentarians like myself. It also brought about women serving in local authorities through the Amendment of Section 124 of our Constitution. This is empirical evidence that the Constitution is a living document and it must adapt to the changing times and needs of a nation. It was high time that youth were taken and included in decision-making bodies such as Parliament, and this was delivered by Constitutional Amendment (No. 2). Now it is high time that we as Parliament follow the economic agenda set by President E. D. Mnangagwa, and this will be delivered by Constitutional Amendment

(No. 3) Bill. This Bill will be our legacy as the 10th Parliament, as it signifies our direct intent to pushing the conversation towards nation-building over political *hullabaloo*. With that, Mr. Speaker Sir, I thank you.

+HON. M. NKOMO: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Amendment (No. 3) Bill (CAB3) of 2026 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe, I rise to support this amendment. As someone who comes from Matabeleland North Province, I support this, Bill. I have spoken to women and the women are saying that they are praying that this Bill should succeed and become law.

They say so because most of the time when elections are being prepared for, they say people are elected from different places and they say this happens in a very short time and within that short time, the person who has been elected is not given enough time to work. When that person is still looking forward to working, then his or her time expires before they have even worked, really. After some time, they will then realise that there is someone campaigning for their posts because that will be the time for them to start campaigning.

This Bill is good; it is advocating for seven years instead of five years. The one in office will have enough time or will prepare how they will work and how they will prepare to do what they are supposed to do and within two years, that is when they start moving around, talking to people. That is why we are saying we support that, Bill. This Bill does not change anything in our Constitution of Zimbabwe. In 2013, we came up with a new Constitution. It started off as a Bill because we used to say that there were too many patches on the old Constitution. What we are doing now is patching this bill, this new Bill, so that we can work properly. We have not changed anything. What is there is just a patch and we want to use the new patch. It is not too many patches. It is just a few patches and that is not what we are talking about.

Previously, people used to vote for the president. You can imagine the number of ballot papers for people to vote for the president. How much do those ballot papers cost? If you look at the cost of running all that and even the fuel that is used, would they end up using a lot of fuel? Would you like the president to be elected by all members of parliament, including senators? They should also elect

the president. There will be development in the country if we do that because the money will not have been wasted during elections.

During elections, members of parliament, who live with the people, are elected by the people. These Members of Parliament are the people who have the right to choose a president.

Lastly, when we talk of removing the Gender Commission, let us look at that again. If you say we have removed that Gender Commission, if you look at children who are raped and the Gender Commission was also looking into that, it will be easier for them. If we remove that, it will be difficult because women also have their issues. Who is going to look into their issues? Women used to go to the Gender Commission and they would assist, especially with issues of inheritance and violence in their homes. People used to report to the commission. We would like to retain that commission. With those few words, I will stop here. Thank you.

***HON. MATSUNGA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for according me this opportunity to add my voice on the Amendment Bill Number 3 (CAB3). Firstly, I want to talk about the Gender Commission. I do not agree that we should dismantle the Gender Commission because I

am a product of the gender commission. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the reason that I do not agree with that the Gender Commission was there way back when women were being violated, assaulted during GBV and sexually harassed. The Gender Commission stood up for the Marriage Act. It did a lot of work so that it would become law to uplift the lives of the women and the girl child that we represent here.

If we look at women's empowerment when it comes to politics, the Gender Commission did a lot of work through teaching and uplifting women so that they can stand the way I am standing now, strong and confident. This is all because of the Gender Commission.

As women in this august House, , most of us did not know a lot of things but through the Gender Commission, it empowered us and conducted investigations throughout the country so that women know their rights because women lived without knowing their rights. Now, a lot of women after being assaulted can stand and witness.

So, my plea Mr. Speaker, is that the Gender Commission should remain in place because if you look out there, there are a lot of rapists who are raping young children. We are saying that the age of consent is 18 years but some fathers are raping children as young as 5 or 8

years, which is very painful. Who is going to stand up for the girl child and women and who will come up with a database of rapists in our area? I think the Ministry of Women Affairs, Community, Small and Medium Enterprises Development needs helpers who come from the Gender Commission.

Secondly, when it comes to chiefs, I do not agree that they should be political. When we were growing up, we learnt a lot from the chiefs through approaching their courts and they were not partisan. If you look at social media, you will find that many issues are being handled by traditional courts. If chiefs are now involved in politics, women who are married will end up being promiscuous and this will make us lose our morals as African people. So, chiefs should not be involved in politics. Yes, we have them in the Senate and we respect them. We know they are going to stand up for what is right because we know that they have laws that they should follow through the Chiefs Council.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, there is an issue of the President being chosen by the Members of Parliament. As an individual, I support it. When we approach elections, there are a lot of things that come up

that cause violence. If it were not because of God, we would have perished but I am saying the President should be voted for here. The President should come from this House.

This is not the first amendment to be done. I was in here in the 8th Parliament, 9th Parliament and 10th Parliament. Laws can be amended because we are the owners, the custodians of the law. We are the ones who make a plan. So, I agree that, under Amendment (No.3) Bill of 2026, the President should be chosen by the Members of Parliament. Out there, we used to cry that elections have been stolen, our votes have been stolen. I think it should come into this House and it should be voted in here. Then we will blame Parliament whilst we are here.

Let me say that ZEC should be dismantled because if you go to ZEC, you find a person who died in 2005 still in the voters' roll. They are not doing their job diligently. I was born in a family of seven. My father is late. Four of my siblings are late. We are only three left but the seven of us are all in the voters' roll. I do not see why ZEC should be in place because I do not see what they are doing. They are not transparent.

Let me come to the issue of extension. I support that, Mr.

Speaker – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] - I agree with it. I support it because we have seen a lot of things in the Second Republic. We cannot thank them just by looking or by words. We have seen a lot of things. There is the *Trabablas* Interchange; there are a lot of interchanges that are being built, even access roads to come to Parliament. You find that roads are being rehabilitated, which has never happened before. If we look at the Robert Mugabe International Airport, we used to be like orphans but now we can see that there is modernisation there because of the development that is happening.

Elections steal a lot of money. Even us, who have been voted for, are left poor. I think our term in Parliament should be extended by two years so that we can gain and also relax. There are a lot of projects that are being done by the Second Republic. When I used to visit my rural area Gutu, I used to travel 40 kilometres to fetch water but now every village has boreholes. We are now travelling shorter distances because boreholes are there and there are nutrition gardens. There is empowerment of women in the country. So, I support the

extension. With these few words, I want to support this amendment. I thank you Mr. Speaker.

***HON. KASHAMBE:** Let me take this opportunity to thank you Mr. Speaker. I will debate what is coming from Seke Constituency. I had the opportunity to move around Mashonaland East's nine districts, hearing submissions from different people on the Constitutional Amendment (No. 3) Bill. In Mashonaland East, it was firmly supported and in Seke, it was well-supported. So, who am I not to listen to people's voices, for the voices of people are the voice of God?

What made me as an individual say that I also support the Amendment Bill is that, firstly, I want to start with the issue of the presidential election by the Members of Parliament. Mr Speaker, it has been said, speaker after speaker, debating the importance of it, how free it is, and how transparent it is when the President is elected here in Parliament. It then wipes away the violence that occurred after the elections. We knew people who always go to court over election disputes. So, we are not going to keep going to court.

It is good because many investors are coming into this country, just as we are seeing. The investors will also be waiting for the court outcomes. So, the constituents of Mashonaland East and Seke and I say that the President must be elected here in Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of the term extension of the President is not about the term of President Mnangagwa, but rather the other presidents who are going to follow. It is not saying, us as Members of Parliament, no. Yes, we are going to have an extension of two more years, not just to be here in Parliament, no, but to finish our projects which we already started.

I give an example of where I come from in Seke. Development is underway now on the road from Marondera to Hwedza. People are working on that road. We also look at the tollgates and other developments underway. We want our current President to be given two more years to finish those projects by 2030. Even here in Parliament, we may want to hide behind a finger, but when we have discussions, it is clear that we are all Zimbabweans. No one is unwilling to have that extension so they can finish their projects. During the Ninth Parliament, COVID-19 struck the land.

***HON. ZVAIPA:** On a point of order Madam Speaker! I do not understand, Madam Speaker, what the Hon. Member has just said, to say that if we add two more years, our President would finish the current projects. What if the projects are not completed within the two years? What is he trying to say? I thank you.

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, order Hon. Zvaipa! Allow Hon. Kashambe to express his ideas. You will be allowed to debate on your own. Hon. Kashambe, you may proceed.

***HON. KASHAMBE:** Thank you Madam Speaker, for your response to Hon. Zvaipa because that is what I was also going to explain to him, to say he will be allowed to debate on his own, but I thank you.

Madam Speaker Ma'am, I would like to debate the issue of the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC). The transfer of the voters' roll from ZEC to the Registrar-General. Let me take this opportunity to come closer to the Minister of Home Affairs and Cultural Heritage, Minister Kazembe Kazembe. He spoke openly, saying, "Go and tell your constituents." Countrywide, the manual system that was being

used way back is no longer in use because everything is now computerised. From the birth of a child, the details get computerised. The death certificate is also computerised in modern ways. He also said that let us make everyone aware that the Registrar-General and the devolution project which is being implemented by the new dispensation, are now in all the districts and are no longer in Harare alone. Even in Seke, at our growth point, we can have our birth certificates and national identification cards issued there. The Registrar-General's institution is now able to undertake these duties diligently using modern methods.

Madam Speaker Ma'am, the chiefs are already involved in politics. What we can debate here is passing long-overdue legislation: if they want it, they must not be caught wanting to do so. However, they must do it freely and openly, because if we look at past years, the chiefs were the ones collaborating with the freedom fighters, so we cannot fight against them. Those who want can be involved in politics. Those who do not want cannot be forced to do so; that is all I can say on that.

Lastly, Madam Speaker Ma'am, on the issue of the Delimitation Commission, Madam Speaker, I support in total that the Commission be there because where I come from, Seke, the issue of boundaries is causing many problems to the chiefs, to the headmen and as Members of Parliament, you see, a constituency in Goromonzi under Seke Constituency; another one is in Marondera, but under Seke, another one is in Marirangwe, Mhondoro; another one is here in Harare Madam Speaker. So, that is causing some havoc with boundary issues.

Some chiefs matters are being tried in Marondera when they are from Seke and even in their constituencies and districts, Madam Speaker, it is causing a lot of problems. I fully support the Delimitation Commission being there. I thank you.

HON. B. NDLOVU: Thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am. Allow me to begin by commending the Hon. Minister of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs for bringing before the House the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 3) Bill, 2026. I also commend the Joint Portfolio Committee for undertaking extensive nationwide consultations and producing a comprehensive report that reflects the views of citizens from across Zimbabwe.

As a Member of Parliament for Vungu Constituency, I consider it a privilege that the public hearings for Gweru District were hosted in Vungu Constituency. This afforded our people and the residents from across the District an opportunity to participate directly in this constitutional process. The hearing attracted well over 1 000 participants and notably the overwhelming majority supported the proposed amendments, demonstrating the confidence citizens have in the reforms being advanced, with only three participants expressing views contrary to the Bill.

The consultation revealed a clear desire for stability, continuity and accelerated development. Citizens are increasingly focused on the completion of projects that improve livelihoods, create employment opportunities and strengthen service delivery. Development is a process. Roads, power stations, irrigation schemes, schools and hospitals require time, planning and consistency. It is therefore understandable that many citizens supported measures that allow development programmes to mature and deliver their intended benefits.

The Committee correctly observed that longer electoral cycles can contribute to policy consistency and effective implementation of national programmes. Across the country, Government has embarked on transformative projects, infrastructure, energy agriculture and social service delivery. Such programmes require adequate time for planning execution and evaluation.

In my own constituency, we are witnessing tangible development progress. The newly commissioned solar plant is creating opportunities for industrial growth, employment creation and improve energy security. Government supported agricultural program continue to improve productivity and household incomes. The ongoing construction of the Lower Gweru/Gweru-Mawella Road is improving connectivity, facilitating trade, opening up economic opportunities for surrounding communities. These projects require continuity if they are to realise their potential.

Allow me to respectfully submit that chiefs are citizens of Zimbabwe and should enjoy the same constitutional rights and freedoms enjoyed by every citizen. They are the custodians of our traditions, culture and values and remain important pillars of

leadership within communities. If a chief chooses not to participate in politics, that decision must be respected. Equally, if a chief chooses to participate in politics and contribute to national development through political leadership, that choice must also be respected. Freedom should not be granted selectively. Our chiefs should have the liberty to determine their own path and exercise their rights in accordance with their consciences and aspirations.

An African proverb teaches us that the best time to plant a tree was 20 years ago. The second-best time is now. Likewise, development should be measured by projects completed and lives transformed. Citizens want the roads completed, industries revived, jobs created, reliable electricity, improved agricultural productivity and a better public service. Above all, they want national development to remain at the centre of our collective efforts.

On behalf of the people of Vungu Constituency, in the broader national interest, I support the report of the Joint Portfolio Committee Committees on the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 3) Bill, 2026 and the recommendation contained therein. I thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am.

HON. MUSHORIWA: Thank you Madam Speaker for allowing me to debate. Today is not just an ordinary parliamentary day. The House is being asked to decide whether we remain faithful custodians of the Constitution of Zimbabwe or whether we become accomplices in dismantling it. I rise, Madam Speaker, to oppose this Bill in its entirety. I oppose it because it is unnecessary. I oppose it because it is dangerous. I oppose it because it is anti-democratic.

Most importantly, I oppose it because it seeks to reverse every democratic gain which we achieved in the 2013 Constitution. The Minister of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Hon. Ziyambi Ziyambi wants us to believe that this Bill is about improving governance. It is not. The Minister asked us to believe that this Bill is about constitutional development. It is not. The Minister further asked us to believe that this Bill is about national interest. Madam Speaker I submit it is not – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] -

This Bill is about one thing and one thing alone, which is the accumulation and the preservation of political power. If this Bill was truly about improving the life of ordinary Zimbabweans, we would be seized at this moment amending the Constitution to guarantee jobs,

strengthen health care, improve education and protect the citizens from poverty. We are not doing that. Instead, what we have today is a Bill whose beneficiaries are us politicians and not the people. The people get nothing but politicians get everything.

You will recall when Zimbabwe overwhelmingly voted for the 2013 Constitution, I want to state here that there were more than 3.2 million Zimbabweans who cast their votes of which 3 079 000 voted for the 2013 Constitution which represented 94.5 percent of Zimbabweans who said this Constitution is a better Constitution. It was a compromise document which could actually push this country forward. The current 2013 Constitution was meant to limit us politicians, not what we want to do today. Today CAB3 wants us politicians to limit the Constitution – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*]

- This Constitution, Madam Speaker, was designed to protect citizens from those in power. Today, those in power seek protection from the Constitution. That is the fundamental danger before us. The Minister repeatedly said constitutions are living documents. Indeed, they are but living documents Hon. Speaker, are supposed to evolve forward, not backward. Progress is moving democracy to more democracy.

Progress is moving from concentrated power to distributed power.

Progress is moving from rulers controlling citizens to citizens controlling rulers. This Bill takes us in the opposite direction. It is not constitutional evolution but it is constitutional regression. It is a journey backwards.

Madam Speaker, one of the most offensive aspects of this Bill is the assumption that politicians know better than the people. At every turn, this Bill removes power from citizens and transfers it to politicians. The people are told they can no longer be trusted to elect their President. Politicians will decide. Really? The people are told they must wait longer before they can hold leaders accountable through elections.

The people of Dzivaresekwa, on 23 August 2023, gave me a five-year mandate which expires on 3 September 2028, Madam Speaker. There are people within my party whom I beat in the primary elections who desire to be Members of Parliament for Dzivaresekwa. There are people from ZANU PF whom I defeated in the general elections who also desire to be Members of Parliament for Dzivaresekwa. Everybody should be given the opportunity at the

expiry of the five-year term to go. If the people still want Mushoriwa as the MP for Dzivaresekwa, they should vote for me. It is wrong, Madam Speaker, for Mushoriwa to stand here and participate in extending my own contract, yet my bosses, the people of Dzivaresekwa do not know.

You are aware, Madam Speaker, that the Hon. Minister has told us that we will not go through a referendum because in his wisdom and view, he thinks it is not necessary. I am not going to comment much on this because it is a matter that is still *sub judice*. I believe that anything that tends to benefit all of us here in Parliament or the current President, needs the people of Zimbabwe to have their say and they can only do that, Madam Speaker, through a referendum. If the people say it is okay, then it is fine. Not just the few of us here, the beneficiaries of the people who cast their vote for us, to simply say, no, no, no, let us extend our term.

Madam Speaker, the people today are being told through this campaign that constitutional safeguards are obstacles. Politicians have the right to decide and I believe, Madam Speaker, that it is arrogance of the highest order. It is a constitutional betrayal.

Zimbabwe does not reside in Parliament. The sovereignty of Zimbabwe resides in its people. We are merely temporary custodians of authority entrusted to us by the citizens, temporarily for five years. We do not own Zimbabwe, Madam Speaker. We do not own the Constitution or the future.

Madam Speaker, every generation of politicians faces a temptation. The temptation to believe that because they possess numbers today, they think they possess legitimacy forever. History teaches us otherwise, Madam Speaker. Parliamentary majorities come and go. Political parties rise and fall but constitutions should endure. This is why constitutions must never be manipulated to suit a temporal interest of those occupying public office. The Constitution must outlive politicians. The Constitution must restrain politicians.

The Hon. Minister of Justice speaks of stability Madam Speaker. I found that argument deeply troubling. Throughout history, attacks on democracy have always been justified in the name of stability. The answer to every democratic demand has been, we need stability. The answer to every demand for accountability has been, we need stability. The answer to every demand for citizens' participation has

been, we need stability but true stability does not come from extending political power. True stability comes from constitutional legitimacy. True stability comes from free and fair elections. True stability comes from accountable leadership. True stability comes from citizens believing that the rules apply equally to everyone.

Madam Speaker, Zimbabwe has many pressing problems. Citizens are struggling to survive. Young people are searching for opportunities. Businesses are battling economic uncertainty. Public service requires urgent attention. Yet the Government's constitutional priority is not solving these challenges. Its priority is altering the rules of politics. That tells us everything we need to know Madam Speaker. There is a profound difference between constitutional reform and constitutional manipulation. Constitutional reform strengthens democracy. Constitutional manipulation strengthens politicians. Constitutional reform empowers citizens. Constitutional manipulation empowers us office holders. Constitutional reform expands accountability. Constitutional manipulation reduces accountability. CAB 3 Madam Speaker, falls squarely into the second category of constitutional manipulation.

It is not very long ago, just a few years ago, 2017, when Zimbabweans were promised a new dispensation. They were promised democratic renewal, constitutionalism and respect for institutions, yet today we are being asked to support amendments that undermine the very constitutional principles that Zimbabweans were promised would be protected. That tragedy, Madam Speaker, is not merely that the Government has brought this Bill. The tragedy is that some who once defended constitutionalism are now defending constitutional erosion. Some who once demanded limits on power now seek to expand power.

Many of us will know, at the tail end of the former President, Robert Mugabe's reign, how many of the people who are sitting on my right were calling for accountability but today, are actually singing a different hymn book. History Madam Speaker, will record those contradictions; future generations will ask what we did when the Constitution was placed under threat and I speak this to all Hon. Members. Future generations will ask whether we defended the people's charter or we surrendered it. They will ask whether we defended democracy or we weakened it.

My answer today is clear and I say this to the people of Dzivaresekwa. I oppose this CAB 3 and all its clauses. I refuse to participate in the dismantling of the democratic gains secured by the Zimbabweans. I refuse to endorse constitutional changes that weaken citizens' sovereignty. I refuse to support amendments that place political interests above national interests. This Bill represents a retreat from constitutional democracy. It represents a retreat from accountability.

Madam Speaker, in 2017, and all of us will recall what transpired. We woke up one morning, and we saw on our national television, men in army uniforms addressing us. They told us that the President is safe; we want to deal with the criminals surrounding the President. Madam Speaker...

***HON. MATIZA:** Madam Speaker, we are now not sure if we are still debating the Bill or not.

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Mushoriwa, please stick to the essence of the Bill.

HON. MUSHORIWA: Madam Speaker, I wanted to remind this whole august House what the Second Republic started on that day. The Zimbabwean people expected that never again shall we have a few to manipulate the President. I want to tell you this, Madam Speaker, before I sit down. The current President came into the Government in 1980.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Mushoriwa, I urge you not to debate the current President.

HON. MUSHORIWA: But Madam Speaker, the Bill seeks to extend the tenure of the current President and Parliament. So, I am actually within my purview, and I just wanted to put this on record...

HON. MATANGIRA: Point of order Madam Speaker.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order Hon. Mushoriwa.
What is your point of order?

***HON. MATANGIRA:** Madam Speaker, if someone does not want to eat pork himself, he must not say people must not eat pork. He must stay at home and in 2028, he must continue staying at home.
Thank you.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Mushoriwa, you may proceed.

HON. MUSHORIWA: The point I wanted to drive before I sit down was to simply say that President Emmerson Dambudzo Mnangagwa has had a commendable history in Government, as a Minister in various ministries. He has had the opportunity to become the Speaker of Parliament in the Fifth Parliament. In fact, he was one of the best Speakers that Zimbabwe has had...

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unfortunately, your time is up Hon. Mushoriwa.

HON. MAKUMIRE: Point of privilege Madam Speaker. I humbly request that you give him five more minutes to wrap up his debate – [AN HON. MEMBER: *I second.*] –

HON. TAFANANA ZHOU: I object.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is an objection Hon. Makumire.

Motion put and negatived.

HON. SHAMU: Thank you Madam Speaker for letting me add my voice to this auspicious debate. I will begin by going back in history. The first President of Ghana and the architect of Pan-Africanism, Kwame Nkrumah once observed that, ‘The forces that unite us are intrinsic and greater than the superimposed influences that keep us apart’. He regarded freedom from colonial domination as an inherent right of all people’s political independence was valuable, not simply because it brought economic benefits but because it restored human dignity and sovereignty.

Madam Speaker, those words, I find them resonating profoundly in our current debate. The words of President Kwame Nkrumah remind us that the future of Zimbabwe must be determined by the aspirations of Zimbabweans themselves, not by external pressure, foreign interest or imported narratives. The Constitution of Zimbabwe must remain an expression of our sovereignty. It must remain an expression of our development priorities and our collective will as a people.

I will try and contextualise what I see happening within this debate. Some of the voices and some of the forces that imposed illegal

sanctions on our economy, sponsored regime change agendas and spent decades attempting to influence Zimbabwe's political destiny are today seeking to lecture Zimbabwe on constitutional democracy. We have heard that narrative before, Madam Speaker and Zimbabwe will not be misled. We are clear on what we want to see being achieved in this country.

This Bill is a democracy in its most authentic form because it is home grown. It is participatory. We saw people participating and people-driven. In his report, the Minister of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs was clear. The Chairman of the Portfolio Committee on Legal Affairs, Hon. Zvobgo, was also clear. The 537 102 Zimbabweans made their voices heard in support of the Constitutional Amendment (No. 3) Bill. That is not the voice of a selective few. It is the unmistakable voice of the people of Zimbabwe. Those who claim to champion democracy should at the very least respect the democratic choices of Zimbabweans.

I will go back to Kwame Nkrumah, where he defined neocolonialism as a state that is independent on paper, but whose economy, system of governance and policy decisions are still

controlled from outside. Madam Speaker, neocolonialism no longer manifests itself under the banner of foreign occupation. It operates through economic dependency, digital domination, cultural influence and external control over strategic national resources. It arises through press statements, NGO reports and funding conditions. It seeks to dictate to sovereign nations, which constitutional choices are acceptable and which are not. It amplifies a small but vocal minority while disregarding the overwhelming majority of citizens who would have spoken through established democratic processes, like we saw happening throughout the process in the life of this debate.

Zimbabwe is no longer a colony, we are free. We do what we want to do. I am emphasising this point because democracy is not the elevation of the loudest voices. It is the respect of the will of the majority. We cannot and will not accept a standard that diminishes the voice of our people in favour of externally driven narratives. Not today, not ever. Zimbabwe will never be a colony again. At this call, this debate is about self-determination.

In addition, Zimbabwe's liberation struggle was not merely a fight for territorial independence. It was a struggle for the right of

Zimbabweans to determine their own political, economic and constitutional future. Thousands of sons and daughters of this nation took up arms because they rejected a system in which decisions about Zimbabwe were made elsewhere and imposed upon its people. That founding principle remains as relevant today as it was at independence in 1980.

The destiny of Zimbabwe must be shaped by Zimbabweans themselves. The spirit of self-determination was what drove the people of Zimbabwe to take up arms so they could freely determine their political status, pursue their economic, social and cultural development and make decisions about their own lives without external interference. It is against that backdrop that we must view this Bill, as the Minister of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, Hon. Ziyambi Ziyambi aptly observed and I want to quote him: “To do otherwise would be to elevate constitutional rigidity above national development and the sovereign will of the people”; that statement captures the essence of constitutionalism in a democratic society.

Constitutions, as he emphasised, are not museum pieces frozen in time. They are living instruments designed to respond to the

evolving needs, aspirations and realities of a nation where refinement is necessary to strengthen functionality, coherence and effective governance. Parliament has both the constitutional authority and the democratic responsibility to act and we are acting. The true measure of constitutional fidelity lies not in resisting change for its own sake, but in ensuring that the Constitution continues to serve the people for whom it was created, under the leadership of His Excellency, Comrade E. D. Mnangagwa. Zimbabwe has made significant strides in reshaping international perceptions, moving from being viewed by some as a pariah State to being increasingly recognised as an attractive destination for investment, trade and diplomatic engagement.

Madam Speaker, I will now try and underscore a point which I think we sometimes talk about without making a proper analysis. Let us take the Gwayi-Shangani Dam, which I feel provides a compelling illustration of why extending the electoral cycle is necessary to safeguard national development projects from recurring political disruptions. This project was first conceived in 1912 and construction commenced many decades later. Today, the dam has reached

approximately 97% overall completion while the pipeline that will ultimately supply water to Bulawayo is about 70% complete.

Now, this demonstrates the intrinsic and enduring need for water security among the people of Bulawayo and the surrounding regions. However, the project's implementation has repeatedly been hindered by electoral cycles and associated fiscal uncertainties. In 2013, the budget realignments resulted in the demobilisation of contractors. Between 2018 and 2019, funding gaps and delays in the tendering process for the pipeline further slowed progress. Moreover, the six-month periods before and after elections often bring cautionary freezes on major project payments and expenditure commitments, resulting in stalled implementation. Consequently, the pipeline remained stuck at approximately 50% completion in 2023 and only advanced to 70% by mid-2026.

The economic consequences of these delays are significant. Government estimates indicate that each year of delay costs approximately USD40 million, excluding the wider losses arising from foregone economic activity in Bulawayo, where maybe they would have been doing some other things, but they cannot do it,

escalating contract costs, inflation-related adjustments and missed opportunities for industrial growth and investment. These costs ultimately overrun and place an additional burden on the taxpayer.

This Bill is thinking about the people. President Mnangagwa's philosophy that *nyika inovakwa nevene vayo* is more than a slogan. It is a declaration of national agency and collective responsibility. It affirms that sustainable development is not imported, but conceived, driven and owned by the people themselves. Through this philosophy, Zimbabwe has embraced a culture of self-determination, resilience, and national responsibility, proving that the destiny of our nation lies not in the hands of others, but in the industry, ingenuity and collective efforts of Zimbabwe themselves.

Now, let us look and ask ourselves who benefits when those national development projects are interrupted every five years by destabilising election seasons? It is not the farmer waiting for irrigation or the young entrepreneur in Chegutu and most definitely, not the widower in Binga. Beneficiaries are those forces that do not want to see Zimbabwe succeed. Many Hon. Members who spoke before me gave examples of South Africa and Botswana to mention

but a few, as respected, stable nations that elect their Presidents through Parliament. Yet, when Zimbabwe proposes the same model, suddenly it is authoritarian? Those are double standards peddling the neo-colonialist mentality. That is neocolonialism wearing a democracy costume.

The people of Zimbabwe understood this principle clearly. The 54 231 citizens who attended public hearings across all ten provinces recognised a simple constitutional reality- if Parliament possesses the authority to remove a President through impeachment, it can equally be entrusted with the responsibility of electing a President. The logic is sound, the precedent exists. Most importantly, the people have spoken. History will record what this Parliament did when Zimbabwe's sovereign future hung in the balance. History will record whether we stood with our people or whether we compromised on the fundamental principle of sovereignty. Zimbabwe is not for sale and is open for business and closed to external interference.

In conclusion, I speak today with the authority of the people of the Chegutu East Constituency who sent me to this august House to represent their interests. Their message was unequivocal. They

support this Bill totally. I therefore stand not only in my individual capacity but as the voice of thousands of constituents who believe that this legislation is in the best interest of our nation and its future development. Madam Speaker Ma'am, Constitutional Amendment (No. 3) Bill defends the gains of our liberation struggle. I thank you.

HON. NJANJI: Thank you Madam Speaker. I stand today representing the good people of Mazowe Central. I rise to add my voice in support of Constitutional Amendment Bill (No. 3). At the heart of this debate is the need to strengthen the capacity of the Presidency to effectively drive Zimbabwe's development agenda and deliver on the aspirations of our people. The Presidency is not merely an office. It is the institution entrusted with providing national leadership, policy direction and oversight of Government programmes. As we pursue Vision 2030, the demands placed upon the Executive continue to grow in complexity and scope.

It is therefore imperative that our constitutional framework evolves to support efficient governance, policy implementation and national development. Under the leadership of His Excellency, President Dr. Emmerson Dambudzo Mnangagwa, Zimbabwe has

witnessed a significant economic transformation. We have seen major investments in mining, agriculture, energy, infrastructure, manufacturing, road rehabilitation programmes, dam construction, rural industrialisation initiatives, innovation hubs and increased foreign investment, which attest to a nation on the move.

The Second Republic has championed a development philosophy that leaves no one and no place behind. Communities that were once marginalised are now benefiting from roads, clinics, schools, irrigation schemes and digital connectivity. These achievements require strong coordination and consistent leadership at the highest level of Government. Madam Speaker, this Bill seeks to ensure institutional stability, continuity and effectiveness in governance. Strong institutions anchored in capable leadership create confidence, attract investment and accelerate economic growth.

Constitutional amendments should always serve the national interest. In this case, the proposed changes are designed to enhance the ability of Government to deliver results and maintain the momentum of economic progress already being witnessed across the country. As Parliament today, our duty is to support measures that

advance national development, strengthen governance and improve the welfare of our citizens. Constitutional Amendment (No. 3) presents such an opportunity. Madam Speaker, I therefore urge this House to support the Bill and contribute to the continued modernisation, stability and prosperity of our great nation. Thank you.

^^HON. S. MOYO: Thank you for the opportunity that you gave me to add my voice on this Bill. I will start with the Gender Commission. My wish is that it is not encompassed in women's rights. It should stand alone because it is the one assisting us as women in ensuring that there is peace for the married ones. We were given a Marriage Act, which encourages us to stay in peace. As women, we are here in this Parliament because we were assisted by the Gender Commission and we can stand alone as women.

We have realised that it has assisted girls because they are no longer encountering challenges as they used to without anyone representing them. I am grateful for the work that the Gender Commission has done. As women, we are here in this Parliament because the Gender Commission is assisting us in representing us.

Without it, as women, we would not be able to come and stand for our constituencies in this Parliament.

Therefore, I do not think it is appropriate for it to be part of the Human Rights Commission. It should be a stand-alone commission. Still on the Committee on Women Affairs, in this Committee, we have always realised that the Gender Commission has assisted us a lot in teaching women how we can be good leaders whenever we go back to our constituencies.

Coming to the issue of our traditional leaders, on Section 281, which has not allowed them to partake in politics but allows them to vote, my wish is that our traditional leaders should not be engaged in politics because they are the ones who always look into the issues of people who will be coming from different parties, standing between these people. Therefore, it is critical that they do not take sides or belong to a particular party. They should represent everyone, not a particular party.

I will then focus on the issue of the election of the Prosecutor General. Section 259, which says, the Prosecutor General is elected by the President of the country, assisted by the Judiciary Service

Commission. Right now, under Clause 26, the President is the one electing without any assistance from anyone. The Prosecutor General is the one who is supposed to indicate that things should go this way or that way. If the Prosecutor General is to be elected by one person, it will not be enough. The judges should be elected by the people as has always been done.

On the matter being discussed by everyone, the extension of the term of office of the President, in my view, we were given time to go around our constituencies to hear what people are saying. One of us indicated that our President should be chosen by Parliament; indeed, our President's term of office should be increased. If Parliament is the one to elect the President, it is easier to work with the number of our constituencies, which is 210 than having a constituency, for example, Uzumba, where it once captured a high number of people who had voted, yet the constituency had a smaller number of those people who had registered to vote in that particular election. Thank you.

HON. MAPOSA: Thank you Madam Speaker Ma`am. I rise to support the Constitution of Zimbabwe, Amendment No. 3 Bill of 2026. In doing so, I am guided by the extensive consultations

conducted throughout the country by the Joint Portfolio and Thematic Committees of Parliament. This consultation reached all provinces and districts of Zimbabwe and received more than 540 000 written submissions from citizens of our country. The overwhelming majority of those submissions supported the Bill, demonstrating that the proposed amendments reflect the aspirations of many Zimbabweans who desire stronger institutions, greater stability and acceleration in national development.

I particularly support the proposal that the President be elected by the Members of Parliament. Sitting in joint sessions, this amendment supports constitutional and sound democratic legitimacy. Section 97 of the Constitution already granted Parliament the authority to remove the President from office. It is therefore logical and consistent that the same institution instructed with the removal of the President should also possess the authority to elect one. Far from democracy, this model strengthens representative democracy because Members of Parliament are elected by their mandate. They get their mandate directly from the people of Zimbabwe, from their constituents.

When Parliament elects a President, it does so as a collective representative of every constituent and every citizen in our nation. The Committee also correctly observed that direct presidential elections have often been associated with high financial costs, prolonged political competition, and should not consume resources that could otherwise be invested in improving the lives of our people. Every dollar saved by reducing the cost of the electoral process can be redirected towards the development of our roads, schools, clinics, irrigation schemes, water infrastructure and disaster preparation programmes.

As a constituency that experienced the devastation of Cyclone Idai, the people of Chimanimani West where I come from understand that development requires resources. Continued and sustainable implementation will, therefore, come with reforms that allow the Government to focus more on service delivery and economic transformation policies. This proposal is not without precedent. We have countries such as South Africa, Botswana and others around us that successfully elected their President through Parliament while maintaining democratic representation. Political stability and

constitutional Government, Zimbabwe will therefore not be abandoning democracy but rather, adopting a model that has proven effective elsewhere or on our continent.

The fact that citizens elect Members of Parliament who then elect the President ensures that executive authority continues to drive the people according to the Constitution. I also support the proposal to extend the electoral cycle for the Presidential and Parliamentary elections from five years to seven years. Why am I saying this? The Committee observed that major development projects require longer periods to reach completion and deliver tangible benefits to our citizens. Development is not achieved through short-term investment. Infrastructure projects, agricultural transformation programmes, industrial initiatives and climate resilience investments often require years of planning, fencing and planning before results become visible. Elections can place the Government in a perpetual campaign mode. Disrupting policy continuity and diverting attention from development priorities.

A seven-year term provides a more realistic timeframe for the Government to implement long-term programmes while maintaining

accountability to the people. Actually, seven years is a short period of time. I was also proposing up to ten years. For a constituency such as Chimanimani West where continual need to rehabilitate roads, build resilient irrigation infrastructure, promote tourism and improve resilience against natural disasters, policy consistency is essential. Communities benefit when development plans are allowed sufficient time to mature and yield meaningful results. Proposing an extension of the electoral cycle, therefore, supports sustainable development and long-term national planning, Honourable Speaker Madam. I further welcome the proposal to strengthen the Senate through the inclusion of additional members, possessing specialist expertise, which are very important in our country, even for any development wherever they might be. The challenges confronting a modern nation are increasing complexity. Zimbabwe requires the expertise of engineers, economists, agricultural specialists, legal scholars, scientists, environmental experts and other professionals who can contribute meaningfully to national policy formulation. By drawing on the pool of expertise available within Parliament, this amendment will improve

the quality of legislation, strengthen evidence and decision-making and ultimately enhance Government outcomes.

The committee analysed and highlighted the need for stability, policy continuity, efficiency and development-focused Government. This amendment seeks to precisely achieve those objectives. They provide an opportunity to strengthen democratic institutions, reduce unnecessary expenditure, enhance accountability, improve policy-making and create conditions necessary for sustainable economic growth and national development.

In conclusion, for those reasons, on behalf of the people of Chimanimani West, I support the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 3) Bill (CAB3) of 2026. I so submit, Madam Speaker Ma'am.

HON. MASHAVAVE: Thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am. It is both an honour and privilege to stand before you today to speak about an important Bill, a Bill that will shape the future of our nation. Let me start with the burning issue, the Gender Commission. My own analysis...

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the Hon. Member be heard in silence.

HON. MASHAVAVE: The Bill had no intention to abolish the Commission. The idea from my own perspective, was to house very important commissions under one roof. The idea was the best. All I may ask is to fund these commissions. I was privileged to be a member of a Joint Committee of this Bill. At one time we had the privilege to analyse clause by clause. When we read the clause of the agenda, when we arrived at the comment on the agenda issue, there was a near fight in the House because it divided the Committee into two parts.

May I persuade the House to at least consider the proposal for a while? I think the country should move forward. Madam Speaker, Ma'am, Clauses 4, 9 and 10 of the Bills aim to substitute the current five-year cycle with a seven-year term. This proposal again is a brilliant piece of legislation and I am in full support of it. A five-year election cycle is uneconomical. The more we rotate this election in a shorter period, the more we consume our scarce resources and again it is time-consuming. I am more worried about prospecting investors.

We have a tendency of waiting for the outcome of an election before they can invest. Yes, the more we rotate these elections, the more we deter them from coming to invest. Zimbabwe is not in isolation from this idea...

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Chigumbu, why are you answering? You are saying, *Ko akambodaro ndiyani*. I was watching you saying that. If you do that again, you will go outside the House.

HON. CHIGUMBU: Sorry, Madam Speaker.

HON. KARIKOGA: Thank you so much Madam Speaker. My point of Order is that I was actually requesting those people from the other side to allow Hon. Mashavave to continue debating in silence. We were quiet and we enjoyed the long lectures, which had nothing to do with the debate, which was being said by the Hon. Members from the opposite side. I thank you.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you so much. If you are Hon. Members in this House, you are expected to behave well and behave like an Hon. Member. That is what I expect. I thank you.

HON. MASHAVAVE: Several countries have similar long-term cycles. These include the United Kingdom, Italy, Iran, Cameroon and many others. This Bill was long overdue and I fully support it. Madam Speaker, Ma'am, allow me to air my view on the traditional leaders. My own analysis is that the Bill had no intention to force the traditional leaders to be in politics. The idea was to flex a rule whereby if a traditional leader feels he wants to participate in politics, let it be and not be a crime.

Amendment to Section 92 of the Bill states that the President must be elected by Members of Parliament in a joint sitting with the Senate and the National Assembly. Section 97 of the Zimbabwe Constitution mandates the powers of Members of Parliament to impeach or to remove a President and for that piece of legislation to be more effective, Members of Parliament should have the powers to appoint and fairly have the powers to remove him. Surely you cannot have the power to remove someone whom you did not appoint. We elect councillors and councillors elect mayors. We elect Members of Parliament and Members of Parliament elect the Speaker of the House. The United States of America conducts elections to choose the

electors by State and these electors from the Electoral College officially elect the President. In other countries like Germany and India, the President is elected by the Parliament. Closer to home, South Africa uses what we call a hybrid system, whereby citizens vote for Parliament and the Parliament will elect the President from within.

On the issue of the voters' roll, Madam Speaker, I fully support the idea of returning the voters' roll to the Registrar for the same reason that the Registrar is the custodian of all the documents, from birth to death, which include birth records, birth certificates, ID's, passports, marriage certificates and death certificates. Surely, a more updated voter's roll is guaranteed.

Zimbabwe is a sovereign State and we are the champions of democracy and the masters of our destiny. We decide how we want to run our own country. I am in full support of the Bill.

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** Thank you Madam Speaker, for according me this opportunity to air my views on this Constitution Amendment (No. 3) Bill as I oppose and decline it from the bottom of my heart.

I object to this Bill because in my constituency, Chiredzi, I asked about this Bill – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Members, may we have order in the House.

HON. NHATISO: Point of order Madam Speaker.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

***HON. NATISO:** I heard Hon. Makumire saying people from Chiredzi. Chiredzi, from which area because I am also a Member of Parliament from Chiredzi but we did not ask him to say all that – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! May we have order in the House! Hon. Makumire, you have been asked to state which constituency from Chiredzi because we have many constituencies there.

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** I am a Member of Parliament for Chiredzi Central Constituency. I asked them about this Constitution Amendment (No. 3) Bill and they asked me to go to Chiredzi General

Hospital to see the state of the hospital and then when I got back, that is when would could discuss this. I went to Chiredzi Hospital and I discovered that most patients did not have access to medication at the hospital.

HON. J. SITHOLE: Point of order Madam Speaker.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

***HON. J. SITHOLE:** I kindly request Hon. Makumire to speak to the Bill and not anything to do with the hospitals. Thank you.

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Makumire, can you proceed?

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** I came back to them and told them the state of the hospital and then the citizens of Chiredzi Central said, if the hospital does not have medication, why should we add two more years? I then asked the women if they were in support of this Bill and the women said they are giving birth on hospital floors. They said they could not continue giving birth on the floors for the next two years, as they want this to be adjusted in this Bill.

I then went to the police camp and asked police officers if they were in support of this Bill and they said that they were being underpaid, and said, look at the state of our shoes. I was taken to their offices, which were made out of wood. They then asked me what the purpose of those two years was if they were working from these wooden offices?

***HON. DHANZI:** On a point of order Madam Speaker. We take an oath as we start to work in this august House. I kindly request Hon. Makumire, as he respects his oath, to tell us the police officers who told him that they are being underpaid. I thank you.

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Dhanzi, I have heard what you said. Let me respond to you, it was once mentioned in this august House that those people who wrote in support of this Bill are close to 537 102. Those people who wrote against the Bill are 2 935. So, Hon. Makumire and these other people are amongst those 2 935.

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** Madam Speaker, I went around the constituency and people had sewage flooding and no water was being provided. I was then asked by these uniformed forces why we need

two more years if we are in poverty like this. I asked if we could proceed for two more years and they said, if you proceed with the two more years, it will increase poverty.

So, most people in Zimbabwe are not in support of this Bill because it is not coming from the citizens. Madam Speaker, let me clarify it for you. The current ruling party in Zimbabwe started in 1980...

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Makumire, speak to the Bill. Do not distract yourself with political parties. If you continue going off, I will force you to sit down.

HON. TOGAREPI: Madam Speaker, I am seeking your indulgence to raise a point of order. We have statistics that were mentioned in this House, but the majority of 500 000-plus submissions were in support of this Bill and 2000 were not. The Hon. Member should not continue to say the majority because we have the evidence in this House, unless he conducted his own consultations that we were not part of.

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is correct Hon. Government Chief Whip. Some people say the majority, but they do not know the exact meaning of the word. You may proceed Hon. Makumire?

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** Thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am. This Bill seeks to extend the term by two more years, but if we look into the current Government, it has been in office since 1980, before I was born. People are asking where the jobs are? Youths are loitering in these streets and they are engaging in drug abuse. They are simply asking since 1980, what were you doing without taking the correct measures for this country? What were you doing from 2017? It is almost 10 years now. Why do you want to increase by two more years if you failed to correct the situation in Zimbabwe for the past 10 years? Those are the questions citizens are asking.

Let me speak to the issue of extending our terms of office as Members of Parliament, so let me show you

***THE HON DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, order Hon. Makumire! Let me ask you a question!

HON. MAKUMIRE: You are in that Chair to moderate Madam Speaker not to question me! Allow me to debate! You are not in that Chair to question me but to moderate the debate!

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, I am moderating the debate, but let me ask you a question... - [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] - Let me ask you whether you are increasing the years or changing the election cycle?

HON. MAVHUDZI: On a point of order Madam Speaker! Madam Speaker, when you are seated on that Chair, you are chairing Parliament. It is not your prerogative to ask people questions ... - [AN HON. MEMBER: *Do not lecture the Presiding Officer!*] -

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am not prohibited from guiding Hon. Members - [HON. MAVHUDZI: *No, no, this is his debate, allow him to debate!*] - You are the misguided one. Please resume your seat. – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] – Please allow the Hon. Member to proceed.

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** Madam Speaker, Ma'am, the relationship between those who are voted and those who vote is that

we are being tasked to perform duties for those citizens. So, we cannot increase or change the contract without consulting those who voted us into office. So, in this case, Madam Speaker Ma'am, those people who voted for us are the people who have made the decision; those people who are in the national voters' roll have made the decision. So, this issue should be taken to the Referendum; we cannot conclude it without doing so.

Let me tell you this, Madam Speaker Ma'am, if this Bill was supported by 99%, why are we afraid of going to the referendum? Why can we not go back to the people? Why can we not go back to those people who voted us into office? I know that we have some very unpopular Members in this House who do not go back to their constituencies. Their constituents do not like them and they are actually afraid of going back to their constituencies. What we are simply saying is that this Bill cannot proceed unless it goes through the referendum?

So, Madam Speaker Ma'am, let me speak...

***HON. ZEVEZAI:** On a point of order Madam Speaker! Thank you so much Madam Speaker Ma'am. I think the Hon. Member was asked to inform the House which constituency he represents. Now he is claiming that some Members of Parliament are afraid to return to their constituencies, yet we represent those people. I do not want him to continue lying to this august House. Thank you.

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Makumire, I told you to stop digressing and stick to the Bill, but now listen to what people are saying. They are saying they are actually in good relations with their constituents.

You are left with Four Minutes.

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** I started my debate at 11 minutes to, so you cannot say that I am left with only four minutes. The Parliament live stream should show the minutes I used during the debate.

I heard other people say that Shumba Murambwi should serve two more years in office, up to 2030. Let me clarify, Madam Speaker Ma'am and tell you, Shumba is now...

***HON. KARIKOGA:** On a point of order Madam Speaker
Ma'am! The issues that we are speaking now are very important. So,
we cannot waste a good opportunity with people who are busy
creating content in this House. – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible
interjections.*] - Since we started today's debate, Madam Speaker,
nobody has mentioned Shumba Murambwi. Where is the Hon.
Member getting that information from? – [HON. MEMBERS:
Inaudible interjections.] -

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Makumire, you are
being asked who said Shumba Murambwi in this august House. Can
you respond? You may now proceed; you are now left with two
minutes.

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** Madam Speaker Ma'am, if you look into
it that the President be voted in this august House, I am not in support
of that because I understand clearly that we have a lot of people who
died for people's rights to vote. So, I am opposing this clause Madam
Speaker.

We have people who, if we ask today, what were you fighting for? Were you fighting for bicycles? What did you gain from the liberation struggle? If I had the opportunity to ask the late Hon. Chitepo or Hon. Jaison Ziyaphapha Moyo, what were you fighting for?

***HON. MATANGIRA:** On a point of order! Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. If we look back at what Hon. Makumire is saying. Those are sell-outs; they did not want freedom to come to the Africans. Now that they have the opportunity of becoming Members of Parliament, they are now saying those who fought for this country, yet they were denying Zimbabweans the right to land. These are sell-outs, thank you. – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] -

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, order Hon. Members. Allow him to wind up; he has a minute left.

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** Madam Speaker, Ma'am, there is an issue that people are bringing in toxicity on the issues related to the selection of the President of the country. I am asking when Bishop Tapfumaneyi Masaya was murdered, which President were we voting

for? When Ndira was killed, who were we voting for? Who killed Chiminya? Who killed Cain Nyere?...

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Okay, that is enough Hon. Makumire! Your time is up Hon. Makumire. – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] - You started debating at 1645hrs, I am recording. – [HON. MAKUMIRE: *Madam Speaker, we have our stopwatch here!*] – Please resume your seat. Hon. Tafanana Zhou!

HON. CHIKOMBO: On a point of privilege Madam Speaker Ma'am. I move for the extension of time for Hon. Makumire!

HON. GUMBO: I second!

HON. TAFANANA ZHOU: Thank you very much Madam Speaker Ma'am. Madam Speaker Ma'am, let me start by quoting Edmund Buggy from ...

***HON. CHIGUMBU:** Point of order, Madam Chair. Point of order, Madam Chair. Point of order...

HON. TAFANANA ZHOU: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. Let me start by...

***HON. CHIGUMBU:** On a point of order. My point of order is in line with the way in which we do business in this House. Hon. Chikombo stood up requesting an extension of Hon. Makumire's time.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are wasting Hon. Zhou's time.

***HON. CHIGUMBU:** I am not yet done, Hon. Speaker. I am requesting that when an Hon. Member requests an extension of time, he should be afforded the time. Last time you said the Clerks-at-the-Table are the ones who check the time for debates. Why have you been keeping and checking time for Hon. Makumire?

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am the one who is in charge of the time and the Clerks-at-the-Table are there to remind me. I am here to monitor time. Please be advised accordingly from today onwards.

***HON. GUMBO:** Point of privilege...

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Members, let us make sure that we do everything for the progress of business in this House.

***HON. GUMBO:** You are misleading people in this House. As the head of this House, you are supposed to protect Hon. Members who are debating and not to oppress them...

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is your own thinking but I believe what I am doing is lawful according to the rules of this House. Hon. Zhou, may you proceed.

HON. TAFANANA ZHOU: I will start by quoting Edmund Burke's speech to the Electors of Bristol. He said, "Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, but is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest; that of the whole, where not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide but the general good."

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate you and Parliament staff on the way you conducted CAB 3 consultations. I have been an MP since 2013 and I participated in most of the public hearings of Bills,

including CAB1 and 2. Most of these consultations were conducted, covering only five provinces. On CAB3, you made sure that we visited every district in our beautiful country, Zimbabwe, which is unusual.

I want to associate myself with the report presented by the Chairman of the Justice Committee, Hon. Zvobgo. I was in Manicaland, covering Manicaland on the CAB3 consultations. People supported the Bill so well and the attendance was so good. I fully support the Bill and as a representative of Mberengwa West Constituency, I am representing the will of the people in my constituency.

HON. JAMES: On a point of order. The Hon. Member quoted the Manicaland consultations. In my constituency, there was nothing fair. In fact, we have a video of one lady speaking and the microphone was taken away from her. It was rigged. It was not a true reflection of what happened in the Sakubva Beit-Hall.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Zhou, may you please proceed.

HON. TAFANANA ZHOU: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Constitutional amendments reflect a society's capacity to grow. They are a powerful tool that allows the law to adapt to the evolving needs and moral standards of the people, proving that a governing document is a living framework rather than a rigid relic. A Constitution is not a mere document in black and white; it is a living document that evolves with the nation.

Let me take you back to the Lancaster Constitution that gave birth to our motherland, Zimbabwe. The Constitution was amended 19 times from 1980 to 2013, which is 32 years ago. If you do mathematics, the Constitution was amended every two years or less.

Let me pick a few clauses that I thought I should add my voice to. The term extension is not targeting our President, President Mnangagwa or us as Members of Parliament, no. The biggest beneficiaries of the CAB3 are the people who are going to win the elections after 2030. The Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 13), which allowed parliamentary and presidential elections to be held concurrently on 29 March 2008, shortened the parliamentary term and

so, we are just going to recover the two years which were shortchanged when the term was cut by two years.

The term for Members of Parliament was supposed to run from 2005 to 2010. The Act also revised the concurrent presidential term from six years to five years. Let me also touch on the clause for the introduction of the Delimitation Commission Madam Speaker. I fully support the clause; we have got a lot of legacy issues from our land reform exercise where the farm boundaries are not known by the chiefs who are governing their jurisdictions. This creates conflicts between the chiefs in our constituencies. The other challenge that needs to be rectified, we have got chiefs servicing two or more constituencies because of the delimitation which was fast-tracked by ZEC.

Madam Speaker, on the Gender Commission, I humbly request the Minister to leave it as it was. We have made some strides in the international community where Zimbabwe was considered as one country which had already achieved the goals for gender issues. From my own view, we are now regressing Madam Speaker if we disband the Gender Commission and overburden the Human Rights

Commission which is now dealing with the issues of national peace and reconciliation since 2023, upon the expiry of the NPRC Act. I humbly ask our Minister of Justice to just spare the Gender Commission so that we progress in the international community. So, I submit Madam Speaker.

***HON. NYABANI:** Thank you for according me this opportunity to speak on behalf of people from Rushinga who elected me for the two terms to represent them here in this House. People in Rushinga were asking, what is it that we have to do with this new Bill which is being tabled in this august House. All the people in Rushinga said they were in support of this Bill. I did not see anyone who was opposing this Bill. If there is anyone who witnessed an objection, may they kindly speak up. So, I will only take what I received from Rushinga and then I will bring it here to say that in Rushinga, people are totally in support of this Bill.

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sorry, Hon. Nyabani, can you repeat what you said?

***HON. NYABANI:** I am saying that we are in support of this Constitutional Amendment Bill as people from Rushinga because

when they came to Rushinga during the consultations, the people were in support of the Bill. There were over 70 people who were in support and there was no one who was opposing that Bill. –

HON. NGADZIORE: I think there is a great misconception in terms of the understanding of what a public consultation is supposed to do and what an election is. For the simple reason that there might be a limited number of people who were or not supporting the Bill is not something that is binding in accordance with our Constitution of Zimbabwe. The election is a determining factor and that is why some other Members of Parliament are yearning for a referendum because it is actual and it reflects quantitatively the number of those who are in support of the Bill. You cannot stand up here and say that due to a public consultation you have ruled. That is a fact Madam Speaker.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hear you Hon. Member but you will have your time to debate –

HON. NGADZIORE: I am correcting the perception that is there. There is a difference between a consultation and an election.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member, wait for your time. You will have your time to debate and you will say whatever you want to say. Please may you take your seat?

***HON. NYABANI:** Thank you Madam Speaker for protecting me but I want him to open to Mark 2 verse 27, which says – We agreed that every member is free to debate and if you have a different opinion you will get your time to debate –

HON. NGADZIORE: Madam Speaker, he says I think I should open the Bible to some verse. That is why I raised the point of order which is allowed by the Standing Rules and Orders of this House.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not supposed to answer him when he is debating. Please may you take your seat?

HON. DR. MUTODI: My point of order is that in our Standing Rules and Orders, it is clearly stated that when an Hon. Member rises on a point of order, they must specifically cite the order that they are referring to or a constitutional rule that is being breached or any provision. Now, what we are seeing Hon. Speaker is that Hon. Members are just standing up to disrupt someone who is giving their

submission. May this be stopped Hon. Speaker. Thank you very much.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point of order has been noted Hon. Mutodi. Hon. Nyabani, please may you proceed.

***HON. NYABANI:** Madam Speaker, before I proceed, I want to know if he is an Hon. Member? – [HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] –

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Nyabani, please continue with your debate.

***HON. NYABANI:** Mark 2 verse 26 - 27, for those who do not go to church says that rules were made for people but people were not made for rules , which means rules can be changed but rules cannot make a person. I just do not want to waffle but I want to quote clause by clause so that as a nation we are not isolated. We do benchmarks and what we do, we copy from other nations.

Coming to Clause 8 , which says that the President will appoint 10 Senators. This is happening in other countries. Coming to Clause 15 on the appointment of judges, we have countries like North America, Latin America and France where the President nominates

judges , being helped by the High Court Council of the Judiciary. Madam Speaker, if people are ignorant, they should not listen.

HON. MATAMBO *Having stood up on a point of order*

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We agreed that people should quote the clause from the Standing Rules and Orders when they rise on a point of order.

***HON. MATAMBO:** Rule 65 in our Standing Orders, but in this House, we are being bombarded with lies. There is no country called North America.

***HON. NYABANI:** Madam Speaker, if we go to Clause 21 which refers to traditional leaders, if we look at eSwatini, there are kings. In 1884, there were no presidents and we had kings and chiefs. When the colonisers came, they met the chiefs and they were fighting with them. The chiefs were those who were ruling. Today, how can we say chiefs are not supposed to engage in politics when, at that time, they were rulers because they are the custodians of the land? The chiefs should be involved in politics because they fought the

whites so that they would not take our land. I say the chiefs should be involved in politics. In eSwatini, there is King Mswati ruling.

Madam Speaker, coming to the extension of years from five to seven, it is not only in Zimbabwe but we have countries in Africa like Burundi, Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea where they have seven-year terms. It is not just coming from Zimbabwe but it is happening in other countries. When we look at other countries, we take what is good so that we would move together as a nation.

Coming to the issue of the President being elected by Parliament, it is not just a starting point from Zimbabwe but we have countries like Botswana, South Africa, Italy, Germany and Greece. There are indirect votes for the President. If you do not know what is happening in Greece or in Italy, it would be new to you. You are amazed but do not be because this is not applying to Zimbabwe. You must be well read and see what is taking place. You should copy what other countries are doing, which is right.

Madam Speaker, this Bill is not being made for ZANU-PF but for the Government because the law that we are talking about for 2013, it was passed by MPs who are no longer here. Some of the laws

that we were using before 2013 were enacted by MPs who are no longer there. As MPs, this time we have to do our job thoroughly, taking a leaf from other countries, evaluating what is good for five years and what is good for seven years, instead of just making noise...

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Engineer, learned as you are, you must behave.

HON. ENG. MHANGWA: I am sorry Madam Speaker.

***HON. NYABANI:** There are a lot of issues Madam Speaker. When the blind men met Jesus and when he gained sight, at first he said, I see people as trees but after a second touch, he was able to see. Other people have eyes but they do not see. They cannot see the cancer screening machines which are here. They are not seeing that there are hospitals which are being revamped and that there are roads which are being constructed. They have eyes but they do not see.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, I want to quote a verse in the *Bible*, Mark 16 verse 19; it says, what has been bound here on earth has been bound in heaven...

HON. JAMES: On a point of order Madam Speaker.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. James, he is about to finish, please may you allow him to finish. Hon. James, I am talking to you, I am saying he is about to finish. Please may you allow him to finish. Hon. Nyabani, please may you proceed.

***HON. NYABANI:** *Anonzwa Shona here uyo ngaanyarare uyo. Unonzwa Shona here iwe?* Mark 16 verse 19 says, what has been bound here on earth has been bound in heaven as well.

HON. MAVHUDZI: On a point of order Madam Speaker.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

HON. MAVHUDZI: Madam Speaker, we are setting a very wrong precedent in this Parliament. Other Members of Parliament are debating and insulting people. Hon. Nyabani has just insulted Hon. James and we cannot allow that to pass. Parliament is a civil institution. We cannot have people throwing insults at other Members of Parliament. That cannot be allowed Madam Speaker. You have to rule on that one.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hear you honourable.

Hon. Nyabani just said he does not understand Shona, so why is he raising a point of order? Is that insulting?

HON. MAVHUDZI: Madam Speaker, it is an insult. If it was coming from Hon. James, it was going to be an insult and racist. You have to rule on that one Madam Speaker. He has to withdraw.

THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hear you. Take your seat.

Hon. Nyabani – [HON. MEMBERS: *Abuda panze.*] –

HON. JAMES: Madam Speaker, a simple apology would suffice.

***THE HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order Hon. Members! We will wait for him to come back.

HON. CHITIMBE: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise to contribute to the debate on the CAB3. I support the proposed extension of term of the Office of President, Members of Parliament and councillors by two years. However, my support is based on the expectation that the additional period will be used to strengthen democratic governance, improve service delivery and address the concerns of the people of Zimbabwe. The additional two

years will also provide continuity in the implementation of national development programmes and allow ongoing projects to be completed without disruption. The people of Zimbabwe must see tangible benefits from an extension of terms, like the Presidential Borehole Scheme, which we witnessed in Budiriro North, Marondera and recently in Bulawayo, spearheaded by the Presidential Advisor. The proposed extension must also be used to promote equal opportunities for women, youth and persons with disabilities so that no one is left behind in the development of our nation.

I also support the transfer of voter registration and maintenance of the voters' roll to the Registrar General. The Registrar General already manages birth certificates, death certificates and national identity records, making the office well placed to maintain an accurate, updated voters' roll. However, before this transfer is fully implemented, the Registrar General must address the challenges many citizens face in obtaining birth certificates and national identity documents. Without these documents, the citizens cannot register to vote or fully participate in national affairs. Government services must be decentralised and brought closer to the people so that every citizen

can easily access the documents they require. No citizen of Zimbabwe should be required to travel unreasonable distances to obtain identification documents.

I oppose the proposal to allow traditional leaders to participate in partisan politics. Traditional leaders play an important role in ensuring that Government assistance reaches communities, resolving disputes, administering justice and maintaining peace within the society. To perform these duties effectively, they must remain impartial and serve all citizens equally. If traditional leaders become involved in partisan politics, people may begin to view them as favoring one political party over another. Furthermore, a person who contests an election against a traditional leader may find it difficult to continue recognising that leader's authority after a political contest. This may create divisions within communities and undermine the dignity, respect and neutrality traditionally associated with traditional leadership. Traditional leaders are custodians of our culture, customs and traditions and their authority is best protected when they remain non-partisan.

I also oppose the abolition of the Zimbabwe Gender Commission. Zimbabwe is one of the countries recognised internationally for promoting and protecting the rights of women and girls. Gender equality remains a specialised issue that requires a dedicated institution with a clear mandate. The Zimbabwe Gender Commission plays an important role in promoting equality, investigating gender-related complaints, combating discrimination and protecting vulnerable groups. It also helps Zimbabwe to fulfil its international obligations under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). The Commission has handled numerous complaints, conducted important investigations and contributed to policies that protect women, girls, men and boys.

For these reasons, I believe the Zimbabwe Gender Commission should remain an independent constitutional body. While I support the extension of terms of office and transfer of voters registered to the register general, I remain opposed to the abolition of the Zimbabwe Gender Commission. I therefore urge this House to adopt reforms that

strengthen democracy, protect our institutions and improve the lives of the people of Zimbabwe. I thank you.

***HON. MURAMBIWA:** Thank you for affording me this opportunity to add my voice on the debate on CAB 3. As I speak, I am representing the people of Zaka North Constituency. When the public hearing was held in Zaka, I was there at Rudanda. There were more than 2 000 people but out of the people who spoke, most of those who contributed supported this Bill. They mandated me and said, you have heard what we have contributed here, so do not go and change goalposts. So, I am here to buttress the points that were raised by the people of Zaka North. The import of this Bill is for the development of Zimbabwe. I have seen that the way development is going, that is the reason why the people of Zaka North sent me to support this Bill. The people who do not support this Bill are those who do not like development.

Let me give you an example: if you divorce your wife, there is no person who enjoys seeing the wife that they have divorced

progressing in life. So, the people who brought sanctions on this country do not want to see it progressing; they want to see it regressing. Let me touch on the election of the President.

HON. CHIGUMBU: Point of order. The Hon. Member must be clear because there are so many Hon. Members who brought their submissions against this Bill, including the war veterans. Who brought sanctions and what is he trying to say ...

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER (HON. MUGOMO): You are out of order, Honourable. May you allow the Hon. Member to debate in silence?

***HON. MURAMBIWA:** Thank you Madam Speaker. We were elected so that we represent the people and those people are the ones who made us be in Parliament. So, there is something that they see in us; that is why they sent us to represent them. They said, we chose you to represent us. We did not have any network here but because you represent us, we have seen now base stations being established. So, they are seeing actions. They sent me to say that there is no bridge in Ward 1 and right now the bridge is under construction. They also

sent me to say that we do not have enough schools in Zaka North but there are schools that are being built in Zaka North. So, they said if you can represent us fully, I think you should also represent us when it comes to the election of the President.

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** Which clause is he referring to? Which clause is he quoting?

***HON. MURAMBIWA:** Thank you Madam President, for protecting me. Let me touch on the extension of the cycle from five years to seven years. This is not being done for the present people, including the President. A lot of people have talked about it, but I found that it was very good. Even the people of Zaka North saw that it was good, because those who want to come next will have two years of learning. Right now, there is a lot of development that is going on in our country through our President.

Allow me to talk about the chiefs. The chiefs who rule over the people are not allowed to engage in politics. They should be engaged in politics because they are the custodians of our tradition. When the war veterans came, they got good teaching from the chiefs. They would question them on areas to go and not to go, and what to do in

those areas. They got those teachings from the chiefs. So, the chiefs should be involved in politics because they have been involved in politics from way back.

Gender Commission should be standalone. It should not be under Human Rights, because I have seen that I am a product of a woman, and I have my mother, sisters and daughters at home. You find that the Gender Commission helped to uplift the lives of women because women do a lot of jobs. So, the Gender Commission should not be abolished, but it should remain in place.

HON. TAWOMHERA: Thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am. I rise today not just for the Glenview South Constituency, but for all the masses in Harare and Zimbabwe at large. We cannot be in this august House to support the Constitutional Amendment (No. 3) Bill, recognising the need for stability and development in our nation. The proposal for the President and Parliament to serve for seven years aligns with the will of the people and provides continuity. A seven-year term mirrors our national development strategy planning cycle and reduces election fatigue, allowing more resources to go towards development and not campaigns.

I would also like to touch on the proposal for the merger of the Zimbabwe Gender Commission with the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission. Clause 18 of the Constitutional Amendment (No. 3) Bill seeks to abolish the Zimbabwe Gender Commission by transferring its functions to the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission. At the heart of this debate is a very simple question. What do we do with an institution that is working? The Government of Zimbabwe is commended for its long-standing commitment to gender equality across the globe.

In 2025, His Excellency Dr. E. D. Mnangagwa received a positive masculinity award from the African Women Leadership Network in recognition of the work done by the Second Republic to promote gender equality and women's empowerment.

Section 232 establishes independent commissions to support democracy. Section 242 is the establishment of the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission. Section 245 creates the Gender Commission. Each was created for a specific purpose because Parliament in 2013 recognised that gender inequality is not a normal human rights issue.

It is systemic, deep-rooted and requires dedicated focus. Nature dilutes focus; it weakens protection.

Section 56 of our Constitution guarantees equality and non-discrimination; hence, Section 243 gives the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission a broad mandate over all rights, but Section 246 gives the Gender Commission a specific mandate, which is to monitor gender equality, investigate gender-based violence and advise the Government on gender policies.

The Commission has played a pivotal role in influencing the criminalisation of sexual harassment through the Labour Amendment Act of 2023. It helped shape anti-sexual harassment policies across the Public Service, higher and tertiary educational institutions and the media sector. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Maputo Protocol both call for a dedicated national gender machinery. These explicitly encourage the establishment of independent national mechanisms to promote, protect and monitor women's rights. Gender Commission is, therefore, not only a constitutional creation, but also a manifestation

of Zimbabwe's compliance with binding regional and international obligations.

We, the people, created two commissions for a reason. Gender violence, mental mortality, and child marriages are not just human rights issues. They are national emergencies that need a dedicated watchdog with its own budget, staff and voice in Cabinet. Merging commissions does not remove bureaucracy, it removes priority. It tells every Zimbabwean girl that her safety is just one item on a long list. When an institution fails, we reform it. When it does not deliver results, we change it, but when an institution delivers results, protects citizens, strengthens our laws, and advances our constitution, we do not abolish it. We strengthen it, keep the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission strong, and keep the Gender Commission independent. I plead with this House to protect Section 56 by protecting the institution that defends it. I so submit.

HON. G. HLATYWAYO: Thank you so much Madam Speaker, for allowing me to add my voice to this very important view. I wish to register my spirited and strong opposition to CAB3. It is my firm belief that the Bill suffers from both a process and substance or

content deficit. Therefore, it must be rejected in its entirety and without any exception. I wish to first register my process misgivings, Madam Speaker. The 2013 Constitution was a bipartisan effort as it was developed under the Inclusive Government and had the advantage of inclusivity. A key ingredient in the making of a social contract between the governed and the governing.

Even more fundamentally, Madam Speaker Ma'am, the 2013 Constitution was a national effort that sought to develop a homegrown Constitution from the Lancaster House Constitution. It received a thunderous approval, as nearly 95% voted yes in the 2013 Referendum. To then seek to change the same Constitution that was widely accepted as a progressive Constitution, not only in Zimbabwe, Madam Speaker but beyond, without going back to the people, will be the highest betrayal after Morrison Nyathi. Section 328 of the Constitution is instructive in terms of amendments of this nature.

Madam Speaker Ma'am, let me salute the drafters of the 2013 Constitution and the people of Zimbabwe for seeing the current mischief ahead of time. Therefore, directed that in such circumstances, a referendum must be convened to change the term

limits and for the incumbent office holders to benefit from these constitutional provisions that they would have engineered. Madam Speaker, I put it to this House that any amendments to the term limits that benefit the incumbent outside Section 328 provisions and in particular, a referendum, would be fundamentally flawed.

It is also not a secret Madam Speaker, apart from the fact that Parliament is conflicted to adjudicate on this Constitutional Bill on the basis that it stands to benefit from the two-year extension. This House has also been subjected to massive re-engineering as it no longer reflects the will of the people as expressed in the 2023 Elections due to the controversial recalls that saw 33 people's representatives being recalled from this Parliament – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] - No party was given a two-thirds majority in 2023. That would give it the legitimacy to change the National Charter. History has no blank pages, Madam Speaker. It shall be remembered that this was the *modus operandum* of the Second Republic as it prepared to unconstitutionally and undemocratically amend the national charter to its own benefit.

Madam Speaker, allow me to transition to my third process misgiving. I also wish to register my disappointment in the manner in which CAB3 Public Hearings were conducted. The Public Hearings were grossly inadequate in number and in distribution. They were also marred by violence and intimidation. I personally attended the City Sports CAB3 public hearing and I am ashamed that as Parliament we failed to give the people a chance to freely express their views without fear or favour.

The City Sports Public Hearing was not a public hearing, Madam Speaker but a party meeting. The meeting was hijacked by party functionaries, who became responsible for deciding who spoke and who...

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER (HON. MUGOMO): Order Hon. Hlatywayo, do you have evidence.

HON. G. HLATYWAYO: Yes, I do have evidence. I was a witness as I have already said, I was there in person. I am talking about my own experiences, Madam Speaker Ma'am and I should be allowed to say my own experiences in this House. If there is someone who has an alternative narrative....

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order Hon. Hlatywayo.

HON. G. HLATYWAYO: Order, it should be embarrassing to this House, Madam Speaker, that no one was held responsible for these transgressions to this day, including the famous case of lawyer Doug Coltart whose phone was snatched by officials.....

***HON. TAFANANA ZHOU:** If it is an offence that was committed, then it has to be reported to the police, not to be said in here. If she said there was a person who was assaulted during the public hearing, it must be reported to the police, not here, Madam Speaker Ma'am.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Hon. Hlatywayo, please may you debate.

HON. G. HLATYWAYO: Indeed, the case was reported. It is before the police but nothing has been done, as I indicated. Madam Speaker Ma'am, we must bow our heads in shame. The only way to salvage this process that is now thoroughly discredited is through a referendum, as stated earlier.

Madam Speaker, let me now transition to my content or substance misgivings. The first one, the proposal to replace direct

popular election of the President with election by Parliament, is a betrayal of those that died in the Liberation War in defence of the one man, one vote principle. Voting for a President is in itself an act of sovereignty and its removal significantly distances Executive authority from popular consent.

I have heard reference to other jurisdictions Madam Speaker and in particular South Africa and Botswana. Contextual intelligence is always important in these debates. There is a tendency to cherry-pick what other countries are doing, yet we all know that South Africa has a whole PR system where both Parliament and the President are elected through a proportional electoral system. I do not support an electoral system that has a first-past-the-post system for Members of Parliament and a proportional representation for the President in our context. I see it as an attempt to manipulate the system to favour the winning chances of one party whose Presidential candidates have not been popular. The proposal will also open floodgates to unscrupulous characters who can use their money or should I say ill-gotten wealth, to buy legislators and become President...

HON. TOGAREPI: On a point of order Madam Speaker

Ma'am. The Hon. Member is also cherry-picking, but my reason for standing up pertains to the popularity of those who go to elections. It is measured or seen by those who win ...

HON. MAKUVIRE: On a point of order, if the Chief Whip has got a point, there will be time for him to debate. We cannot allow him to interject in a debate.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, Hon. Makuvire, you are not allowed to raise a point of order on another point of order.

Allow him to debate.

HON. TOGAREPI: Madam Speaker, we cannot allow Hon. Members to stand up and lie that people are unpopular when they are in office through electoral mandate—[HON. MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*] -

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: Order, order, Engineer, you have passed that level. We do not expect such behaviour from you; you are an intellectual Eng. Mhangwa. Order! Hon, Chief Whip, may you continue.

HON. TOGAREPI: Madam Speaker Ma'am, my point is, the Hon. Member said we are minting because we want to protect unpopular people. From my political party, we won elections, which means that we are incumbents at the moment.

HON. G. K. HLATYWAYO: Constitution Hon. Speaker, must never be tailor-made for individuals. I also reject the proposal to extend presidential, parliamentary and local authority terms from five years to seven years. Looking at the Government's records over the last nine years, I do not see any justification whatsoever to warrant any extension. Zimbabweans also overwhelmingly expressed their desire to have clear-cut term limits in the 2013 Referendum and any change to the current provisions will be a betrayal of the people of Zimbabwe, more so, in the absence of a Referendum. The authority to govern is derived from the people; we were all given five-year terms and we must stick to the mandate we got from citizens in line with the principle of popular sovereignty as espoused in Section 3 (ii) of our Constitution.

On enlargement of the Senate, enlargement to have more appointed individuals by the President is a clear violation of the

principle of separation of powers where the three arms of Government are supposed to be distinct and independent. The proposal is more ridiculous by the proposal to have Parliament as the Electoral College that elects the President.

On transferring voters roll functions from ZEC to the Registrar-General's Office, the former is an independent Commission and the latter is an office under the direct control of the Executive. It is therefore, important to keep such a function that is central to our electoral processes away from the direct control of the Executive to cure the mischief of toxicity and the illegitimacy that the Minister referred to during his Second Reading speech. I, therefore, do not support the proposal and urge us all to keep the voters' roll function under ZEC.

I do not believe that it is a coincidence, Madam Speaker, that a new Delimitation Commission is being proposed at the same time that the electoral system for the election of the President is being changed. It is quite obvious that the party composition of parliamentary seats will determine who ultimately wins the presidency. This new Commission appointed by the Executive can thus become a

gerrymandering vehicle whose role will be to secure the President.

The delimitation function must be left as is currently. The provision to remove partisan restrictions on traditional leaders is baffling. I think the current wisdom is superior in that traditional leaders have a very important role to play in our communities, including being custodians of our customs, traditions and culture.

Traditional leaders also preside over traditional cases in traditional courts and therefore, impartiality is key to the effective discharge of their duties. The proposal reminds us of how colonial administration before 1980 reduced the esteemed offices of traditional leaders to agents of colonialism and detached them from the citizens. We must therefore move away from such colonial vestiges.

The proposal to transfer the role of the Zimbabwe Gender Commission to the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission is tantamount to deprioritising gender equality as a key Government focus, contrary to the provisions of the National Development Strategy II that elevated gender to a thematic area. Zimbabwe Gender Commission is a specialised agency. It is a Commission that looks at a matter that requires laser focus and specialised attention. The

differences between the two entities can be likened Madam Speaker, to the difference between a general practitioner in the medical field and a

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER (HON. MUGOMO): Hon. Member, you are left with five minutes.

HON. G. K. HLATYWAYO: Thank you very much, I will finish in five minutes. The difference between the two entities can be likened to the difference between a general practitioner and a specialist such as a gynecologist or an orthopedic surgeon; you cannot replace the latter by the former. This proposal risks undermining efforts to advance women's rights in a country that is still plagued by abuse of women.

The proposal to consolidate the Executive's control over the judiciary and the prosecution will significantly increase the President's control over the appointment of judges through the removal of public participation in transparency interview processes. This is certainly at variance with the principles of accountability and institutional independence, which are key cornerstones of constitutional democracies.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, it is my considered view that this Bill is a monumental democratic regression that seeks to protect the interests of political elites at the expense of ordinary people and democratic tenets. The Bill is a pipeline for massive authoritarian consolidation, creating an imperial president and further weakening democratic institutions. Contrary to the assertions by the Minister of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs during the Second Reading, this Bill is actually about extending the President's time in office. It does take away the right for citizens to choose a president of their choice.

It is about internal succession issues of the ruling party, seeks to postpone elections to a later date, thus creating a very dangerous precedent and a moral hazard where incumbents can extend their terms and postpone, if not to remove, elections altogether. Yes, it seeks to concentrate power in the hands of the President, not just in the running of elections but in everything, including in other arms of Government, contrary to the separation of power doctrine. Any attempt to extend term limits outside a Referendum is procedural, unconstitutional, undemocratic, fundamentally flawed and will set a

bad and dangerous precedent where politicians can change term limits willy-nilly without going back to the people.

I have heard the lame argument that the Bill seems to lengthen and not to extend the term limit. I care less about the nomenclature because the import is the same and, in any case, Section 328 (i), provides the definition of term limit provisions. Term limit provisions mean a provision of the Constitution which limits the length of time that a person may hold or occupy a public office.

Madam Speaker, a Referendum must not only be seen as a legal requirement but a political imperative. A Chief Executive Officer of a company cannot extend his contract without the approval of the shareholders or the board of directors; otherwise, it will be tantamount to a hostile takeover. This Bill pushes our country to the consequence of instability and more toxicity.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER: You are left with one minute, Hon. Member; can you wrap up your debate.

HON. G. K. HLATYWAYO: Thank you Madam Speaker, I am just winding up. This Bill pushes our country to the precipice of instability and more toxicity. I urge us all to prioritise the national

interest over personal benefit by overwhelmingly rejecting this Bill in its entirety. Our fidelity, Madam Speaker, must always be to the country and not to narrow partisan and personal interests and agendas. May God bless Zimbabwe.

Z

t615625

9th June 2026

HON. DHLIWAYO: Thank you Madam Speaker, for allowing me to add Chipinge East's Constituency's voice to the debate in question. The Constitutional Amendment (N.o3) Bill comes at a time when Zimbabwe, for the first time in two decades, is finding an economic fit. This stability follows the carefully crafted and implemented Short-to-Medium-Term Development Programme, the Transitional Stabilisation Programme that ran from 2018 to 2020. In addition, that formed the foundation for NDS1, which ran from the year 2021 to 2025 and eventually the NDS2, which is running from this year, 2026 to 2030.

These policies have enhanced macroeconomic credibility as the country, for the first time in more than 20 years, enjoyed sustained price stability as evidenced by a single-digit inflation rate since the year 2024. Balance of payments stability, falling broad and strict

unemployment rates and positive economic growth rates, averaging 5% for the past five years. It is this astronomical economic growth rate and development of which we are witnesses that has pushed millions of Zimbabweans to demand that His Excellency President, Comrade Dr. E.D. Mnangagwa, must continue in his position until 2030.

So, it is the work and projects that have been completed in record time that have convinced the people of Zimbabwe to demand the term length to be extended to seven years, for the current and succeeding President, so that the second dispensation may start and complete new projects and the few that are still a work in progress. The people of Zimbabwe are not saying anyone should stay forever; that is naturally impossible. They only want an additional two-year extension to the current term and successive seven-year terms thereafter.

It was not electoral violence that pushed the millions of Zimbabweans to demand the term length extension. In fact, in 2023, we had the most peaceful election ever. It was an irreversible astronomical development trajectory that made the millions of

Zimbabweans demand the term length extension. For the past two years hitherto, the echoes became louder and louder from every corner, every ward, traditional leaders, every village, almost all churches, except a few church denominations whose missions were closely tied to our occupiers or the then colonialists during the War of Liberation. Some of these denominations have not repented of their intention. I feel it is high time that they must be reminded not to depart from their mission of preaching the good news of the Lord Jesus Christ and not to entangle themselves in opposition politics, which has dismally failed in Zimbabwe...

HON. ENG. MHANGWA: On a point of order. There is an assertion that was made by Hon. Dhliwayo, which asserts that certain churches, most of them very honourable, have worked with this country even in the toughest times of the liberation struggle. Their call for justice has been called opposition activities. I call on you to withdraw unconditionally.

THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER (HON. MUGOMO):
Honourable, I think you got your time to debate. Allow the Hon.

Member to debate. You were given your own time; then you debated.

Allow the Hon. Member to debate.

HON. ENG. MHANGWA: The integrity of this House is at stake. Allowing that to flow would have so many repercussions. It is okay, Madam Speaker, if you are supporting such a skewed perspective. Thank you for holding that.

HON. DHLIWAYO: It is therefore not surprising to see 99.5% of more than half a million of those who participated in the Public Hearing voicing their support for Constitutional Amendment Bill Number 3. A few, only less than 1%, could not fathom such an overwhelming majority could support the Bill. They were still stuck on the 2023 election outcome despite the fact that His Excellency the President, Dr. E. D. Mnangagwa, had the majority vote. They expected the same results. They forgot to take into account two main variables: time difference and the developments that have taken place to date.

This is 2026. The harmonised election took place in 2023. There was no Trabablas then. There is one now and some are a work in progress. State-of-the-art cancer machines have not been procured

then. Now they have been procured. We had no stable currency for our own then. Now we have a stable, gold-backed ZIG currency. Time will not allow me to mention many other flagship infrastructure projects such as roads, hospital rehabilitation, water and sanitation, among others, which were not completed then. Such developments naturally make the second dispensation more attractive.

Madam Speaker, I went on to scientifically determine whether the number of participants are sample size was statistically adequate considering a finite population of about 6 million registered voters. Despite the fact that in practise only around 60% actually vote, I used the highest potential number of voters of 6 million. The reason why I defined my population as eligible voters is basically because the crux or apex of the debate in question on the CAB3, at least in my opinion, is on presidential and parliamentary elections and the electoral cycle.

I therefore set my aim at 6 million. I also wanted a sample size that gives us the minimum margin of error of 1% given our population size. This implies that I set a 99% confidence level for rejecting a null hypothesis. With this variable in place, I then employed the widely used Cochran sample size formula. The answer I

obtained is 5 966, which is approximately 6 000. This implies that, according to the Cochran sample size model, at least 6 000 participants or respondents were enough to determine whether eligible voters were endorsing CAB3 or not for the given confidence level and margin of error.

However, we went overboard to get an overwhelming half a million participants, with more than 99% endorsing all the clauses and a paltry less than 1% rejecting the amendment. This is not mere statistics but the voice of the people. They were voicing continued price stability. They were voicing their support for continued positive economic growth. They were voicing their support for continued balance of payment stability. This, in my opinion, was a result of the captain of the ship, to be specific.

***HON. HAMAUSWA:** On a point of Order. Here in this House, on the seat that you are seated, the Presiding Officer of this House, Hon. Speaker Mudenda, stated that whenever you talk about issues that involve statistics, the numbers must be easy to verify. The statistics that he is referring to, of millions, I do not think he can provide a document to support that.

***THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER:** Hon. Hamauswa, do not say you do not think because you do not know whether Hon. Dhliwayo is going to produce the statistics in documents or not. Allow him to debate and finish.

HON. DHLIWAYO: Thank you, Madam Speaker, for your protection. This, in their opinion, was a result of the captain of the ship, to be specific. They cannot imagine slipping back into the 2008 economic quagmire and Parliament, for the people and by the people, cannot be seen opposing the voice of the people.

Madam Speaker, let us not forget, it took us more than 20 years since the Black Friday of 1997 to find a working formula, a working solution to the 10 years defined by the current crisis, exchange rate volatility and price instability, economic recession and widening balance of payment deficit. We cannot forget those years when our supermarkets were defined by empty shelves, when winding queues in shop verandas and safe stations were the order of the day and night. Now, we have fully stocked the supermarkets with more than 60% of locally manufactured products. Fewer queues have disappeared. We now have a working Zimbabwe gold currency.

Only last week, we just landed one of the most powerful non-permanent seats of the UN Security Council. The G7 countries such as Germany could not make it. This is Africa's endorsement of our Diplomat-in-Chief, Africa's and the world at large's endorsement of our engagement and re-engagement diplomacy, the world's endorsement of our country's international image and relations, as alluded to by Hon. Shamu in his point of national interest.

Once again, befitting congratulations to the sons of the soil, befitting congratulations to our Diplomat-in-Chief and the President, His Excellency, Dr. E. D. Mnangagwa, Munhumutapa. To the Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Hon. Prof. Murwira and team, a job well done indeed! - [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*]- It is in this vein that, on behalf of Chipinge East and on my own behalf, I stand supporting Constitutional Amendment (No. 3) Bill (CAB 3), especially Clauses 4, 9 and 10, which represent the wishes of the millions of Zimbabweans that came out in their hundreds of thousands to support the extension of the term length from five years to seven years, both for the President and the

Members of Parliament, amending Sections 95, 143 and 158 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe.

This will allow policy consistency and accountability during the tenure of the National Development Strategy 2 and align it with regional, continental and global frameworks such as the SADC Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) (2020-2030) and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (2015–2030). They are all coming to an end by the year 2030. Any policy disruption a year or two years before the end of these programmes is most likely to trigger some adverse economic effects and accountability challenges.

After 2030, the Second Republic leadership has to account for the Vision 2030 blueprint. The leadership has to account for the National Development Strategy blueprint. An additional two years does not mean the current President is indispensable. This can only be done if the founders of such programmes drive their vision to the end.

Defining a seven-year term as indispensable leadership tenure is misplaced. A seven-year term does not mean the absence of democracy. There is no empirical evidence that shows that less than

seven years means more democratic space, never, neither does a seven-year term mean a lack of democracy. We have many mature democracies with a seven-year term, such as Italy. A seven-year term does not imply regressivity. Mind you, we are not here to represent the voice of scholars but the millions of Zimbabweans who, without mincing their words, want this amendment. In fact, it is two years late.

Moreover, as some debaters before have already alluded to, such constitutional reforms are not unique to Zimbabwe but have since been implemented by even the so-called founders of democracy. In Europe, several countries have since moved to seven-year presidential terms, including but not limited to Italy, Ireland and Kazakhstan.

Madam Speaker Ma'am, let me come closer home. To the sub-Saharan African countries of which we are a part. In the year 2008, Cameroon amended its Constitution, which provided for a seven-year presidential term, followed by those of other countries. Guinea conducted a public consultation in which about 25 000 people participated to enter its Sabbath. Yet in our case, more than half a

million. These millions are our bosses. They want the amendment to be done.

Madam Speaker Ma'am, who are we to resist the Sabbath of the Lord? After seven years, then shall there be rest. Far be it from us, as Parliament, that we are found hindering the millions of Zimbabwe by not allowing sufficient time. A formula that has hallowed the supremacy of economics over politics, the supremacy of real economic development over slogans, defined by tangible products beyond the ability to read and write. The Second Republic has rewritten the principles of political science. The benefits of frequent elections, beyond those of printing election materials, the world-over, must be reconsidered.

Coming to direct *versus* indirect votes. Some think the indirect vote will rob the Zimbabweans of one man, one vote. Do they imply that South Africa is denying its citizens their right to vote? Is Botswana denying its citizens? Is the USA, which uses an electoral system, denying its citizens, the right to vote? Surely not; that thought is misplaced.

Studies have shown that the majority of people vote on a partisan basis, which is not threatened in this Bill. It is actually strengthened. The Constitutional Amendment Bill also seeks to reform our voting model. This enhances institutional capacity as voting will be dictated along partisan lines. Chipinge East applauded this amendment, as it eliminates the possibility of delays in forming the government due to mere court cases. The worst-case scenario is when the loser argues that the party he does not belong to has voted for him. The Bill brings such madness to an end.

Moreover, it eliminates the big-name mentality above the superiority of political parties. In political parties' constitutions, they are tempted to try and make the political party spring over individuals. However, this has not been the case, especially in opposition parties in Zimbabwe. The big-name mentality has weakened opposition politics as noble ideas are ignored in favour of the so-called big names in opposition circles. It also eliminates the possibility of populating or littering the voters' roll with presidential candidates, with no one to vote for them except themselves. This lowers printing costs and enhances efficiency.

In short, what this clause is saying is that you can only become President...

***HON. MAKUMIRE:** On a point of order. He cannot continue to read what he is reading because the time is up. - [HON.

MEMBERS: *Inaudible interjections.*]-

***THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER:** Order Hon. Makumire. You are not minor children who have to be constantly reprimanded. I have a watch with me and am keeping the time. So, you cannot tell me what to do. I am the one who told him to stop after four minutes.

Wrap up, Hon. Dhliwayo.

HON. DHLIWAYO: Thank you Madam Speaker Ma'am. In fact, the indirect vote is a master ...

HON. CHIGUMBU: On a point of order. Can you clarify to us, Members? We were once told that you are not the one who holds the watch. Now, you are saying that you are the one who is timekeeping.

***THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER:** Thank you Hon. Member. May you take your seat? Can you please continue Hon. Dhliwayo?

HON. MAKUMIRE: Point of privilege, Madam Speaker, you cannot automatically adjust or increase time for the debater without

the consent of the House. We must give you consent. You cannot just make a ruling to say I have given you extra time without our consent. We are a House of Rules and Orders. You must be bound; you must be governed by this *Green Book*. You cannot just increase time without our...

***THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER:** Order Hon. Makumire, I have got time here, that is why I have told him that he has got four minutes left.

HON. MAKUMIRE: No, you must be guided by this...

***THE TEMPORARY SPEAKER:** We have heard you. Thank you and you may sit down. Hon. Dhliwayo, you may continue.

HON. DHLIWAYO: Thank you Madam Speaker, I am done.

***HON. MABURUTSE:** Thank you Madam Speaker, for giving me this opportunity to add my voice on the Constitutional Amendment (No. 3) Bill. Personally, and on behalf of Chivi South Constituency, we are in full support of Amendment (No. 3) Bill. I want to thank Hon. Z. Ziyambi and everyone else with whom he worked together with, who brought forth this Bill before this Parliament. I am in full support of the extension of the term of the

President from 5 to 7 years. This gives the Government, led by His Excellency E. D. Mnangagwa, an opportunity to finish the national projects, which Zimbabweans are dearly crying for. There is no one with a question on the extension of his term. The Chivi South Constituency wants the term to be extended so that the Tokwe Mukosi Master Plan will be finished. We have a dam called Kunzvi Dam, which we are looking forward to being completed together with Gwayi-Shangani. There is no one who is not willing for these projects to be completed.

On the election of the President by Parliament, guided by Section 97 of our Constitution, which allows this Parliament to impeach the President, I see no hindrance that the people who are given the powers to impeach fail to get the same powers to elect. I believe that many people, except for a few who have different opinions, once the majority says something, it has been said as they say *chakanaka chakanaka mukaka haurungwi munyu*. This is indeed a Bill and I suggest that it remains like that because it encourages our country to carry on with development. It stops funds from being

driven out but encourages the development of Zimbabwe as a nation.

With these words. I thank you.

**THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE, LEGAL AND
PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (HON. Z. ZIYAMBI):** I move that
the debate do now adjourn.

Motion put and agreed to

Debate to resume: Wednesday, 10th June, 2026.

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