

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

OFFICIAL REPORT

Wednesday, 2nd April, 1997

The House met at 2.30 p.m.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The Oath of Allegiance was administered to the following Members:-
Jimmy Nuru Ondiek Angwenyi
Raila Amolo Odinga

PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The Vice-President and Minister for Planning and National Development (Prof. Saitoti): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following procedural Motion:-

THAT, the debate on the Motion of Presidential Address be limited to a maximum of seven days, with not more than ten minutes for each Member speaking excluding the Mover in moving and replying who shall be limited to twenty minutes in either case.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this procedural Motion is in respect of the Presidential Address which was delivered by the Head of State during the State-Opening of Parliament yesterday. And because of the wish to allow as many hon. Members as possible to contribute to this Motion, this is why there is a limitation in time for each debater or contributor. At the same time, as it is traditional, it is proposed that they should take seven days.

Therefore, I beg to move this procedural Motion.

The Minister for Labour and Manpower Development (Mr. Masinde): Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this Motion. The Presidential Address is a very important address and it is important too that as many hon. Members as possible should be accorded the opportunity to discuss it. I am sure that ten minutes is quite adequate time so long as hon. Members remain relevant and to the point. This should give an opportunity to as many of them as possible to discuss it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, with those few remarks, I beg to second.

(Question proposed)

Mr. Orengo: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move an amendment to this Motion. I have already given in a written copy of the amendment that I propose to the Motion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment that I propose is that the Motion be amended by adding or inserting the following words immediately after the words "limited to 20 minutes in either case" on the third line and fourth lines: "and the Leader of the Official Opposition and the leaders of other political parties be limited to 20 minutes".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if my amendment is approved, then the Motion should read as follows:

THAT, the debate on the Motion of Presidential Address be limited to a maximum of seven days with not more than 10 minutes for each Member speaking excluding the Mover in moving and replying who shall be limited to 20 minutes in either case and the Leader of the Official Opposition and the leaders of the other political parties be limited to 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a procedural Motion, so I would not go to the merits, but the Presidential Address is a very important address at the State Opening of the House. As the Motion rightly reads under Order No.9, this speech is an exposition of public policy by the Government through the Head of State. This speech, in a way, articulated the views of the Government in respect of various issues which are contained in the Address and since I am not addressing that substantive Motion, it would be right for the leaders of the other parties in the Opposition, including the Official

Leader of the Opposition, to have a substantive response to the Motion and to the speech which was made by His Excellency the President.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, actually the object of asking for this amendment is that the Opposition should also be recognised and this is the practice in many Parliaments, that after an address of this nature, or after the budget speech, the parties represented in Parliament should have an official response to that exposition of public policy be it the financial statement or an address during the State Opening. I think the House would want to hear what the Official Leader of the Opposition would react to in that speech; what is the position of FORD(K), FORD(A), DP and KSC, and now that we have a Member for NDP, what is the position of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the spirit under which the Leader of Government Business moved this procedural Motion, I would ask hon. Anyona to second my amendment to the Motion.

(Applause)

Mr. Anyona: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel greatly honoured to rise to second this amendment. I think we have not adequately recognised the role and importance of the Presidential Address to Parliament. Listening to the speech yesterday, without going into the matter right now, it was quite clear that importance was not reflected in the substance of that speech. But nevertheless, the principle is that it is one occasion in the year when the President, on behalf of the Government and the country, lays down the policy that guides the Government in the course of the year. That is such an important matter that it must be given the treatment in the House that it deserves on both sides of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, exposition of public policy in recent years has lost meaning. When I first came to this House, we always looked forward to the wisdom of the President and the collective wisdom of the Government in the issues that were said in the policy. Over the years, I have been away for a long time, but since I have been here for the last four years, the position has been declining. Year after year, we have not had any exposition of public policy. I just want to say that to, underline the importance of the fact that this is an important speech, and we must really deliberate on it?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, multi-partyism in this country has been treated as a matter of a joke. I do not really know whether, when we decided to go multi-party, we seriously meant to go multi-party and to do what multi-partyism is supposed to do. It is in that respect that for the last four years in this House, there has been no recognition of a serious nature or, even of any nature at all, to the role of the Opposition in Parliament. There is no multi-partyism if there is no role of the Opposition in Parliament. We have parties out there which constitute multi-partyism in the country, but in Parliament, there are parties in the Opposition that are represented and in order to give multi-partyism meaning, it is incumbent on all of us in this nation to give equal weight and recognition to both sides of the House.

As I have said before in this House, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for many years we only had one House, so, what is new in this Parliament, and what is more important as far as I am concerned, is the fact that we now have two sides of the House. I want to plead with the Government side to seriously give recognition to the Opposition. Let us disregard the shortcomings of individual Members of Parliament, both in the Opposition and the Government side. Let us disregard the shortcomings of political parties either in the Opposition or in the Government, but let us recognise the principle that we do need a Government side such as we have, and we do even more seriously need an Opposition, and a strong and serious Opposition side as well.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, another mistake that has been made is to treat the Opposition as a single unit. It is as if the Opposition consisted of one political party. That might have been the case, but it is not. There are several parties that are represented on the Opposition Benches. I would like to believe that these parties have their own ideological and policy differences and that is what brings diversity to the politics of this nation. That is what brings variety to this Parliament. It is, therefore, important that whereas on certain occasions the Opposition may well decide that they would want to have one voice maybe through the Official Leader of the Opposition, but that is their voluntary choice. Otherwise, individual parties have the right to be heard in this House. After all, how does a party take character if we cannot know what that party stands for in Parliament, and it is in Parliament that a party can articulate its ideologies, policies and ideas? So, it is very important, therefore, that the leaders of the various political parties are recognised and given the necessary availability of time to be able to articulate their position.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I know that our friends on the other side are even now dreaming of governing this country for 100 years. That is an empty dream and it is not possible. But nevertheless, just keep on dreaming. The truth of the matter is that any other party in this House and any other party leader, I hope leaders are not permanent, has the right and ability of becoming President of this country. This is the time that we would like to know, when hon. Matiba becomes President - I saw him here right now - what kind of President he would be like. We do not want to be surprised one day when, someone has ascended to the highest throne of this nation, to find that he was not fit to be President after all. So, let us give the opportunity now, so that

these party leaders and others in the party can begin to develop their skills, so that this country has a potential of having able leadership in the future in spite of the high dreams by our friends on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to support.

*(Question, that the words to
be added be added, proposed)*

The Assistant Minister, Office of the President (Mr. Sunkuli): Mr. Speaker, Sir, of course, the Government knows that there is an Opposition. Although our hon. colleagues request us to recognise this fact, we already do this. When we reject this particular amendment, we do not do so because we do not recognise that there is Opposition. Under normal circumstances, it would be good to say that the leader of the Opposition does, in fact, say something on behalf of the Opposition. But, as hon. Anyona has himself put it very clearly, the Opposition in this country does not speak with one voice. First of all, if you ask the Leader of the Opposition to say something on behalf of the Opposition, he will say it on behalf of himself and not on behalf of the Opposition. Therefore, it would be good to allow the Leader of the Opposition to state his own opinion, because he represents nobody else apart from his constituency.

There is only one Opposition political party in this country that I know of, which speaks with one voice. This is the Kenya Social Congress. If today you ask the leader of FORD(A) to speak on behalf of the party, another eminent member of that party will want to say something contrary to what his own leader says. The recent gestation that has gone on in FORD(K) shows you that the process of mutation in the Opposition is going on. We must recognise this process of mutation. The only way of doing that is to allow the Government, which speaks with one voice, to speak as a Government, and allow each individual Member of the Opposition to speak for himself.

Mr. Obure: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is the hon. Assistant Minister in order to mislead the nation and this House by saying that it is only the Opposition that is divided when he knows that KANU is divided into groups A and B?

The Assistant Minister, Office of the President (Mr. Sunkuli): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to debate a hypothetical issue. What I am saying is that---

Mr. Munyasia: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Please we need your guidance. Is it true that there is no official Opposition party in this House and no Leader of the Opposition, as hon. Sunkuli appears to imply? Is he in order to disrespect the Opposition by asserting that we are just individual hon. Members representing our constituencies, and that we are not bound together in any party? At least I know that FORD(K) is the Official Opposition Party!

Mr. Speaker: Order! I invite the hon. Members to look at the Standing Orders and see that there is provision for the official Opposition Party, and we have the leader of that party. But if you want to know, the practice is, and has always been in Commonwealth countries, that wherever there is an official Opposition Party, the leader of that party has an automatic right to first respond on any Government issue. That is the position.

The Assistant Minister, Office of the President (Mr. Sunkuli): And, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is a very good opportunity for the leader of the Opposition to state his position.

Mr. Anyona: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I think the hon. Assistant Minister, who is a friend of mine, is getting himself mixed up. I think there is a misconception on the part of the Government. Are they in order to talk about the Leader of the Opposition? There is no such thing here! There is a Leader of the Official Opposition! Secondly, are they in order to imply that each party has more than one leader? There is only one recognised leader of each party.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Can I give guidance here so as to remove any further unnecessary entanglement in this issue, so that we can deal with the amendment as it is? The question of the amendment is not as to the unity or otherwise of any political party. What is before us is whether or not we should allow 20 minutes to the leaders of the political parties represented in this House. That is the relevant bit and it is what we shall articulate.

The Assistant Minister, Office of the President (Mr. Sunkuli): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can see hon. Obwocha hurrying me up. He knows that, in fact - we were together in the long trip that hon. Orenge mentioned this morning - it would be unfair to say the leaders of all these small parties should be allowed the same time as the majority is allowed. This is not fair to the electorate that sent us here. We should not allow the minority to have more voice than the majority. I think the position, as it is, is fair and so we reject this amendment.

Mr. Nthenge: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Sir. First of all, I would like us to become grown-ups. Whether we like it or not, we are in a position of responsibility. If your father dies when you are a young man, and you are his first born, you will have no

alternative but to take his position in deliberations. Similarly, if you are an elected Member of this House, you become an elder. This is because some of those who voted for you may be as old as your own parents. Therefore, we must stop looking like what I call debating clubs in secondary or primary schools. Here, we are trying to build this country for our good and that of our children and great grand children.

What is being asked for here is very simple: Let each leader of a political party get some extra 10 minutes. That is all. And how many parties are represented here? This only means allowing another 30 minutes if there are three Opposition parties. If there are four Opposition parties, only another 40 minutes will be required. This harms nobody. I feel that it is high time we looked at things as grown-ups. Even if we feel that we are young and can debate matters for the sake of it, when we are in this House we should elevate our standard a little bit upwards. When we go for tea or a drink, we can then exercise that other liberty.

Maybe I am getting too old, but that is the way I see it. I am supporting the amendment because it is very important. Once a person has been made a leader by the voters, we should recognise him, whether we like him or not.

All of us cannot wear the same suit. But if you are wearing a very beautiful light suit whereas I am wearing a black suit I have to recognise your light beautiful suit. Therefore, we should give these people that chance.

One thing that I would like to say here, in conclusion, is that we might be looking at hon. Wamalwa or hon. Anyona, but it should be known that this amendment might apply to you tomorrow. You do not know what is going to happen tomorrow. If people decide to make you their leader, would you like to be denied that privilege? You would not. And who knows whether you do not have leadership in your blood to lead a group? Therefore, let us not over-personalise the issue.

With these remarks, I beg to support.

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this amendment.

One of the speakers from the Opposition said that it is necessary to give the leaders from the Opposition an opportunity to contribute on the Floor of this House because other Members would like to see and hear how they present themselves, and from this tell what kind of leaders they will be tomorrow. I think this Parliament is not a training ground. We have not come here to train people to be leaders. It is up to a given political party to elect a leader capable of leading this nation.

I would like to mention that if leaders from various political parties of this country were given more time to contribute on this Motion, as they have requested, they will take more time than the Mover of the Motion, and I do not think this is practised in any other Parliament where democracy is practised. I would not like to see Kenya behaving differently from the other Parliaments. We recognize the Opposition. They have benches and their leaders there are given a chance to talk in this Parliament. When the time comes for them to respond, they should do so effectively, but they should not ask to be given a special chance to show how capable or incapable they are of leading this country. The position is that---

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. In view of the clarity of position on both sides, may I call upon the Mover to respond?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, hon. Members! First of all, I would like to advise the hon. Member for Kasipul-Kabondo that a Mover of an amendment has no right to respond. Therefore, your request cannot be acceded to by the Chair. Proceed.

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I was saying that we have recognized the Opposition in this House. They have been given their place and I do not see much ado in this matter. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Nyagah: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for this opportunity. I will be very brief.

Having listened to both sides, I only get worried that the Government side is scared of this little amendment that this side of the House is asking for. Yesterday, listening to the speech by His Excellency the President, one of the things that he said was that there should be no partisan politicking in this House, and now it seems like we want to do exactly the opposite. As we all know, there are few leaders from the Opposition. What are some extra ten minutes for the few leaders to expound on ideas that would go towards the building of this country?

Let us not forget that when we left this Parliament in the last session, we left it in disarray. We are now beginning a new session. We know that most of us are very worried as to whether we are going to come back to Parliament or not. Let us have a good beginning, but how do we do this? How do you expect co-operation from this side? It is by co-operating with us right from the beginning. What we are asking for is nothing serious, but just extra ten minutes.

Let me echo the words of hon. Anyona, and I would request my good friends on that side---

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I rise to propose that the Question be now put in accordance with our Standing Orders. **Mr. Speaker:** I would have acceded, but in the same spirit that

we must give every party time to be heard, we have not heard the NDP and I am not inclined to send them out. Proceed, hon. Nyagah!

Mr. Nyagah: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker, Sir. As I was saying before I was cut short by hon. Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo, the hon. Member sitting at the back had wise words to tell us. I would like that side to listen to what he said. I would like to echo that each one of us sitting in this House can be a presidential material and can lead this country. Having said so, let us, as brothers and sisters, have an opportunity to hear the views of the people who are recognized and respected by those people who brought them here.

One other record that I would like to put straight is that this side enjoys a majority representation in this country. You are a minority Government. That is a fact and if anybody dares shout, he needs to go back to school and learn because that is factual. I am not being rude in what I am saying. We know that votes were taken from this side, and I think it is only fair that the people who voted in bigger numbers of representatives should be given an opportunity to be heard.

With those few words, I support the amendment.

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if our friends opposite are not yet aware, there is democracy and multi-partyism already in this country.

Mr. Muite: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is it in order for the hon. Minister, to refer to Members on this side of the House as "his friends" when some of us are not? Should he not talk about the hon. Members on the other side of the House?

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have no problem with that. If they do not want to be friendly, then they can be unfriendly. I said hon. Members opposite. Let me educate them.

There is democracy in this country and therefore, we will practice it in this House as well. There is multi-partyism and that is why these hon. Members are on the opposite side. The question of the leaders of parties getting as much time as the Leader of Government Business should not be an issue, because for the last five years, we have sat here and we have passed the same resolution and we have worked well. So, this is our way of doing things in this Parliament and this is our own practice and they have subscribed to it for the last five years. Is it really true that they are now waking up when we are winding up this Seventh Parliament to realise that they need additional time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, Mr. Biwott!

Mr. Nthenge: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. My point of order is simple arithmetic. The Motion is stating that there should be twenty minutes for the Mover and another twenty minutes for him to reply. The other leaders will not be given forty minutes. They are urging us to give them twenty minutes. They should not say they are the same. There is a lot of difference between twenty and forty minutes.

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think he knows what he is saying either. I just wanted the hon. Members opposite, who are yet--

Mr. Speaker: What is it, Mr. Anyona?

Mr. Anyona: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the very important point raised by hon. Nthenge has been lost sight of. The other side, in its usual manner, keeps talking about equal time. Please, can you help the House?. It is not equal time. They have twenty minutes to move and twenty to reply. We are merely asking for twenty minutes, which is half of their time. Can the point be made clear?

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member, who has just spoken knows very well that he has subscribed to this Motion for the last--how many years? He cannot tell us today that he has now become suddenly bright and now knows that he needs twenty minutes more. The ten minutes available---

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Anyona: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have made my request simply because of this problem we have from this side of the House. I was asking for the Speaker to guide the House. They are creating confusion by saying that we are asking for equal time. They have forty minutes, but we are asking for only twenty. Can it be clarified before the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The Speaker should not be drawn into that debate. Can you debate amongst yourselves? Proceed, Mr. Biwott.

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, indeed, they are asking for twenty minutes and we are saying that they cannot get that twenty minutes. As it is at the moment, everybody has ten minutes. The hon. Members of the Opposition are like as us here, they are educated and they are very clever. If they have something to say, ten minutes is enough to say it. If the Leader of the Official Opposition has something to say, he will say it in ten minutes, in a nutshell because he is a brilliant fellow. The other members who represent various departments will also have ten minutes. So in all, they will be able to say everything that they want to say. In the

case of the one-man party like the Kenya Social Congress, once he speaks, that is the end of it. The same applies to hon. Raila's party.

(Laughter)

Mr. Anyona: Mr. Speaker, Sir, is it in order for hon. Biwott, who knows that he has a lot of "skeletons" in his cupboard--- Is he in order to talk about a one-man party? There cannot be a one-man party. The law would not allow it. Is he in order? There may be one member of that party in this House. That is not the same thing as being a one-member party. Is he in order? Shall we, in the same spirit, throw open the cupboards and see the "skeletons?"

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Order, Mr. Biwott! Like I said this morning, let us address what is relevant. I do not think the numbers of Mr. Anyona's party will determine one way or another, whether we should allow the leaders of the political parties in this House twenty or ten minutes. So, can we address what is relevant?

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member has spoken of "skeletons". If he has "skeletons", he can keep them. But I was saying---

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Can we put to the minimum unnecessary points of order? Now proceed!

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will go to the point.

Mr. Speaker: Order! It is these unnecessary diversions from the issue that are inviting all these unnecessary points of order. So, will you, Mr. Biwott, also stick to what is relevant?

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I was saying is that surely, ten minutes is enough for anybody who has something constructive to say, mainly on issues that matter. In any case, at the end of the day, we will be judged by the issues---

Mr. Speaker: What is it Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo?

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am a bit scared of this reference to "skeletons". You know, "skeletons" belong to human beings. When hon. Biwott refers to "skeletons" and, given what has been said before, I get very scared. Can he tell us a little bit more about these "skeletons"?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The Chair will not entertain frivolous points of order. If hon. Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo is by nature scared of everything, the Chair can assure him, that so long as he is in front of the sight of the Chair, he will be fully protected against everything.

(Laughter)

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in fact, the person who brought the "skeletons" issue is on the other side and the man who is scared of those "skeletons" is also on the other side. We do not have any "skeletons"; all "skeletons" are on that side. If there is anybody to be scared, we are the ones who should be scared of those "skeletons".

Mr. Otieno-Mak'Onyango: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The Chair will not want to hear anything about "skeletons" henceforth. Proceed!

(Loud consultations)

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Biwott): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was saying that ten minutes will be enough for any serious contributor to the debate. Therefore, I do not think that there is need for that additional twenty minutes because the leader of any party on the other side can have all his supporters to say whatever additional thing they may want to say.

With these few remarks, I beg to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Kiliku: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Although His Excellency the President took only ten minutes to complete his speech, he was reading it.

I would like to appeal to the President to come to this House and listen to the comments of hon. Members' on his speech.

Mr. Speaker: By the way, Mr. Kiliku, are you with us?

Mr. Kiliku: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am fully with you. This is a very important---

Mr. Speaker: Order, Mr. Kiliku! It does appear on the face of it that you are not with us. What we are discussing is whether or not, to give twenty minutes to leaders of political parties in the Opposition. So, can you address yourself to that? When we come to the debate on the Presidential Speech, then if you catch my eye, you may be able to say what you want to say.

Mr. Kiliku: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was commenting on the Presidential Speech because the twenty minutes given here---

Mr. Speaker: Order! You are out of order. You cannot anticipate a debate that is coming. Now, do what is here. Proceed!

Mr. Kiliku: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the twenty minutes given to this side--- How can you speak for only ten minutes on the Exposition of Public Policy, when as hon. Members of Parliament, we are expected to talk about the crises facing this country? We are the leaders. We need more time to speak about what is happening in the country. Ten minutes are not enough.

Mr. Speaker: Order, Mr. Kiliku!

Mr. Murungi: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Since my friend, hon. Kiliku, does not seem to really follow what is happening here, would it be in order now for the question to be put?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! I would have acceded to your request, except you put a rider to it; that the hon. Member does not understand what is happening in this House. For me to accept that, will amount to my accepting your improper motive of him. So, I will not accept. I will give the hon. Member a chance because so, far he is relevant.

Mr. Kiliku: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have just come from recess and we are expected to take more time on that Motion. Before you speak on one item, 10 minutes are over.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the Opposition, why can you not allow the Official Leader of the Opposition to be given more time to speak on what is happening in the country? I know the other side of the House is now refusing, but maybe after the next General Elections, we are going to have the Official Leader of the Opposition from that side. That is a fact. What we are making here is not for this Opposition now, it is even for the Opposition in future. My friends, you are no doubt going to be in the Opposition after the next General Elections. So when we are talking about timing, it not just for the sake of this Opposition, it is for the sake of any Opposition that is going to be in the House in future.

The Assistant Minister, Office of the President (Mr. Sunkuli): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. The hon Member should know that the rules we are making now, are for this Session only and next time, we will try and see what to do.

Mr. Kiliku: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I know the Standing Orders of the House. You came here the other day, my friend hon. Sunkuli.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, not only the Official Leader of the Opposition, but even the leaders of other political parties in the House should be given more time to speak and not 10 minutes. I think this is the time you should now start thinking of changing the rules. You have talked about so many Opposition parties in this House, yet how many parties do we have in KANU? We have KANU(A) and KANU(B), only that they are not registered parties.

With those few remarks, I beg to support.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, Members! I think this is the right time to dispose of this issue.

*(Question that the words to be added
be added, put and negated)*

So, we now revert to the Motion as it was, Mr. Obwocha!

(Debate on the original Motion resumed)

Mr. Obwocha: Mr. Speaker, Sir, thank you for giving me this opportunity to contribute to the main procedural Motion. Since I wanted to say something about the amendment, I have put that aside.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, although this procedural Motion is a formality, we would like to say that the exposition---

(Loud consultations)

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, Members! Hon. Members, the disposing of the amendment does not mean the end of Business. We are still in Business. Proceed, Mr. Obwocha!

Mr. Obwocha: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if there was really the exposition of Government policy in that speech, then we should have been allowed more time to contribute. I would like to correct an impression given here by the hon. Member for Kilgoris, that in other countries, the leaders of various political parties are not recognized. In fact, the Leaders of the Opposition in most of the Commonwealth countries that we were able to visit, are between the Prime Minister and the Ministers, and that is how highly they are rated. I would also like to say that if the Government is really interested in apportioning this time according to proportional representation - the way they are trying to present it in the House - then, they should have enough courage to adopt the proportional representation even in the voting.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we would like to urge the Government side to be reasonable. This was part of what the Presidential Speech addressed itself to and yet, they are not addressing themselves to this in the House.

With those few remarks, I beg to support.

The Assistant Minister for Agriculture, Livestock Development and Marketing (Mr. Osogo): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. In view of the fact that this is only a procedural Motion and it has been deliberated on for such a time with the amendment on it having been defeated, will I be in order to move that the Mover be now called upon to reply.

Mr. Speaker: I deferred that here a few moments ago!

The Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Ntimama): Thank you very much, indeed, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, now that the amendment has been done away with and I was going to oppose it anyway, I think it is important to know that this is a very important Motion which everybody should have an opportunity to contribute to, and it is only fair and proper that we should stick on the 10 minutes, apart from the 20 minutes of the Leader of Government Business, so that everybody in this House can get an opportunity to contribute to this important speech of the President.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was going to say that it is important at times to stick to tradition and traditionally, this Motion on the Presidential Speech has been exactly as it is presented here. That is 20 minutes for the Leader of Government Business and 10 minutes for everybody else including the leaders of the political parties. They are all Members of this House and if they catch your eye, then they can also go ahead and speak for the 10 minutes on this Presidential Speech. So, it is important to stick to it, so that we may give a good opportunity to everybody to contribute.

Now, before I sit down, because I can see we are going to end this Motion, I wanted to correct this fallacy of the majority vote. This is a fallacy and it is important for hon. Members from the other side to start understanding that Mr. John Major had less votes than the Liberal party, the Labour party and the Social Democrats put together and yet, he went ahead and became the Prime Minister of Britain.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mr. Bill Clinton was elected by 43 per cent of the votes of the people of America and those votes are absolutely less than what Bob Dole and Ross Perot and the other independent candidates got. So, we must not---

Mr. Speaker: Very well, hon. ole Ntimama. I think you have put your point across but we have already disposed of that issue. So, can you come to the one which is before us right now?

The Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. ole Ntimama): Mr. Speaker, Sir, all I wanted to say is that, that is absolutely a fallacy. Everybody went to the polls under a different name, a different party and as individuals and President Moi won. So, what are you talking about?

Mr. Muite: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is it in order for the hon. Minister to mislead this House that John Major was elected by less votes? John Major became the Prime Minister of Britain because he was the leader of the party which garnered a majority of the votes in the House of commons. No person cast their votes directly for John Major. What vote is he talking about?

The Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. ole Ntimama): Whatever it is, even if you are talking about Margaret Thatcher, definitely, she got less votes than all the other parties put together.

Mr. Obure: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to contribute on the procedural Motion.

First of all, I want to greet all Members of Parliament who have managed to be here. Possibly this is the last time and the majority might not be here next time and they had better say goodbye because the Opposition is going to constitute a majority in this House and hence form the next Government.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just want to state one thing that 10 minutes is not enough. A lot of time that has been given to a particular hon. Member is too little because the rate of thinking for various individuals cannot be the same. We have some Members here who stammer. If one stammers, one requires an extra minute to articulate an issue. Secondly, there must be an extra time---

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): On a point of order, Mr.

Speaker, Sir. The hon. Member has made a very serious allegation that there are some hon. Members here who stammer and therefore, they need more time. Can he substantiate that claim?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Order, Mr. Mutiso. You have been here for a long time. What rule in the Standing Orders makes it wrong for a Member to stammer? Is it a crime? Is it a social misfit? Is there anything wrong with stammering? Proceed Mr. Obure.

Mr. Obure: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for protecting me. The point I want to drive home here is very important for this House for now and for the future of this nation. Ten minutes for any leader that represents a substantial number of people or problems in his constituency cannot be enough to articulate those issues. So, what I am saying here is that enough time should be allocated to a Member of Parliament in order to articulate issues effectively because it is not for his own good or the party he represents, but the views he gives represent the views of the majority that he represents.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are times for interruption. Like now, you have already taken two minutes of my time to protect me. Another two minutes have been used to oppose me and I have been left with two minutes. What---

Mr. Speaker: By the way, Mr. Obure, this one has no time limit. You can speak for two days.

Mr. Obure: That is very good. What I am trying to say here is that we are being paid by this nation in order to address the issues that affect this nation. In this Parliament, there should not be any time limit. If we put time limit, like civil servants, we will be stealing money from the public. Other Parliaments continue upto mid-night. When Members absent themselves from the proceedings of this House, we do not time them. For example, we have some Members who attend this Parliament for a few seconds and they are paid equally as those who stay here full time.

So, this question of time should be looked into, so that we can give our Members of Parliament more time to articulate issues effectively, so that we can legislate and understand what we are legislating for this nation.

The other point is that there is too much interference whenever a Member of Parliament wants to articulate an issue. There must be a way in which you have to protect any Member of Parliament who wants to articulate an issue or to address the issues that affect his or her constituency and the nation at large. What I am trying to say here is that there is too much in life that needs to be addressed in this nation. There are too many problems that cannot require only 10 minutes for any Member to articulate, except a Member who does not want to represent his people - that is a Member who is here to oppose and does not have adequate material from his people. But a Member like on this side where we have learned lawyers and Professors who can lecture for three hours, require that kind of time to discuss those issues. Even our friends on the Government side need more time to be taught so that they can understand what they are doing in this nation. I was a teacher one time and a student who is slow to learn needs more time. So, as we have recognized in this House, our Ministers do not understand. The capability of Ministers' understanding is little. Can we give them more time?

The Assistant Minister, Office of the Vice-President and Minister for Planning and National Development (Dr. Misoi): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is it in order for the hon. Member to impute improper motives against Ministers that they do not understand anything?

Mr. Obure: Surely, I am speaking in this Parliament and for this nation. If they really understand, let them give us one issue in the last four years that they have addressed. There is famine in this country and people are dying. What do they really understand? There is insecurity in this country and what does the Minister of State in charge of internal security understand about security? We have not had enough time---

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Kalweo): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. This is why we are saying we should be limited to 10 minutes because the contributors do not have the material to contribute. Is the hon. Member in order to say that I am not aware of what is happening in the country? Does he know that I am fully aware of all these things and that I know what is happening in all parts of the country?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Let us not be personal. Proceed, hon. Obure!

Mr. Obure: Mr. Speaker, Sir, with all due respect, you, this House and the nation have seen the real example I have just given here. I do not have to repeat.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the other point that I wanted to raise here is that we are not giving our Members of Parliament an opportunity to articulate the issues that affect their individual constituencies. I would suggest that in future, we should pass a Motion in which we give at least two minutes to any Member of Parliament who attends this Session on a particular day, to address the issues that affect his constituency.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, every now and then when I go to my constituency, there are one or two issues that arise. For example now, there is famine in Kisii District. There is no food in my constituency. The people are many and there is famine. But I have not been given an opportunity to address these issues. There is shortage of medicine and I do not have---

Mr. Speaker: Order, hon. Obure! If you became relevant and to the point on this Motion, we may then go

to the open Motion where you can articulate the issues of your constituents.

Mr. Obure: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. What I am saying here is that let us give at least two minutes to any Member of Parliament who has an issue, like insecurity, and which the nation would like to know, to address it without interruption.

With those few remarks, I beg to support.

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Kalweo): Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I say a few words here.

The procedural Motion that we have here is quite in order. In ten minutes time, if somebody is not repeating himself, he can articulate as much as he wants. But because of mixing the issues, for example, if we have a Motion here discussing about health, and then you start bringing in issues about Mr. Kabila and whoever, that would need more time. But if we can narrow ourselves to the issues related to whatever Motion we are discussing, ten minutes is more than enough.

I know you can have materials but you can scale them down to a point whereby you can highlight only the main points and avoid---

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I thought we have already disposed of the question of whether we should give ten minutes or twenty minutes, and we are now discussing a procedural Motion?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, we have!

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Kalweo): That is exactly what I am doing, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I am supporting this Motion. But I am making the point that: If we are not repeating ourselves, ten minutes are enough for every speaker. In this case, all Members of Parliament are equal. This is because we are all elected. In this case, we are all Members of Parliament, regardless of whether one is a Minister, the Leader of Opposition or holds any other position. I support this issue because since time immemorial, this has been a procedural Motion.

With those few remarks, I beg to support.

Mr. Muite: Mr. Speaker, Sir, one of the difficulties facing some of us on this side of the House, when making up our minds on whether to support this procedural Motion in its present form or not, arises from a Constitutional contradiction.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when you look at yesterday's programme, it states that this was a State opening of Parliament. Therefore, one assumes that the President was coming here in his capacity as the Head of State of all of us. It is not always possible in this country to distinguish when the President is performing a particular function in his capacity as Head of State and, therefore, all of us must respect and accept that, or when he is acting in his capacity as the Executive President of this country.

I would like to appeal to this Government to address the issue of that Constitutional contradiction. We must separate the functions of the Head of State and the Executive President. A lot of problems have arisen in this country because that distinction is not there.

When we removed the position of the Governor-General back in 1964, we should have instituted the position of Head of State to whom we all owe loyalty so that when Parliament is opened by the Head of State, he is above party politics.

So, this is the contradiction that I would plead with this Government to recognise and to assist this nation in resolving so that we distinguish---

Mr. Karan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Can the Mover be called upon to reply because it appears we have exhausted this issue?

Mr. Speaker: I think I will accede to the request this time.

(Question, that the Mover be now called upon to reply, put and agreed to)

The Vice-President and Minister for Planning and National Development (Prof. Saitoti): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

(Hon. Obure moved to the Table)

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, hon. Obure! Hon. Obure, I am afraid that you were out for too long. So, can you now remember that you just do not walk around in the House!

(Question put and agreed to)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON
PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

The Vice-President and Minister for Planning and National Development (Prof. Saitoti): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following procedural Motion:-

THAT, a maximum of two hours, with not more than 20 minutes for the Mover, 20 minutes for the Government official respondent and ten minutes for each other Member speaking, and that ten minutes before the time expires, the Mover shall be called upon to reply.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a procedural Motion and it does not depart from the tradition that this House has known all along, when it comes to debating the Private Members' Motions.

Therefore, I do bring it here and hope that this too will receive the consent of the hon. Members.

With those few remarks, I beg to Move.

The Minister for Labour and Manpower Development (Mr. Masinde): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand here to second the Motion. In so doing, I would like to emphasize that Private Members' Motions are very important, regardless of whether they come from the Opposition or from the Government.

In the past, we have noticed that the time allocated to the Private Motions, that is, Wednesday morning, is hit by lack of quorum because very few Members of Parliament come to the House at that time. This interrupts the debates allocated to this particular time.

I would like to appeal to hon. Members to become serious and take these issues very seriously because they affect not only the constituency from where the Mover comes, but the whole nation. We need serious contribution from the whole House.

With those few remarks, I beg to second.

(Question proposed)

Mr. Muite: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to move an amendment to that Motion as follows:-
The Motion should be amended by adding a proviso at the end of the Motion. The proviso is: Provided that in case of Motions by the Opposition, the limit of two hours may be extended to such time as a majority of the Opposition Members may determine.

I would like, at the outset, to appeal to hon. Members on that side to begin to practise what the Head of State said on the occasion of the State Opening of Parliament that with regard to some of these issues the House should debate them and approach them on a non-partisan manner. They should look at the merits and demerits of a particular Motion. We do so as Kenyans and as a Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, some Motions that have been introduced in this House by the Opposition have been critically and fundamentally important. These Motions have raised very weighty issues and when those Motions are allocated only two hours with twenty minutes for the Mover and twenty minutes for that side of the House and ten minutes for the Mover to reply, that leaves us with ten minutes each. If you do calculations you will find that those Motions only permit three hon. Members from this side of the House to contribute. Only six hon. Members out of 200 hon. Members contribute.

I would recall, by way of an example, there was a Motion from this side of the House to discuss the conduct of the Speaker. That was not a light Motion; it was a very fundamental Motion and some of us would have wanted the opportunity to defend it but we never got that opportunity because there were only three people from this side and three people from that side who were able to contribute on that important Motion. I recall the Motion I moved in this House regarding the preservation of Public Security Act. It was an important Motion, but again many people who wanted to contribute were not able to do so. Some of these Motions are actually more critical and more fundamental than even Bills. So, what we are saying is that, we are not asking in this proviso that all the Motions by the Opposition should have open-ended time. That is not what we are saying. Ordinarily, let those Motions be limited to two hours, even the ones from this side of the House. The objective of this amendment is that, even when the Opposition comes up with a Motion which it feels is so important that adequate time should be given to it, provided a majority of the Opposition members so request that the time be extended to three, four hours or for the rest of the day, that Motion should be given that adequate time.

For example, if a Motion was to be brought in this House to discuss the conduct of the President and it is permitted under the Standing Orders, that is the sort of Motion that should actually be debated for only two hours with many hon. Members wanting to defend the President and others wanting to contribute. What we are saying is that, even when we have got an important Motion--- There was one on tribal clashes which again was limited to two hours. So, many hon. Members were not able to contribute. As and, when an important Parliamentary Motion is brought by

the Opposition and the Opposition itself feels that it wants more time to debate that Motion, it should be realised that, that amendment is intended to provide that leeway for the Opposition to request for and, in fact, to determine the extension of that time. I would like to plead with the Leader of Government Business and the Deputy Leader of Government Business and all the hon. Members on that side of the House to support the amendment which is brought in good faith. We are saying that we in the Opposition in this multi-party Parliament should have the capacity to decide on important Motions and to decide on adequate time for us to debate those important Motions. I cannot see if that side of the House wants to show by conduct that they are going to take seriously the advice of the President that they should be non-partisan in some of those issues. I cannot see how they can now stand up to oppose this amendment. How can they stand to oppose this amendment?

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for giving me an opportunity to second this very important Motion.

The public verdict out there is that, the Seventh Parliament is a pathetic failure. One of the main contributors to this concept and notion now is the fact that we have between 10.00 a.m and 12.30 p.m to expound on policies that have far reaching ramifications on the lives of Kenyans. There are very many pending Motions because of this question of limitation of time. There are many issues that have been left untackled. There are many areas of the public life that we have not touched as a Parliament. I think, we should organise our work, not in accordance with some archaic traditions, but in accordance with the needs of our day. When the time requires it, when we have a crisis, a catastrophe, a disaster, we should be able to address that disaster not because time is limited in Parliament or otherwise. I think, Parliament should now in the 20th Century be modern enough to be flexible to find the opportunity to explain to the Kenyan public what we are doing here.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, apart from Wednesday morning where nearly half of this Parliament has the opportunity to expound on considered policy issues, there is no other opportunity for hon. Members of the Opposition to do so. We, therefore, feel restricted and we have to resort to Question Time and here again an hon. Member is restricted to one question a day. The point that we are making here is that the Opposition and other hon. Members on the Back Bench on that side, require much more time than we have to be able to debate the issues of the day. We must not close our eyes to the issues affecting our people; we must be open, flexible and clever enough to adjust whenever it is necessary.

*(Question, that the words to
be added be added, proposed)*

The Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. ole Ntimama): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand to oppose this amendment and with all due respect to the hon. Member who has moved this Motion. First of all being one of the best lawyers in this country, he must understand that the Private Members' Motions are not exclusive to Members of the Opposition. To definitely dwell and harp on the rights of the Opposition to extend time, I think, is wrong; it is totally discriminatory.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when it comes to the resolutions of this House, there is supposed to be no Opposition or KANU or Government side. It is supposed to be a resolution of the House. To try and exclusively say the Opposition will have the right to extend the time, I think, is wrong, unprocedural and illegal. And, I think the hon. Member whom I consider as an eminent lawyer, probably, should go back and look into that one particularly.

Mr. Muite: Mr. Speaker, Sir, is it in order for the hon. ole Ntimama to suggest that the proposed amendment is illegal without showing the House the specific sections of law which he thinks this amendment is breaching? If his point is that there will be Motions by the other side of the House, should he not actually bring an amendment to the amendment if they also want to extend the time? I have never been a member of KANU and I do not know whether they want extension of time or not.

Mr. Speaker: Let me say this: He is making a contribution; expressing his view. It does not necessarily have to be correct. Proceed.

The Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. ole Ntimama): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not say the amendment was illegal. I think the way that the hon. Member stressed that it is the Opposition to make the decision whether the time should be extended or not is not right and it borders on an illegality.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the other thing that I want to say very clearly is that all the Motions of this House are considered to be important and I do not know any Motions that have been brought to this House that can be said to be unimportant when compared with the others. I do not know whether the Opposition would probably have the barometer to start telling us which Motion is important and which one is not important. I think this one is a discourse that we should not continue with because I do not think we are really discussing something important when we extend the time and give the Opposition the right to decide whether the Motion is important or unimportant, or whether the time should be extended.

I beg to oppose.

Mr. Mulusya: Mr. Speaker, Sir, thank you for noticing me. For the first time I want to disagree with my colleagues on this side on this Motion. There is no way this House would want to enact any regulation or any law which should be favouring only one side. And, I think there is an assumption from some hon. Members, like my colleague, hon. Muite, that he is going to remain permanently in the Opposition. No, we are fighting to go to the other side and he should be able to see to it that when he is on the other side, everybody is treated fairly.

Mr. Leshore: Good boy!

Mr. Kiliku: On a point of order Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is it right for the hon. Member to refer to hon. Mulusya as a "good boy?"

(Laughter)

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! First of all, Mr. Kiliku, why are you talking? I thought I gave the Floor to Mr. Mulusya or have you suddenly changed from being Kiliku to Mulusya and vice-versa?

Mr. Kiliku: But it was the hon. Member from the other side---

Mr. Speaker: Yes, very well. Order! Then what you do is that you shout: "point of order". Once I give you the Floor, you proceed. I did not hear you and neither did I give you the Floor. So, if you have any point of order, rise on a point of order and get the Floor from the Chair and then proceed. In the meantime, Mr. Mulusya was on the Floor as far as I can recollect.

Mr. Kiliku: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is it in order for hon. Leshore to refer to hon. Mulusya as a "good boy" and, particularly when such a compliment is coming from KANU which can damage the name of Mr. Mulusya?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The term "good boy" coming from any side of the House and referring to an hon. Member of this House is totally out of order and since I did not hear it I will not revisit that issue. However, let the House know that no "boy" is here; either good or bad. Proceed.

Mr. Mulusya: Mr. Speaker, Sir, hon. Leshore tried to recruit me to be a spy but I declined and that is why I am now suddenly becoming a "good boy".

Mr. Speaker: Order, Mr. Mulusya! Do you know what you are supposed to be speaking about? Now proceed.

Mr. Mulusya: Yes, Mr. Speaker. What I was saying is that what this House should be able to strive to do is to create---

Mr. Leshore: On a point of order Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is the hon. Mulusya in order to say that I am trying to recruit him to become a spy? I am trying to recruit him to come to the KANU side and not to be a spy.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order Mr. Michuki. I asked the hon. Members yesterday, in my speech, to be dignified and to respect each other. It does not matter a bit to me what else you think of another Member. In the eyes of the Chair, all hon. Members in this House are equal and respectable and ought to behave respectably. I will never allow any Member to belittle the dignity of this House by trivialising what otherwise should be serious issues. So, Mr. Mulusya, can you proceed with your debate and can we have no further unnecessary interjections?.

Mr. Munyasia: On a point of information Mr. Speaker, Sir. There is a technical difficulty. This particular proviso is asking that the Members of the Opposition alone may decide whether to extend the time for debating a certain Motion or not. I am wondering which Standing Order will be used by the Speaker to ask Members of the Opposition alone to say whether they may extend the time or not. If there is no such provision in the Standing Orders, would it be in order to ask that this particular debate be put to end because it contravenes the Standing Orders of this House?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I would like to hear from the Members but even the Chair is at a loss as to what role, in fact, the Chair has in determining, at the end of the day, when to invite the Members of the Opposition to make that decision. It is upto the Members, first of all, to decide and vote on it.

Mr. Mulusya: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I may continue, what I was saying is that this House should strive to create a balance between today and tomorrow. We should not say that since today we are in the Opposition, we should have a decision overriding the rights of the other Members. It should be a decision made by the majority of these Members because very soon the status quo is going to change and when it changes, which is inevitable, I do not see us, especially those of us who will be on the Government side, questioning a decision which was made by a previous Parliament. It is very important that we members, even those of the of the Opposition, start thinking rationally and we also invite our colleagues on the other side to be rational in thinking so that in future, whatever this Seventh Parliament has decided upon, will be something that we can look back at and say that it was a step forward. I do not want any of

us to underestimate the ability of the Opposition to be able to jump to the Government side. It is a matter of a few months and let us now be patient and we will be able to achieve that.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Motion.

The Minister for Information and Broadcasting (Mr. Makau): Mr. Speaker, Sir, no one denies that the Private Members' Motions are very important. But we would be setting a very bad precedence by introducing discrimination on the basis of Motions that are brought to this House. Hon. Members should realise that when we talk about the Private Members' Motions these are Motions brought by hon. Members of Parliament, but not Ministers or Assistant Ministers, and it does not matter whether it is from the Opposition side or the ruling side. These Motions are the same because they are brought into this House by the Backbenchers from both sides of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Mover of the amendment was talking of "weighty" Motions and so on, we should bear in mind that all Motions brought into this House are the same. They carry the same weight; whether an hon. Member brings a Motion talking about abolition of something or whatever, all Motions are treated the same in this House. This is one thing that should be borne in mind when we are debating this amendment which I am opposing on the basis of the fact that it is discriminatory. There is no way it can be implemented because there is no provision or any guidance in the Standing Orders that the Speaker will be able to know which Motion is that the Opposition Members term as "weighty" or a Motion that they feel that they need to be given more time to debate it. I am saying so because I strongly believe that Private Members' Motions are extremely important to the Government and to their constituencies in that they alert the Government on problems that are existing in various constituencies and they also make the electorate know that, that hon. Member did not come to this House to "sleep;" that he is alert and knows the importance of letting the nation know what contributions he is making. But to suggest that we allocate more time to a given Motion because it has come from the Opposition side or the ruling side and so on, we would like the Mover of this amendment to let us know, as has been pointed out by the hon. Munyasia, under what Standing Order the Speaker or anybody here is going to see why that Motion which is coming from the Opposition or from the ruling side should be given more time.

It should be realised that Motions coming from the Opposition side are not more important especially when it comes to Private Members' Motions because a Private Members' Motion from the ruling party could even be more helpful to the hon. Members in the Opposition, especially in their constituencies if that Motion is national in its outlook.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, with those few remarks, I beg to oppose the amendment.

Dr. Lwali-Oyondi: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for allowing me to contribute to this amendment. First of all, it is a rather strange amendment in that it is pointing out to a group, I am not a lawyer, but as far as I know, any law that is aimed at any given group is a bad law. Laws should be aimed at making everything uniform. Having said that, I oppose my friend's amendment.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Private Members' Motions ought to have more time than what we have at the moment. The Mover usually takes twenty minutes, the Minister takes another twenty minutes and then in the reply they have ten minutes each. We end up having just about an hour given to the Mover and the Minister in replying. The remaining time is usually too short for hon. Members to contribute to any given Motion. I would suggest that in future we have slightly more time than two and half hours we have at the moment so that hon. Members can contribute to these usually very interesting and important Motions. These Motions are brought into this House by hon. Members because they arise out of need and out of what the hon. Members see in the their constituencies and out of things affecting their constituents. Therefore, it is important we have more time to debate such Motions than we have today.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, while we have these Motions, we should have an Implementation Committee. Many Motions have been passed here and I am not so sure whether any of them has been implemented. I call upon this House to bring back the Implementation Committee so that it can follow-up whatever Motions we pass here lest it will just degenerate into blowing hot air and having nothing substantive done.

Secondly, I oppose this amendment because there is no way we will measure the importance of a given Motion. There is no scale on which you can put and say this Motion is "weighty" and this one is not. We normally say that "it is the wearer of the shoe who knows where it pinches more" and usually when the hon. Member brings a Motion here it is actually pinching more on him than it may be pinching on me. For example, when the hon. Member from North-Eastern Province is talking of having dams, in the area where I was born and where I am representing this House, dams mean very little. We have no droughts, we have piped water and rivers which are permanently flowing. So, when the hon. Member is talking of dams, we may not take him very seriously and yet dams are a matter of "life and death" for people in the North-Eastern Province. I might look upon his Motion as not being "weighty" and yet it is "weighty" as far as he is concerned. Therefore, all Motions that are brought in this House are very "weighty" in that they affect the constituents of that particular hon. Member of Parliament.

Having considered those points, I feel that this amendment is not properly represented because it is

discriminating against some parts of this country. When we debate here, I think we should debate as a Parliament, and not as hon. Members of the Opposition and hon. Members of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, with those few remarks, I beg to oppose the amendment.

The Vice-President and Minister for Planning and National Development (Prof. Saitoti): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to enjoin myself with the previous speakers, including some of them from the opposite side, namely, that we should not set any precedent at all in this House for persons or any Motion that could be construed in anyway to be discriminatory because all of us here are Members of Parliament, and if a Member of Parliament feels that he wants to bring a Motion, I do not think that he should feel that this House, in its own rules, would bar him from proceeding in a certain way and yet could allow another Member to proceed that way by virtue of party affiliation. Then, I think, with due respect to hon. Muite, there is some kind of a defect in this kind of an amendment.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, Sir, let me also draw the attention of this House to the fact that in the debate of a Motion which in the course of the deliberation, the whole House finds that it is important and that the time limitation, as fixed by a resolution of this House, there is absolutely nothing to prevent the House from passing another resolution to extend the time. Indeed, I know that we have done one in the past, for example, when we were debating the Motion of Adjournment which as we all know, has normally been fixed by a certain period of time; but then in the course of the debate, it has then emerged that, perhaps, much more time is required so that Members can make more observations, this has been granted, I believe by the House.

So, while the original Motion is seeking for certain limitation, that becomes a guideline and we have done that in the last four years and, indeed, from my own understanding, this has been right from the inception of this Parliament and its Senate. But there is, therefore, that proviso that should the House at one time feel that more time is required because of the nature and importance of the debate, that can always be done.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I only decided to intervene at this particular time because I felt that it is important that hon. Members do know that, indeed, that when the debate becomes important and there is an important Motion, hon. Members themselves can always be able to pass a resolution to extend the time. I think it is clear that this amendment should be rejected because it is defective, but at the same time, as I said, there is always a proviso that we can always be able to extend it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I therefore, beg to oppose that amendment.

*(Question, that the words to be added
be added, put and negatived)
(Debate on the original Motion resumed)*

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really surprised that hon. Members seem to be waking up now at this time when we are almost running to the end---

Mr. Nyagah: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, Mr. Nyagah! Mr. Mutiso, first of all, we have disposed off the amendment; secondly, we are now on the procedural Motion brought by the Leader of Government Business; thirdly, hon. Members do not "sleep" in this House. Would you please address yourself to the Motion?

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I apologise for that. I know that hon. Members are very much awake in this House and that was a slip of the tongue. What I was saying is that this is a procedural Motion and over the years since 1963, some of us have been in this House and this issue of trying to extend the time has been discussed and found out that the 10 minutes are adequate. Therefore, for any hon. Member to put up his case whether supporting or opposing a Motion in 10 minutes if he is a serious Member, he can effectively do so, and therefore---

Mr. Munyasia: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is the hon. Member not misleading this House by asserting that he has been in this House since 1963 when we know very well that for 10 years he was somewhere after having behaved like "Kabila"?

(Laughter)

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the records of this House has it that I have---

Mr. Obure: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. The hon. Member has made a very serious allegation that hon. Mutiso has been behaving like Kabila of Zaire. Is that---

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, hon. Obure! Unless you are not in this House, the hon. Munyasia never mentioned the word "Zaire" anywhere, so, that is your word. Proceed, Mr. Mutiso.

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have excused the new hon. Members of this House because they do not know facts of history. But what I wanted to say is the fact that I have never lost any elections that I have campaigned for since 1963. Therefore, I would think that 10 minutes for any serious Member speaking can make his case effectively heard. Therefore, I want to support that 10 minutes for each Member speaking and 20 minutes for the Mover in moving and replying are enough. This has been proved over the years since 1963. This is what I was saying and, therefore, there is no need of saying that this time is not enough at this late hour when we are about to finish the Seventh Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, with those few remarks, I support.

Mr. J.N. Mungai: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Sir. The question of time in this House is really important, but may I agree with the Motion as it reads. What is most worrying is that all these debates that are brought here with the time limit given and Members in the past have agreed and even today, we have agreed; but what is most worrying is that Motions are discussed in this House, they are passed; but we have a problem in the implementation stage. This is why I believe that, even the hon. Member who had moved the Motion on the amendment probably was tempted to do so because he thought that would help the Ministers to understand the importance of the Motions brought into this House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is so sad to see that Motions are brought to this House by either parties or individuals, but these Motions many times are taken either as Opposition Motions or individual Motions probably meant to popularise a Member because of political reasons; but it is not like that.

Motions are brought to this House because they have some effect on the people. It is up to this House to think about such Motions and why they are brought to the House. After they have been passed here it is important that they are implemented. If I may ask, how many Motions, now that the Seventh Parliament is coming to an end in this year, have been implemented after being passed by this House? It is important that the Government takes this matter very seriously. The Opposition has no war with the Government, and Motions which are passed here are meant to help the people.

While I support the Motion as it is, I caution the Government to ensure that Motions which are passed here are implemented.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Mak'Onyango: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I want to share the views that have been put across by some of my colleagues as to the need to take the timing for Motions more seriously than we have, perhaps, done. Debate on any Motion is essentially an exposition of ideas. So, it is important that we accord ample time for debate on private Members' Motions. You will agree with me that very often the issues we raise are of national importance. Their national importance is not likely to come out as clearly as it ought to due to time constraint. Very often, apart from a few very gifted people, or hon. Members, many hon. Members are never at their peak in their contributions until they are quite some time into their time while on the Floor of the House. So, I would want to agree with those colleagues of mine who are advocating for more time to be accorded to debate on various issues.

Legislation is a very important undertaking and, therefore, it is important that we accord hon. Members who make contributions in the House ample time so as to enable them to realise the most that can be made out of any debate. A number of issues that come up in form of Motions need effective input from as many people as possible, especially experts. I am of the view that if we had a little more time this would accord our professionals and other experts in various fields which are covered by the Motions brought to this House to contribute an input. Therefore, there is need for a little bit more time.

Again, it is also important that there is as much independence as possible for hon. Members who contribute to Motions. The present situation makes hon. Members experience time constraint and because of this time pressure they are not likely to bring the best out of a Motion. Therefore, I do feel, and very strongly so, that there is a case for more time to enable hon. Members of this House to deal more exhaustively with issues that come on the Floor of the House in the form of Motions. Therefore, I wish to appeal that consideration be given to time that will be accorded the House to debate any Motion that comes on its Floor.

With those few remarks, I beg to support.

Mr. Ndicho: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Since this is a procedural Motion there is nothing much that we can change. But I would say that we have derived most of the procedures for our House from the Westminster Parliament. It is 33 years since we attained Independence and we have learned enough from the Westminster Parliament. I think it is high time that we Africanised the procedures in our Parliament. We are too British and have tended to discard our African norms and practices. We have tended to copy the whiteman very much. For now we can pass this procedural Motion, but I will call upon the relevant Committees to sit down and try to Africanise our Parliamentary procedures, so that we can feel more African than British. I once happened to visit the German Parliament and found that Members of Parliament even attend sittings without wearing ties and even in boots. I was

very concerned and when I asked why they behaved like that they told me that they were simply not British but were Germans!

The Assistant Minister for Land Reclamation, Regional and Water Development (Mr. Ligale): Aah!

Mr. Ndicho: Mr. Speaker, Sir, hon. Ligale can say "Aah", but I know that he has never gone to the German Parliament. I wish he could go there and find out the truth.

So, I would like us to feel proud that we as Kenyans have a Parliament whose practices are modelled along the Kenyan context. Therefore, while I would not like to oppose this procedural Motion let us try to modify our Parliamentary practices to fit in our own culture.

The Assistant Minister for Research, Technical Training and Technology (Mr. Kagwima): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not have much to say, but I want to join my colleagues in supporting this procedural Motion. I will want to say that there is no way we could increase this 10-minute period. Even as it is, the two hours allowed for each private Member's Motion are not enough. This is especially so when many hon. Members are interested in speaking on a Motion. So, I would say that the time limit remains as it is: Extending it beyond the 10 minutes would even deprive hon. Members a chance to speak on Motions that concern the people they represent in this House.

Having said that I also want to hail the spirit that has been shown by the hon. Members in debating this Motion. They have behaved in a cohesive manner in the interests of the Kenyan public. I want to call upon the hon. Members to continue with this spirit so that a Motion from whichever side of the House will be seen to be a Motion of the House.

With these few remarks, I want to thank you for having given me this chance, and I support the Motion.

(Question put and agreed to)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS

The Vice-President and Minister for Planning and National Development (Prof. Saitoti): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following procedural Motion:-

THAT, the debate on any Motion for the Adjournment of the House to a day other than the next normal Sitting Day shall be limited to a maximum of two hours with not more than five minutes for each Member speaking;

Provided that when the period of Recess proposed by any such Motion does not exceed nine days, the debate shall be limited to a maximum of thirty minutes, and shall be strictly confined to the question of adjournment.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Motion is set within the same framework as has been the case traditionally, namely that for the Motion of Adjournment the total period for debate is two hours. By the time we are adjourning the House, virtually every Member of Parliament would wish to make a contribution and that is why it has always been proposed that a Member speaks for only five minutes. There is no doubt that five minutes is a very short time, but in order to be able to accommodate virtually every Member, that would be the only alternative. That is why we are bringing here this Motion so that the hon. Members can be in a position to approve it.

There are two segments to this Motion. You can see that the last segment does say, "When the period of Recess proposed by any such Motion does not exceed nine days, the debate shall be limited to a maximum of thirty minutes---".

Once again, this is a very short period of time, but then if the period of Recess lasts for thirty days only then the Members will always come back quickly and resume their work, but when we adjourn for a longer period of time, the debate takes two hours and Members are allowed five minutes to speak on the Motion. That does give as many Members as possible time to contribute on this Motion.

The Minister for Labour and Manpower Development (Mr. Masinde): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand here to second this Motion. This is a procedural Motion.

Indeed, five minutes might sound a very short time, but in order to give an opportunity to every Member to express his views, it is fair that we keep to this limited period. If he has properly organized his ideas, he should be able to fit in these five minutes. After all, under normal circumstances, the issues are of a general nature and as such there should be no problem. We have done this in the past. We have also read that heads of states have been subjected to five minutes' address at international meetings. So, this is nothing different from the ordinary.

With those few remarks, I beg to second the Motion.

(Question proposed)

Prof. Anyang'-Nyong'o: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Motion moved by Leader of Government Business and seconded by the Deputy Leader of Government Business.

I also rise to record my concern that in the previous Sessions of Parliament, some of us have requested for Motions of Adjournment which did not see the Floor of the House. I do not know whether this is due to the congested programme of the Sessional Committee, but I think it is important that from time to time Members bring to your notice the need for Motions of Adjournment. They need to be brought to the House as promptly as possible. In my recollection, Members usually request for such Motions because of the gravity of the subject matter of the Motions they want discussed.

Secondly, I think the procedure to be followed in bringing Motions of Adjournment to the House is very clear in the Standing Orders and, therefore, Members should not be taken in any merry-go-round exercise as if bringing these Motions to the House is a privilege. I am making this point because sometimes Members do not feel dignified when they have to chase Motions already proposed as Motion of Adjournment to come into the House. I hope that during this last Session of the last Seventh Parliament, that point will be taken into account and that it will be implemented.

Finally, I would like to note that in Motions of Adjournment brought before the House by the Opposition, quite often, they require detailed response from the opposite side. They should not in any way be treated in any belligerent manner. In the spirit in which His Excellency the President gave his speech yesterday, saying that in this last session of the Sixth Parliament people should put aside any sectarian interests and put to the fore the national interests and the interests of the people of Kenya, I hope the Front Bench and the Government will champion it. I also hope that that spirit will help when the Opposition brings forth these important Motions of Adjournment which we intend to do and that a reciprocal response will be met from the other side.

With those few remarks, I beg to support.

The Assistant Minister, Office of the Vice-President and Ministry of Planning and National Development (Dr. Miso): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand to support this procedural Motion as presented. This is in line with other standard practices in Commonwealth parliamentary democracies. I think the time allocated is quite sufficient given the fact that hon. Members who want to contribute to the Motion should deliver their messages within the shortest time possible. It is also a well-known fact that communicating effectively does not require many minutes. Communicating to an audience can be done effectively in a minute and, therefore, if all of us were to put the issue in proper perspectives, we would save a lot of time. We would also avoid irrelevancies on issues which are not related to the Motion. It is upon us to put things in such perspective that the time we have is used in the best way possible to represent the interests of the people who elected us. It is also important for us to articulate issues of concern to the public and the nation at large.

The practice by hon. Members to use the opportunities in this House to raise issues which are partisan or which relate to ethnicity, many at times downgrades the dignity of this House. I think, as hon. Members of Parliament of the National Assembly, we should have such an approach which is nationalistic and above ethnic considerations and even other sectarian issues. If we do that, the integrity and dignity of this House will be respected and people will look upon this House as a House which provides guidance and meaningful development. They will see it as a House which will be able to deal with the problems facing this nation and come out with solutions which will resolve those issues affecting our people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have, in the past, had Motions on various issues and topics which affect the people. As those Motions are presented here, the people outside expect us to really deal with those Motions exhaustively and come out with a solution regarding those problems. There are times when we all raise Motions here, which do not solve any problems at all like Motions of adjournment which only gives us opportunity to engage in shadow boxing and to damage the image of other parties or even of other hon. Members of this National Assembly. I think, we as hon. Members of Parliament who have been elected to determine the destiny of this nation, should at all times, put the interest of Kenya and the population above our own interests, differences and petty conflicts of interest. If we were to do that, the whole world would be able to give us that respect and dignity and would also be able to support us in our development endeavours, assuming that our dealings with these other bodies are in the interest of this nation. I do, indeed, support this Motion the way it is. Let us hope that in this last Sitting, we as Members of Parliament, will be rational, reasonable, logical and responsible in such a way that when we go back to our people to seek their votes, they will be able to say, "Yes, they have done very well."

With those few remarks, I support the Motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Who has not spoken today? Yes, Mr. Gatabaki!

Mr. Gatabaki: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for giving me an opportunity to contribute to this procedural Motion.

I want to divert from this debate. We inherited a British tradition. Since I came to this Parliament three years ago, I have never had an opportunity of contributing to any Motion because of timing. We inherited a British tradition, but the Britons have gone further than us. If they have an issue of national importance, they go past midnight. Here, we break off at 6.30 p.m. everyday or towards that time. We have relied on a tradition which we cannot defend. The other day I issued a statement about this Parliament that this Parliament does not represent the interests of the Kenyan people. We are now on the second day since December---

Mr. Speaker: Order, Mr. Gatabaki! You may have your views about the validity or otherwise of Members of this House being elected. That may be the case. You may express that outside. But as far as the Chair is concerned, you will not be allowed to belittle the hon. Members who are sitting in this House.

Secondly, you will address the debate as it were, and that is, the timing given to a debate of adjournment. That is what is before the House, not your opinion about the Members of this House. Proceed!

Mr. Gatabaki: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for your guidance. I would like to impress this House that there are too many weighty issues of national importance which this Parliament, the highest law making authority on the land, does not address itself to. There is famine in the country. Githunguri has not suffered from that famine, but there is famine in all the areas where these people come from. I want to contribute to their welfare. There is no famine in Kiambu District, but there is famine where they come from. There is famine where President Moi comes from.

Mr. Speaker: Order, Mr. Gatabaki! What has famine got to do with five minutes during the time of adjournment? You are absolutely irrelevant. Now stand warned to be relevant, otherwise, I will cut your speech short. Proceed!

Mr. Gatabaki: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the warning.

(Laughter)

Since I came to this Parliament I have always considered the Chair exceedingly hostile to the people of Githunguri. The people of Githunguri produced a Vice-President of this Republic and the First President was trained in Githunguri. Therefore, the people of Githunguri deserve a bit of respect.

All I am saying is, this House gives a pittance. We give so little time to discuss issues and I keep wondering whether a Member of Parliament can contribute meaningfully because of the duration of time. I am asking the indulgence of this House to be more serious about the crisis facing our nation, not to be limited by an ancient tradition.

The Britons do not stick to two hours, twenty or ten minutes. If there is a crisis of national importance, they meet immediately and resolve it. They even go up to midnight. The House of Congress in the United States is a full time job institution, but here it is a joke to be a Member of Parliament as we hardly contribute anything. The other day the President came here and spoke nothing. Time has come for us to be serious about the crisis facing our nation. We have seen Zaire disintegrating because of not giving importance to issues of national importance. I am concerned about this House being a serious debating organ. The only way we can be a serious debating organ is by giving more time to issues of national importance.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for allowing me to contribute to this Motion.

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is the hon. Member not really refusing to adhere to your ruling? He is talking about things outside the Motion of adjournment.

Mr. Speaker: Well, in a way.

The Assistant Minister, Office of the President (Mr. Sunkuli): Mr. Speaker, Sir, what my friend, the hon. Member for Githunguri, has failed to address is the whole question of management of time. I know that our Parliament here is very good in the management of time of Motions and I think we should all support this. The more we manage our time and use our time economically, the more we can be able to transact business in this House.

I do fully agree that the speeches in this particular type of Motions be limited to the most economical time possible. You can see, if we do not limit time, if we leave things open-ended the way we do with the Bills, many hon. Members tend to be irrelevant and they tend to digress. For instance, hon. Gatabaki cannot even stick to the point in the two minutes he has been standing. It is important that we make a law about it. It is important because hon. Members should learn that when it is a Motion of adjournment, the only matter that can be discussed is the matter of adjournment, nothing else. The hon. Gatabaki can represent people of Githunguri in this House, only if he is relevant and I wish that the hon. Nyagah was not interrupting him because hon. Gatabaki needs to listen. He needs to know that he cannot represent the members of Githunguri by being irrelevant or by coming to the House to reproduce what he has written in his infamous magazine of *Finance*. He needs to stick to matters of adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the Motion.

Mr. Gatabaki: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir!

Mr. Speaker: Order! What is it Mr. Gatabaki?

Mr. Gatabaki: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Is it in order for the hon. Member to bring the issue of the irrefutably famous magazine in the issue of the procedural Motion?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Can we do two things, hon. Members? I think hon. Sunkuli, you are wrong, Mr. Gatabaki was not the issue. Mr. Gatabaki, you are also wrong, you do not advertise any newspaper in this House.

Mr. Achola: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I stand to support this Motion, but I am just wondering whether we should not think of increasing the maximum time to two and a half hours, so that we can allow at least 30 Members of this House - which forms the quorum in this House - to be able to speak on an adjournment motion. I think, next time this one comes up again, it should be considered because it is important. Five minutes within two hours can only be given to 24 people and I do not think that is sufficient enough to cover as many Members as we would like.

Otherwise, I think, the Motion as it stands is quite acceptable and, therefore, I stand to support it.

Mr. Ndicho: Mr. Speaker, Sir, allow me again to come back to this issue of being liberal in this House. The Vice-President and Minister for Planning and National Development, who is the Leader of Government Business brought in the issue of adhering ourselves to the traditions of this Parliament which we inherited from the British. This is the time we should discard these traditions and say no, to British traditions of Parliament and get our own traditions commensurate with the current traditions and aspirations of Kenyans today. At the moment, we are practising, as hon. Mutiso said, was practised in 1963.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, surely we have to be seen to have evolved and done away with some traditions since then, and transact Business in the modern style. But today, we are practising Business in the methodology of the 1960's.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, sometimes I am puzzled when we come to the Motion of Adjournment and it is not a wonder to see the Kenyan Parliament adjourning, even when there are people dying of some calamities. To the Kenyan Parliament, it does not matter, people can die but as long as our time to adjourn has come we adjourn and go home, yet it is the people of this country - Kenyans themselves - who elected 188 of us to come to this House and discuss those pertinent issues. So, I would like to request the Government through the Leader of Government Business to device ways and means of discarding these old traditions of Parliament. They are colonial and draconian. Let us be modern and get into the 21st century with new methods, styles and procedures of this House. My worry is: Shall we go to the 21st century with the traditions of the 19th and the 20th centuries of this House? Let us be bold and be more African, let us not be guided by *Wazungu* who died long time ago and those who even in their country today, do not practise what they used to do in the 1940's and 1950's. They are going modern every other time, yet the *wazungu* insist that for Kenya, the debate for adjournment should be five minutes only even if our people are dying of calamities. I wish to request the Government and the proper organs to address themselves to this issue of taking Parliament seriously.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Kenyans outside are looking upon this House as the only institution that should discuss issues. They expect that when we talk about issues, change will come, but what can we change in five minutes? What can I change and say about Juja Constituency in five minutes when we are adjourning?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, my earnest believe and trust is that the present Government can change these traditions, so that when another Government takes over, "we" shall find a reformed tradition of a modern Parliament.

With these few remarks, I beg to support.

Dr. Lwali-Oyondi: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I rise to support the Motion, but with the following remarks: That Motions of adjournment should be there and should not be mechanical. We pray to the Members on the Government side that they should think before they support such motions. There is a time when we have got very important issues to talk about and once the Leader of Government Business commands, they obey. For example, in the last adjournment, there were a lot of things that could have been discussed, the KANU Members of Parliament knew about it, but they mechanically voted for the adjournment.

*[Mr. Speaker left the chair]
[The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula)
took the Chair]*

Secondly, we would like to have a bit of change in the way the Chair appoints those who have to speak. If you look back into the records, you will find that it is one and the same people who speak. I have been here for almost five years and I have always been in Parliament without fail and I have as yet to speak on a motion of adjournment. This is because it happens that it is only the same people who catch the Speaker's eye. Secondly, when appointing those who have to speak, I would suggest that the Members contributing should be well observed to establish whether there are Members from the various Opposition parties, for example, FORD(K), then FORD(A) followed by KNC, then NDP, should there be a Member, and allow them to contribute, then go back again. That is on the Opposition side.

Of course on the KANU side, you can also take into account those from "KANU(A)", "KANU(B)", "KANU(C)" and even "D" as well. So that there is an even-spread.

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, another issue that should be looked upon is that, there are certain Members of this House who are very devoted to this House. They support the House, even on a Motion that is not all that popular. These devoted Members who stay in the House through thick or thin, should be given a chance to speak.

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, quite a few Members have been frustrated because they support the quorum in the House, but when it comes to speaking, there are Members who come through the door, make signs here and there, then they speak and dash out. They never listen to anybody's contribution, but to themselves, then they get out. That is not the encouragement that should be given to Members. We should have people speaking here and staying to vote because speaking in this House and not taking a vote is wasting time. This can be compared to football where you can display all styles, but if you do not score, then your styles come to nothing. The same applies to Members from the Opposition who give very brilliant speeches and then put their hands into their pockets and bow out to go and take some tea or do their own business. By so doing, they do not vote. That means that their previous speeches had nothing and they do not even support themselves. I think it is in order for the Chair not to support that kind of debate.

The time for adjournment should be adjusted in future to be more than two hours. But I agree that if you have something to say, you can easily say it in five minutes. You cannot say all that is needed in your constituency even if you are given one hour. Therefore, that is the day we have to discuss very sensitive matters. I do not agree with hon. Sunkuli when he says one should talk about the adjournment only and nothing else. During the Motion of Adjournment, we have to speak about things that affect our constituencies.

With those few remarks, I beg to support.

Mr. Obure: Thank you, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, for allowing me to contribute to the Motion.

This Motion of Adjournment has been a thorn in the flesh for Kenyans and for this House. When we are talking of adjournment and about doing the summary of all that we have been doing that Session. It is a time that we have to recollect what have done and focus on what we are going to do in our constituencies. I think the time of adjournment is very important in that, it is the time that requires the Leader of Government Business to give any advice to shape what we are going to tell the nation and what Parliament policies are, so that they can be articulated and when we go back home, we will be able to comprehend and tell Kenyans what the Government stands for and what it is intending to do and it has done.

Now that time has become a problem in this Parliament and in this Nation, many Members of Parliament have expressed the desire that the tradition should change. What kind of tradition are we changing? Are we changing our own tradition or the tradition that we have inherited in this Parliament? To my own understanding and to many Members of Parliament, I think we want to change the traditions of the British who colonised this nation. Today, we have failed because of time. We have failed time and again and so time has failed this nation. Time has failed this nation because we have passed with tradition, so that things that are supposed to take three hours take one minute. The point I want to drive home here is that we have to follow our own traditions. Our African tradition is very important in shaping things in this nation. I was brought up in a country where wazee could sit down and deliberate diligently, quietly and constructively. I think we should imitate what our forefathers thought time was. To me, time is not the watch I am wearing. If I wind forward this watch from 5.00 p.m. to 6.00 p.m., I could say, "the time is 6.00 p.m. and we could leave". So, time can be changed, but the real time according to the African tradition meant that one had to look at the sun when it was rising and when it was setting. That is what time meant because one cannot uphold the sun or make it set faster than expected. So, time and again, we have messed ourselves.

I think the issue here is that more time should be allocated to Members of Parliament, so that they can be able to articulate clearly, the issues facing their constituencies. That is the only time that we can address the issues that affect our nation correctly. So, I propose that the Motions for Adjournment should be allocated a full day. I am saying this because the issues discussed at that time stretch right from the beginning to the end. That will be the time of winding up all that we had discussed. That is the time when we are doing a summary and when the Leader of Government Business is to collect all the issues which articulate Government policy and that is the day when all Parliamentarians must be able to attend, because it is important to this nation. During the time of Adjournment, the Leader of Government Business hurriedly brings a Motion which might get some Members still in their constituencies.

When those Members are travelling to Nairobi to come and attend the proceedings of the House, the Leader of Government Business is on the Floor proposing the Motion of Adjournment.

I think the time allocated to this Motion is not enough. Where are we hurrying to? The question of time is money should not arise in an African context. We are so prone to borrowing British culture. Let us abandon this practice and uphold African concept of time.

With those few remarks, I authoritatively oppose this Motion and propose that we should allocate more time for the Motion of Adjournment.

Mr. Mathenge: Thank you, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. It has been customary for this House to debate a procedural Motion at the commencement of each Session of Parliament. I think time has now come for this House to draw up its own timetable specifying when Parliament shall meet, go on recess and for how long, and how it shall resume its Sitting. If we had a drawn-up timetable or programme---

Mr. Mak'Onyango: On a point of order, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. I would like to seek some guidance as to whether hon. Mathenge has been able to catch the Temporary Deputy Speaker's eye?

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): He has, otherwise, he would not be speaking, would he?

Mr. Mathenge: Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, this hon. Member has spoken more than ten times today, when hon. Mathenge has been sitting here waiting for a chance to make a contribution. When hon. Mathenge at long last catches the Temporary Deputy Speaker's eye, then he has no business to complain. He should listen. So, he should listen to what I am saying. I call upon this House to draw up a timetable at the beginning of a Session---

Mr. Mak'Onyango: On a point of order, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. Is it in order for the hon. Member to refer to impute improper motives on my person?

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): What did he say?

Mr. Mak'Onyango: Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, he talked of a cow.

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): I did not hear that. Carry on, hon. Mathenge!

Mr. Mathenge: I think my friend, the hon. Member has had a very long holiday at home or here in Nairobi. He has forgotten that we have come here for serious business. This being the second day since we started serious business here, we do not need to waste our time.

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): Did you call him a cow?

Mr. Mathenge: No! I have never used that language! That language is below me! I am above that kind of language! I am not a heckler and hon. Members know that! I was a provincial commissioner. I am above pettiness and the language of insulting other people. That does not befit me. I do not speak that kind of language. How could I call another hon. Member here a cow? How could I use abusive or obscene language in this august House?

An hon. Member: Do not even call him a bull!

Mr. Mathenge: Anyway, that is now behind us. What I am saying is that as it has been customary for us to debate a similar Motion at the commencement of every Session of Parliament, I would suggest that this Parliament draws up its own timetable, specifying dates of commencement of business, dates of going on recess, dates of coming back to the House and so on, until the Session is over.

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: On a point of order, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. Is it in order for hon. Owino Achola to refer to hon. Mathenge as the 'former governor' of the Rift Valley?

Mr. Mathenge: Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, these are very small matters! Whether he calls me a governor or what, I used to be a provincial commissioner. These friends of mine like to call me governor and provincial commissioner because they know of my ability to govern. They know that I mean business because I have proved by words and by action that what I say is what I believe in and it is what I consider to be practical and unbiased against other people. So, they can call me governor, PC, top administrator and any other names that they may have. I have been all that. Anyway now, I am wearing my cap of hon. Member of Parliament for Nyeri Town. Do not forget that I am also the District Chairman of DP, and a former KANU District Chairman for Nyeri, and a former member of the Governing Council of KANU. But I left all that. I am not speaking on behalf of KANU.

But I support the Motion as it is. As far as the timing for each hon. Member to speak is concerned, that is, five minutes, I think it is fair. We have done it here before and there is no need to increase the time because some people may even take an hour to speak on these things and end up without saying anything meaningful.

So, if anybody has anything to say, he should be able to say it within five minutes. If somebody cannot make a point in five or ten minutes, that means that he had not done his homework.

Mr. Munyasia: On a point of information, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir.

Mr. Mathenge: I do not need any information.

An hon. Member: Is it because they are your juniors?

Mr. Mathenge: No, they are not juniors but they are my equals.

Since I am not here to joke, I support the Motion, with those few remarks.

Mr. Mulusya: Thank you, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. I want to agree with most of the previous hon. Members who have spoken on the issue of time.

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, two hours is a very short time. We need at least a minimum of a whole afternoon sitting to be able to deliberate on matters before us, especially when we know what we are going to face

when we go out on recess.

Recess for all hon. Members who are able to speak their minds has been a nightmare for us. Those KANU Members who speak their minds cannot articulate issues and meet with the people they represent just because the DCs and the DOs have been given too much powers. They do not allow Members of Parliament to meet freely with the electorate, which is the main purpose of going to recess. So, it is very important that during the days that we are supposed to go on recess, some matters are ironed out.

When we adjourn, we do so to go and talk to these people. In the recent recess that we went, we witnessed cases of civil servants like DCs, DOs, Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs stealing famine relief food. We have no forum to air that one. That is a matter which---

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): Hon. Mulusya, the Motion before the House is very clear. Do you agree with it or you do not? How the DCs and DOs are stealing relief food is not before this House.

Mr. Mulusya: I agree with it. May I inform the Chair that even in yesterday's KANU Parliamentary Group Meeting, the issue of stealing of relief food was discussed at length. It was being stolen when we were on recess. Any question about that?

Members of Parliament want to be able to tell the Government what they expect the Government to do. They cannot be able to tell the Government what to do and how to work when they are on recess in five minutes. Five minutes is a very short time for anybody, however articulate or clear-minded he may be. We need far much more time than this. We are not going to ask for it now, but may I tell you that most of us who are going to come back in the next Parliament will insist that the Motion of Adjournment be given a full afternoon sitting so that many issues can be discussed.

Mr. Mak'Onyango: Thank you, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir.

Let me take this opportunity to make a call. Motions of Adjournment are very important facility for both this House and the Members hereto because they accord us an opportunity to expound on important national issues. Now, since it has to do with the adjournment, I really do want to make and appeal that when we talk of supremacy of Parliament, I think, in all fairness, Parliament should be a master of itself to the extent of among others, being able to decide when Parliament goes on recess. I am saying this because I can recall, before we went on the just concluded recess, this side of the House felt very strongly that there were certain very important issues that needed to be disposed of hence, an attempt to get the House to stay a little bit longer to dispose of those issues before we proceeded on recess. That was not to be because of what to me appeared to be the fact that Parliament is not quite supreme as we are made to believe.

Now that we are talking on this particular Motion, I think it is an appropriate time for us to address this issue. In order to make Parliament truly supreme, it must be a master of itself, and therefore, Parliament should be able to determine its own programme and decide when to go on recess and what not. I do think that if that is done, it will really help this Parliament so that, at least, we can be able to address issues as and when they arise instead of having to wait at the benevolent of somebody somewhere before we can be given an opportunity to discuss important issues that need to be addressed by this House.

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, there is also the question of how some of the facilities under adjournment are utilised. Very often, there are hon. Members who come up with very, very critical issues that need to be ventilated by this House and possible solutions drawn up. Now, I think, the process through which one has to go in order to be given an opportunity to raise the matter under the Motion of Adjournment is too cumbersome and I think we would be able to serve this country a lot better, if we simplified the process so that really, as and when a situation arises that need to be discussed under the Motion of Adjournment, a hon. Member should find it relatively easy to be able to bring up whatever the matter that is involved.

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, some of the contributors have talked about the fact that the five minutes that is provided is more than enough and if one is organised, he should be able to raise whatever point---

The Minister of State, Office of the President (Mr. Koech): On a point of order, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. Now that there is repetition of what is going on, I am wondering if I will be in order to move that the Mover be called upon to reply?

Mr. Mak'Onyango: Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, as I was saying before I was interrupted, in the Motion of Adjournment, I think, we should be able to liberalise the procedure so that as and when hon. Members have issues that need to be brought up under the Motion of Adjournment, there should be relative ease, to enable a hon. Member concerned to be able to move such Motion without any problem. I was talking about the question of five minutes, ten minutes and what-have-you. I do not think that our concern should be so much on five or ten minutes. We are concerned and I think what we want to do in this House is to come up with such an arrangement that will result in quality debate so that, at least, an arrangement is made that will be able to make hon. Members come up with the best possible input to whatever the issues before the House.

So, if more time is going to facilitate this, then I think that is what we should go for. The fact is that there are some who are better organised than others. There are those who will be able to organise their thought or chain of thought and be able to put their message across within a very short time and others will not. So, I do think that what should be our concern here in future should be what we need to do that will result in high quality debate.

With those few remarks, I beg to support.

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to make a few remarks over this procedural Motion.

I have a feeling that KANU is anxious to sabotage the process of democracy through the limitation of time for hon. Members to expound on important issues that affect us day by day. This Parliament is working for very few hours a day, yet the taxpayer is paying millions of shillings for us to sit here. This is not exactly theft, but it is dishonest on the part of Parliament. Parliament must be able to pay to the public's due by serving the public, yet we can count because of these various adjournments, the number of Motions we have passed in this House. I think, both those hon. Members within KANU and those within the Opposition must be given the opportunity to air their views that may be affecting the people they represent. Therefore, this limitation of five and ten minutes on every Motion is a practice against democracy.

Time is of essence, in other Parliaments, when they have something important to discuss, hon. Members sit up to midnight. There is no occasion when this Parliament has been able to sit up to midnight because the Front Bench on the KANU side is busy trying to make money as quickly as possible. I can appreciate the circumstances under which you operate and the limitations that are placed upon by the executive interference on the Parliamentary activities. Therefore, I oppose this Motion because I think that, curtailing the ability of Parliament work is a fundamental denial of the rights that we proclaim to defend here. It goes against the spirit of our oath to serve the public and defend the Constitution, if we cannot discuss those matters that are most crucial to the nation. Therefore, this Parliament runs a risk of becoming irrelevant.

This Parliament might be treated like that convention in Zaire which has been made irrelevant by Mr. Kabila's forces.

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): On a point of order, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. Is the hon. Member in order to insinuate that by allocating five minutes for each Member speaking, the Government is denying the Members time to speak when we have been doing this since time immemorial? Is he in order to try and imply that?

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, I was saying earlier on that we must get away from this archaic tradition so that we adapt and adjust to face the challenges of our times. It is my contribution that when people are dying of hunger in Ukambani and eating dogs, we are not able to articulate the issues that will solve their problems because the hon. Mutiso is too afraid to discuss those issues. It happened in your constituency.

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): On a point of order Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. Is the hon. Member in order to insinuate that I am afraid of discussing issues in this House? Can he substantiate that?

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: It is my humble submission that five minutes is not sufficient time to debate the critical challenges that face all of us and not only the KANU side but even our side and all we are saying is that we are pleading for more time for each Member who has a view to put forward, it is not mandatory that if we are given ten minutes you will use all of them; that if you have twenty minutes you will use all of them. I am only saying that five minutes is an undue limitation on the rights of Members to exercise their democratic rights. That is all I am saying and I am not suggesting that Mr. Mutiso himself has eaten any dog. I am only saying that these things are happening when this Parliament is pretending that we are serving the nation. We are burying our heads in the sand like the proverbial ostrich when things are facing us and we are going to be driven irrelevant by circumstances like Mobutu's Government has been done. That is all I am saying and I am dead serious about this that we cannot pretend to wananchi that this Parliament is going to solve their problems when we are not going to do so. Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, therefore, the question of my right to speak for Kasipul-Kabondo must be treated by this Parliament very, very seriously and time is essential in that respect.

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, with those few remarks, I beg to strongly oppose.

Mr. Obwocha: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to join my colleagues in opposing this procedural Motion. First of all, I would like my sentiments to be registered that Parliament as an institution should set its own timetable because we are normally "ambushed" by the Sessional Committee; that here is a Motion on Adjournment and we should go home". This is a dignified House with dignified Members of Parliament. These are not school boys and school girls. They should be given their due dignity to express what they feel should be said on behalf of their constituencies.

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, as I understand it, the Motion on Adjournment comes at the end of the Session or the sittings and, indeed, if it is coming at the end, it is a summary of what has been happening and what we

expect the Government to do. And, therefore, Members being given only five minutes to contribute to this Motion is inadequate time. We need more time to reflect on what has happened during the sittings; on what has happened during that Session and what we expect the Government to do or even ourselves as the Opposition to reassess our position.

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, without going into our experiences outside this House, other Parliaments particularly those we visited; that is the Canadian Parliament, the United Kingdom, the different Parliaments in Australia and New Zealand have devoted more time to Parliamentary work. The kind of time that we have devoted to Parliament, we are indeed robbing the money of the taxpayers of this country. It is too short and we do not deserve the salary and allowances that we earn with the time that we are sitting here. We should extend the sittings of this House to deliberate the issues that affect our constituents and the laws that we feel are good for this country.

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): On a point of order, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. I seek your guidance here. The hon. Member has used the word that we are sitting here and we are "robbing" the taxpayers during the short time that we are here. I am wondering whether that terminology is correct; that we are "robbing" the taxpayers by sitting here and doing nothing for them?

Mr. Obwocha: Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member for West Mugirango should be heard. I said that the salary we get and the allowances is not commensurate with the amount of time that we put in the business of this House.

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): Are you saying that you and your colleagues are robbers against wananchi?

Mr. Obwocha: Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not think I used the word "robbers" and there is no way a Member of Parliament can be a robber. If I said 'robbing', then I should honourably withdraw because I did not say it. This is the very reason why you went to jail hon. Mutiso.

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, to conclude, all that I am advancing is that the little time we have been given to contribute to this Motion of Adjournment is too short for any Member to make any point; to assess what we have done; to reflect on what we have done and, indeed to bring up the issues and we would propose that more time should be allocated to the Motion of Adjournment.

With those few words, I beg to oppose.

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am quite in order. Maybe the hon. Member does not understand what I am saying. All I am saying is that the Sessional Committee has the full mandate to decide on what business this House has to transact. Therefore, the Sessional Committee is not "ambushing" the House at all, whatever the Sessional Committee agrees upon is brought here and is upon the House to agree on what the Sessional Committee has passed. The Sessional Committee, like any other Committee of this House, has full mandate---

Dr. Otieno-Kopiyo: On a point of order, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. This Motion goes against the spirit of our Constitution, Section 79(1) states that:-

"Except with his own consent, no person shall be hindered in the enjoyment of his freedom of expression.

That is freedom to receive ideas and information without interference, freedom to communicate ideas and information without interference---

Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, by restricting Parliamentarians to five minutes each, this Motion contravenes Section 79(1) of the Constitution. I seek your guidance, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker.

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): I think he should have also told you that we are now pre-writing the Constitution.

Carry on, Mr. Mutiso.

The Assistant Minister for Home Affairs and National Heritage (Mr. Mutiso): Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am sure that you will also agree with me that the hon. Member is trying also to "ambush" you with the section of the Constitution.

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): Order, hon. Mutiso! He is not capable of "ambushing" the Chair!

Mr. Munyasia: On a point of order, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. Since we have heard almost all possible arguments for and against this Motion, would it be in order to call upon the Mover to reply?

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): I will accede to that.

(Question, that the Mover be now called upon to reply, put and agreed to)

The Vice-President and Minister for Planning and National Development (Prof. Saitoti): Mr.

Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not think I am going to add any word further to what hon. Members have said. I think they have done justice to a very important Motion.

With those words, I beg to Move.

(Question put and agreed to)

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

ADJOURNMENT OF DEBATE ON MOTION

The Minister for Labour and Manpower Development (Mr. Masinde): On a point of order, Mr. Temporary Deputy Speaker, Sir. In view of the fact that the next Motion is very, very important, and also that it is to be debated for seven consecutive days, in order to give hon. Members sufficient time perhaps to start tomorrow, may I move that this House do now adjourn under Standing Order No.23(2).

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): Within the meaning of the Standing Order No.23(2), I do not find your Motion frivolous, vexatious or an abuse of the House.

(Question put and agreed to)

ADJOURNMENT

The Temporary Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wetangula): Hon. Members, it is now time for the interruption of business. The House is, therefore, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, 3rd April, 1997 at 2.30. p.m.

The House rose at 6.00 p.m.