

PARLIAMENT OF ZIMBABWE

Tuesday, 4th August, 2026

The Senate met at Half-past Two o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

(THE HON. DEPUTY PRESIDENT OF SENATE *in the Chair*)

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE HON. DEPUTY PRESIDENT OF
SENATE**

BILL RECEIVED FROM THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY:

**BIOLOGICAL AND TOXIN WEAPONS CRIMES BILL [H. B. 9A,
2025]**

THE HON. DEPUTY PRESIDENT OF SENATE: I would like to inform the Senate that I have received the Biological and Toxin Weapons Crimes Bill [H. B. 9A, 2025] from the National Assembly.

SWITCHING OFF OF CELLPHONES

THE HON. DEPUTY PRESIDENT OF SENATE: I would like to remind Hon. Senators to put your gadgets on silent or better still, switch them off.

MOTION

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE, LABOUR AND SOCIAL WELFARE (HON. DINHA): I move that Orders of the Day, Numbers 1 to 3 on today's *Order Paper* be stood over until the rest of the Orders of the Day have been disposed of.

Motion put and agreed to.

COMMITTEE STAGE

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH BILL [H. B. 6, 2025]

Fourth Order read: Committee Stage: Occupational Safety and Health Bill [H. B. 6, 2025].

House in Committee.

Clause 1 put and agreed to.

On Clause 2:

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Madam Chair, I propose that we insert because there is no consultation in terms of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), so we said the consultation shall be between

the labour based on the Convention 1976. In fact, what we want is the inclusion of a tripartite so that there is labour, Government and business.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE, LABOUR AND SOCIAL WELFARE (HON. DINHA): Thank you Madam Chair. I would like the Hon. Senator to clarify on the inclusion of tripartite. Thank you.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: I think every member of an international organisation that ratifies the Convention undertakes to operate under a tripartite structure. So, Hon. Minister, the Government should not really work on its own but they should consult within the ambit of the tripartite so that we do not have the capture of the institution by the Government of the day.

HON. DINHA: Thank you Madam Chair. Right now, we are dealing with Clause 2 and the issue of the inclusion of a tripartite will be addressed as we move with the Bill. Right now, it is not necessary.

Clause 3 put and agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 13 put and agreed to.

On Clause 14:

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: There is no specification of the representatives of workers. Unions should be registered. So, it cannot say workers. It should be workers of a registered union.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE, LABOUR AND SOCIAL WELFARE (HON. DINHA): Thank you Madam Chair. Here, our reference to workers is all workers. This Bill deals with all workers and protects all of them. When we say workers, even those who are not members of the union are also included. That is why there is this word ‘workers’ because there is everyone. Thank you.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: The idea of an Act is to ensure that workers are registered. You are working as a tripartite at the national level because those organisations are registered. So, you cannot meet a tripartite. There are so many employers and workers in the country. When we put the law, it should encourage everyone to register because the Government cannot meet employers and workers who are not registered. It defeats the whole purpose of you meeting at a tripartite level and then the tripartite level is not being encouraged by the same

players at the national level. Yes, the Act will say it represents all workers, but workers must be registered through unions.

HON. SEN. ZVIDZAI: I have got a debate Madam Chair. I think the absurdity of what the Minister is saying is that she can just walk down First Street and say, you come and represent workers. Is that practical?

HON. DINHA: Thank you Madam President. As I have said earlier, the idea of the Bill is to protect the working people and we know that there are unions. That is why Clauses 2 and 3 say workers and their representatives. Representatives, meaning their unions regardless of which union they have joined. Here, we are talking about workers and on Clauses 2 and 3, there is reference to their representatives which are their unions. Thank you.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Yes, but we do not have to speculate...

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON (HON. SEN. A. DUBE): No, Hon. Tshabangu, I have not given you the floor. Why can

you not wait until I give you the floor? Yes, Hon. Tshabangu, you can now take the floor.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: What I am saying to the Minister, in response, is that law should define. You should not make anybody out there to speculate what you mean by representative. I can get a lawyer to represent me. I can get a friend to represent me. We have to ensure that the unions are registered. Unless if you want just to run this thing yourselves and then we just go, but you are creating a mess. Some of us come from the labour. What do you lose by putting and setting a term to indicate that these are registered? They should be represented by their register unions – [HON. MEMBERS: *Hear, hear.*] -

HON. SEN. MAVENYENGWA: Thank you Madam Chair. I think this clause is correct as it is because when we say workers, I think we are including those in the workers' unions ... - [HON. SEN. ZVIDZAI: *Point of order.*] – I am debating, I want to debate, I am not answering for the Minister. – [HON. SEN. ZVIDZAI: *A point of order is posed even when a person is debating, sit down.*] – I am

still debating – [HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: *The Minister must respond, you are not the Minister, we are not debating through you. Respect us.*] –

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: Hon. Senators –

[HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: *No, the Minister has to respond first.*]

– Hon. Tshabangu, no, we do not do that – [HON. SEN.

TSHABANGU: *It does not work like that, he is not the Minister.*

The Hon. Minister is there to respond, why is Hon. Mavenyengwa responding on behalf of the Hon. Minister?] - Order Hon.

Tshabangu – [HON. SEN. ZVIDZAI: *There is a point of order, sit down Hon. Mavenyengwa.* What point of order Hon. Zvidzai?

HON. SEN. ZVIDZAI: Thank you Hon. Chairperson. My point of order is...

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: Hon. Sen. Zvidzai, sit down. Hon. Mavenyengwa, sit down. Hon. Zvidzai, can you sit down, you are not the one who was debating and can you sit down so that I give the Hon. Minister an opportunity to respond.

HON. SEN. ZVIDZAI: I have got a point of order Madam Chair.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: For what? I said sit down Mavenyengwa.

HON. SEN. ZVIDZAI: I think it is unfair. I have got a point of order which must be responded to.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: Let the Hon. Minister respond.

HON. SEN. ZVIDZAI: What have you said about my point of order? Have you pushed it out?

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: I said he must sit down. I did not take his debate.

HON. ZVIDZAI: Sorry?

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: I did not take his debate. I want the Minister to respond to what you said. No, I want the Minister to respond to what you said – [HON. TSHABANGU: *Madam Chair, but the point of order supercedes...*] – No, I want the Minister to respond to

what you said – [HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: *But Hon. Mavenyengwa debated.*] – Yes, he debated, you debated, then I want the Hon. Minister to respond. I do not want the Hon. Mavenyengwa to respond. I want the Minister to respond. Hon. Minister, I give you the floor to give the clarity.

HON. DINHA: Thank you Madam Chair. Like I said, the idea is to protect all workers, whether they are involved with unions or not, because some workers are not registered with unions. So, if you want, we can include the definition of representatives, then we include the unions.

HON.SEN. TSHABANGU: I think let us take her proposal in the definitions. So, we have to go back to the definitions, this is what you are saying?

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: She has made a proposal that we should include the unions in the definitions. So, I am saying, should we go back to the definitions? I did not quite get your proposal, the last part of your proposal.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: Can we have the amendment written down so that we do not mix everything? Please, can we have the amendment written down?

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: It is the Hon. Minister who proposed. I proposed and then she rejected and then put a counter-proposal. So, she should put it down.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: I think the Hon. Minister has clarified. So, I say, can you put down the amendment so that we have the amendments in writing?

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Madam Chairperson, in writing? So, the Minister is responding to the amendments that I have put in writing and submitted to you but she is suggesting...

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: Hon. Minister. Can you approach the Chair.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE, LABOUR AND SOCIAL WELFARE (HON. DINHA): Thank you Madam Chair. On the issue of the workers and the unions, we are not amending anything because if we refer to Clause 40, there is inclusion of

tripartism. It is the establishment of the Zimbabwe Occupational Safety and Health Advisory Council and there is the issue of the employees' organisations. These employees' organisations are the unions, it means any organisation, trade union or association formed to represent.

I think Clause 14 is clear. So we will deal with that one when we get to Clause 40. On Clause 14, it says workers and representatives and representatives can be lawyers or trade unions. It is carrying its literal meaning. So when we define it, it becomes discriminatory. We are not going to define "representative" because it is clear in Clause 14 and Clause 40.

Clause 14 put and agreed to.

Clauses 15 and 32 put and agreed to.

On Clause 33:

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: I propose that we insert corporate liability and deterrent penalties. The justification is that you cannot replace life. Most companies fail to take responsibility if something happens or if an employee dies at the workplace level. This amendment introduces corporate liability and personal accountability where an

offence causes death and penalty disability. The company faces a minimum of 50 000 so that we have these deterrent penalties because they are not even prescribed. The Act does not prescribe the penalties when an employee dies at work through negligence, not negligence caused by him or her as an employee but by the company.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE, LABOUR AND SOCIAL WELFARE (HON. DINHA): Thank you Madam Chair. If you look at Section 45, it says any person who causes the death of another person at the workplace shall be guilty of an offence and the provisions of Section 49 of the Criminal Law Codification and Reform Act shall apply with necessary changes to the sentencing of such guilty persons. On the death of such person, I think we have to refer to the Criminal Law Codification and Reform Act. Thank you.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Yes, I have seen that but my point is, if you go anywhere in the SADC, there is a prescription; the law should define that there is an employee who died at work because of the negligence of the management or the company. This is defined. If we do not do deterrent penalties like that, people are going to continue dying in

their workplaces. They continue to die, and I do not think we make laws to ensure that people die in their workplaces. We make laws to protect workers and everyone else in the workplace, so they do not succumb to employer negligence. What is the harm to prescribe if it is proven beyond any reasonable doubt in any court of law that the employer was negligent? This is the prescription that you are supposed to compensate. You cannot replace life. If I can have a pushback to the Hon. Minister and say, what is the cost, what is the compensation for an employee who dies at work when the employer does not put measures that are required in terms of law?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE, LEGAL AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (HON. MAZUNGUNYE): Thank you Madam Chair. I would also like to thank the Hon. Member for the contributions. However, I feel that if we take a closer look at the Act, clearly Section 35 spells out what is prescribed if an employer causes or is negligent to the extent of causing the death of another. It prescribes the prescription in terms of Section 49 of the Criminal Law Codification Act, [Chapter 9:23]. If we are to interpret the Offences and Penalties

Chapter, we have to refer to Section 49 of the Criminal Law Codification and Reform Act. We cannot say it has not been spelled out. It has been clearly prescribed. If you go to Section 49, it is clearly described because that is culpable homicide. When it has already been legislated, what is the point of legislating again when it has already been spelled out that whenever there is a culpable homicide offence, it has been spelled out where the harm is in this Act by referring it to another piece of legislation. I feel it is the issue of referencing or referring a clause to another clause; it is not new in our legislation when we do legislate.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: A pushback, Madam President. We are talking about issues to do with labour. This is why we have a Labour Court. This is why it is distinguished. Issues of labour are separate. You cannot take a labour issue to the High Court because we have independent issues. Why should we go to a criminal Act? This is not a criminal Act. This is not criminal conduct. It is a labour issue which should be prescribed.

If an employee dies and his family goes to the Labour Court, because they want to sue the company, they are referred back to the criminal Act. Why should our laws and labour be streamlined? We have independently streamlined them. We have courts, there is a labour officer and there is a Labour Court. So, these are issues of labour. Why should we intertwine them with the criminal Act?

HON. MAZUNGUNYE: Thank you Madam Chair. I think the Hon. Member is missing the point here. Indeed, we are discussing labour issues but when it comes to sentencing and the nature of any transaction that would have occurred, we are dealing with labour of course, but now we are talking of culpable homicide. That is criminal in nature.

There is a criminal penalty associated with it which has been well defined before. Of course, the cause of action would have happened in a labour setting, at a workplace but when there is the death of another person, then it becomes culpable homicide. It has to be dealt with in terms of criminal law because it is already criminal law.

The moment there is negligence, whether at a workplace or anywhere to the extent of causing the death of another, it becomes

culpable homicide. There is no harm in us dealing or concentrating on the Criminal Law Codification and Reform Act. It does not interfere with any worker-employer relationship in so many ways but as soon as we have that situation, it becomes culpable homicide and it has to be dealt with in terms of the Criminal Law Codification and Reform Act.

As it is, by referring the penalty, it is also deterrent enough by criminalising any action which leads to the death of another. It clearly shows that the legislature here has clearly spelled out the deterrent measures in the event that you are negligent of leaving or not giving adequate protection to the workers. I so submit.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: If that is the case, why not import it and put it there since the circumstances are different? A culpable homicide is when someone runs over someone by car and that is a criminal act but it is not the same as you are not given protective clothing at your workplace and then you die. Those circumstances will be different. They will be argued differently. Hon. Minister, let me give you an example. If you go to South Africa today, you are...

HON. CHAPFUDZA: Madam President, I need some clarifications. I think here we are dealing with a double-edged sword that this culpable homicide has happened at a place of work in line with things to do with labour.

After the company has been convicted of culpable homicide, what is the compensation? On the criminal side, it has been proven that there was negligence and it has been treated as culpable homicide but on the Act, what is it now suggesting as compensation for that which has been proven by the court? That is I think where the beef is, that the Act should also say, if proven guilty in the criminal court, then there is such and such a penalty as to compensation. Thank you.

HON. SEN. MAZUNGUNYE: Thank you Madam Chair. First and foremost, let me address the issue that has been said before in respect of culpable homicide, whether the definition of culpable homicide is when you unintentionally cause the death of another and maybe you have been negligent in doing so. So, whether it has happened on the road, at a workplace or anywhere but if you cause the death of another unintentionally, it becomes culpable homicide.

So, it is okay for it to be dealt with as I have said earlier on, but also in respect of the issues raised by another Hon. Member, there are procedures which are already clearly laid out. If you succeed in a criminal matter, you can still pursue damages in court. We might not need to over-legislate when we are crafting laws.

Therefore, we still have so many avenues where you can seek recourse in that regard. Primarily, this piece of legislation deals with the need to protect the workers at the workplace. So, we might not need to over-legislate the way we intend to do it inasmuch as we need to protect our workers.

Clause 33 put and agreed to.

Clauses 34 to 37 put and agreed to

On Clause 38:

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Thank you Madam President. It is 38 (b) (2), Donations. There is no Act under which it can operate on donations. You cannot rely on donations. The theory of putting an Act there has to be a levy which you can control, ring-fence and predetermine the future. So, where are you going to get these donations

from? If they do not come, what happens? So, I propose that we introduce a 0.5% levy, which is about \$3 based on the current salaries of the employees. However, the challenge is that you cannot put these levies in here. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE, LABOUR AND SOCIAL WELFARE (HON. DINHA): Thank you Madam Chair. I also want to thank the Hon. Senator and say that he is right, we cannot rely on donations only but if we refer to Clause 38 (b), it says that there are fees charged by the authority. So, these fees can act as funding. Nonetheless, we cannot block anyone who wants to donate. We have also talked about the 3% levy on the workers, but we think workers are already overtaxed and so, we cannot burden them with the 3%.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Thank you. Madam President, I have never seen an Act where you write donations. Donations from who? Let us remove that. Donations from who? Who donates? You cannot supplement an Act, no. If I donate today as an individual, then I have taken charge of that Act. That is point number one Madam President.

We cannot put donations in an Act. Who are you receiving these monies from? The Minister gives you or other organisations but civic organisations donate. How then would you account for that amount?

Secondly, it should prescribe if there are any funds. The law must expressly spell them out. The Act is silent on those funds that you are talking about. How is this going to be funded? Hon. Minister, where will the donations come from?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE, LEGAL AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (HON. MAZUNGUNYE): Thank you Madam Chair. We appreciate the sentiments being raised by Hon. Sen. Tshabangu but I must hasten to point out that the harm which the Hon. Member is indicating is in respect of putting donations in the legislation. I am of the opinion that there is nothing wrong. We actually have several Acts which also include donations when legislating. So, maybe what we would do is to seek clarification as to the inclusion of the actual percentage of the tax referred to, but donations can be from anyone. I may also want to seek further clarification as to where the harm is, because donations may come from anyone. In the legislation, it

is being allowed and it can still be regulated through regulation. We can have regulations which dictate the manner in which those donations can be accepted. So, to indicate donation in an Act, I would not see anything wrong with that. If I had examples, I would have shown them to you but there are sections or Acts where the inclusion of donations is there in our legislation. I so submit Madam Chair.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Madam Chair, he suggested a levy and we are still debating. When is he going to look at that levy that I suggested? In his response, he said we will look into it. That is critical Madam President. At what stage are they going to look into it when we have passed this Bill? I am asking because we are actually dealing with the amendment now.

HON. DINHA: Thank you Madam President. If we go to Clause 38 (a), it says funding of the fund to the extent permitted under the Fourth Schedule. If we go to the Fourth Schedule, there is the assessment paid by employers, money paid by employers to the general manager, money paid as penalties, interest from investments of funds and any money transferred in terms of paragraph 3 (c). So, you can see

that there is no need for the percentage to be charged to the workers because the funding is there. We cannot also remove donations because even the Government and other companies can receive donations.

Hence, we cannot block anyone who wants to donate. I am sure you can see that in terms of that, there is a lot of funding and there is no need to overburden the workers with the 3% levy charge from their salaries.

Clause 38 put and agreed to.

Clause 39 put and agreed to.

On Clause 40:

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Madam Chair, the Minister appoints all these members. I want to put the amendment that I suggested earlier that one representative from the registered employers' organisation; you just send six representatives from the employer organisations, which of the employer organisations? There are quite a number of them, but they have to be registered because you will speak about tripartite. I also want the Chairperson, just like what happens at the tripartite level, you have a rotation that the Chairperson, after a certain period of time, the Labour

chairs and the business chairs on a rotational basis. My two fundamental submissions are that it has to be clear which organisation here.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE, LABOUR AND SOCIAL WELFARE (HON. DINHA): Thank you Madam Chair. I do not see anything wrong for the Minister to appoint the representatives that are stated here. As you were saying here in Clause 40, that is there is the inclusion of tripartite, any organisation is chaired by the Chairperson. You cannot say they rotate. There will be the Chairperson or maybe the Vice Chairperson. So, we cannot say this one chairs and that one chairs. In the case of the employer organisation, it says there are six representatives from the employer organisations.

When we are talking of tripartism, we do not deal with unregistered organisations. All organisations that we deal with are registered, whether they are employer organisations or employee organisations. Thank you Madam Chair.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Madam President, I hear the Hon. Minister. The point that we are trying to drive home is that we should

not assume when we are making law. What is the harm Hon. Minister?

Okay, a deviation from my point, you are dealing with...

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: Address the Chair Hon. Sen. Tshabangu.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: Madam Chair, you are dealing with registered organisations. I am glad that you have said that yourself. How does the Minister appoint members? It is the organisation, and the Minister should seek the names from the organisation...

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: Thank you Hon. Sen. Tshabangu.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: I am not yet done Madam Chair. I want to make my point.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: Can you make your point so that the Minister responds. The Minister should not appoint. He should get the members that are seconded by the registered, but when you say the Minister appoints, tomorrow he is given the power to appoint someone from ZCTU, ZFTU or even leave ZCTU.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE, LEGAL AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (HON. MAZUNGUNYE): Thank you Madam Chair. I would like to appreciate the sentiments raised by the Hon. Member. If we are to go to Section 40, it clearly defines what is under subsection (1). It clearly defines what employees' organisations are, where it says it means any organisation, trade union or association formed to represent or advance the interests of the employees or class thereof, in respect of their employment. So, any registered organisation is defined here. If we proceed to the employers' organisations, it is also defined as any organisation or association formed to represent or advance the interests of the employers or groups thereof, in respect to matters relating to employment.

So, in that regard, organisations are clearly defined in terms of the Bill. If you are to proceed to subsection 2 or subsection 3 rather, it says the council shall constitute members appointed by the ministers and it goes on to list that the members should be from the Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Health, Transport and (b), it indicates six representatives from the employers' organisations.

First and foremost, the employers' organisations will be represented. These representatives are coming from employers' organisations. There is no way they can appoint themselves to the council. They have to be appointed by the Minister. Since they are drawn from representatives, they nominate, they agree, they sit and they provide candidates. When they provide candidates, it is the Minister who then appoints.

So, there is no way they can appoint themselves into the Advisory Council. They would be appointed by the Minister but it has to be clear in respect of the concerns that the Hon. Member is raising, that these six representatives are coming from the organisations. So, they will give their names, and the names they provide; it is the Minister who then proceeds to appoint, unless if you wanted it to be crafted in a different manner, but as it is, clearly, members will come from the representatives. They will sit as unions and agree that so and so will be part of the council, then the Minister appoints.

Clause 40 put and agreed to.

Clauses 41 to 48 put and agreed to.

First, Second, Third and Fourth Schedules put and agreed to.

HON. SEN. DZVIDZAI: On a point of order Madam Chair.

Madam Chair, the Minister proposed an amendment in this House, subject to input from Senator Tshabangu.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: It was explained very well, Hon. Sen. Zvidzai. The Minister explained!

HON. SEN. DZVIDZAI: It was explained by the Minister...

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: You are now out of order.

HON. SEN. DZVIDZAI: Mr. President, why, do you muzzle us? I am saying I heard clearly, following Senator Tshabangu's input, the Minister came up with an alternative amendment and she said so.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: With all due respect, Madam Chair, if this is the way we are going to craft laws as policy makers, then we are a disaster. When we make laws, we should not be partisan. When Ministers come to present their Bills here, they should be receptive to our amendments and input. We are not rubber stampers here.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: No, Hon. Tshabangu, after that statement, the Minister responded again and there was no objection.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: I am giving an overall view. We are disappointed. This attitude, this arrogance that is being perpetuated by the Minister...

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: You are not allowed to say that, Hon. Tshabangu.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: I withdraw the statement but what I am trying to say is, we ought to be respected. When we make input, it does not mean that we want to go and be employed there. We are making these laws for the future. They should not come here as if this thing was written for them. If they want to pass the Bill, they should do it on their own.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON: There was no objection.

HON. SEN. TSHABANGU: This is unheard of; I have to express my displeasure. Ministers should be considerate. They should do it on their own, they should not come here. No, they should not come here,

Madam Chair. Why should we give them a quorum for this Bill to pass? We are not going to give them a quorum for this Bill to pass. We do not want to be involved in this way. We are not going to give you the quorum for this Bill to pass. We are making these amendments; we have researched. We are making these amendments in good heart, good spirit. When we did CAB 3, Hon. Minister Ziyambi took our amendments and the Bill was brought back to the National Assembly. No, no, no, we cannot do that.

HON. SEN. GOTORA: Hon. Tshabangu has given a lot of information in this House and the Ministers responded. After the Ministers' responses, there was no follow-up to come up with an actual amendment. I assume they thought that we had understood the explanations coming from the Ministers. In fact, the whole debate was between Hon. Tshabangu and the two Ministers, which is very good. He was not muzzled.

House resumed.

Bill reported without amendments.

Third Reading: With leave, forthwith.

THIRD READING

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH BILL [H. B. 6, 2025]

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE, LABOUR
AND SOCIAL WELFARE (HON. DINHA):** Mr. President Sir, I now
move that the Bill be read the third time.

Motion put and agreed to.

Bill read the third time.

MOTION

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE, LEGAL AND
PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (HON. MAZUNGUNYE):** Thank
you Mr. President. I move that we revert to Order of the Day Number
1 on today's *Order Paper*.

Motion put and agreed to.

MOTION

APPROVAL FOR THE RATIFICATION OF THE CONVENTION ON
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNAL ORGANISATION FOR

MEDIATION IN HONG KONG SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE
REGION

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE, LEGAL AND
PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (HON. MAZUNGUNYE):** Thank

you Mr. President. I move the motion standing in my name;

THAT WHEREAS Section 327 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe provides that any Convention, Treaty or Agreement acceded to, concluded or executed by or under the authority of the President with one or more foreign states of governments or international organisations shall be subject to approval by Parliament;

WHEREAS the Republic of Zimbabwe signed the Convention establishing the International Organisation for Mediation on 30th May, 2025 in Hong Kong, Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, whereas the Convention will advance and promote the use of mediation and will be a useful complement to existing international dispute settlement mechanisms;

AND WHEREAS the Republic of Zimbabwe is desirous of ratifying the Convention and

NOW, THEREFORE, in terms of Section 327 (2) (a) of the Constitution of Zimbabwe, this House resolves that the aforesaid Convention be and is hereby approved for ratification. I so submit Mr. President.

***HON. SEN. MAVENYENGWA:** Mr. President, I believe that signing this agreement is good because in Zimbabwe, we value freedom and peace. When there are conflicts, we want people to talk about it and resolve issues amicably. I have risen in support of that Convention. We want this House to support the Convention because it promotes peace. I do not think that there is much and neither is there anyone to disagree because it is an issue that has to do with safeguarding lives. I thank you.

HON. MAZUNGUNYE: Thank you Mr. President. We also take this opportunity to appreciate the debate from Hon. Mavenyengwa and also his fair affirmation in supporting the Convention here said. We are thankful for the debate and appreciate his sentiments. I thank you. —

[HON. SENATORS: *Hear, hear.*] —

Motion put and agreed to.

On the motion of **THE MINISTER OF HIGHER AND
TERTIARY EDUCATION, INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND
TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (HON. DR. SHAVA)**, *the House
adjourned at Eleven Minutes past Four o'clock p.m.*