

**A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ON
THE LIFTING OF THE IMMUNITY OF THE FOURTH REPUBLICAN
PRESIDENT OF ZAMBIA IN 2013**

By

Clare Mwiinga

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in

Linguistic Science

University of Zambia

Lusaka

October 2015

DECLARATION

I, Clare Mwiinga hereby declare that *A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Parliamentary Debate on the Lifting of the Immunity of the Fourth Republican President of Zambia in 2013*, represents my own work. The sources of all materials have specifically been acknowledged and the dissertation has not previously been submitted for a Degree at this or any other University.

Signature of Researcher:

Date:

COPYRIGHT

© Clare Mwiinga 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this dissertation may be reproduced or stored in any form or by any means without prior permission in writing from the author or the University of Zambia.

APPROVAL

This dissertation by Clare Mwiinga is approved as fulfilling part of the requirements for the award of the Degree of Master of Arts in Linguistic Science of the University of Zambia.

Examiners' Signature:

1.....

Date:

2.

Date:

3.....

Date:

ABSTRACT

This study examined the discursual features of the parliamentary debate session of 15th March 2013 in which the immunity of the Fourth Republican President of Zambia was lifted, in order to establish the ideological implications of these features. The study was guided by the critical discourse analysis theory, which is an ensemble of techniques for the study of textual practices and language use as social and cultural practices. The data were collected by employing a purposeful sampling technique to select the debate session of 15th March, 2013. The recordings of this debate session, which were transcribed verbatim, constituted the sample for the study. Since the study is purely qualitative, it solely relied on document analysis by identifying themes which emerged from the debate session.

The analysis was done by first identifying the linguistic items present in the arguments used by members of parliament during debate session. Then the implications of these linguistic items were identified, and finally these implications were used to establish the ideological dimensions of Zambian politics. The study further makes use of Fairclough's model and van Dijk's framework in its analysis.

The results of the study indicate that the rhetorical structure of the arguments of the parliamentary debates follows a particular sequence and that the discourse of individual members of parliament is reasonable as well as persuasive. Besides, the idea of the relationship between the discursive event and discursive structure was established. The immunity lifting, which is the discursive event shaped the debate session, the discursive structure. The overall theme of the debate session which is 'respect for the rule of law, good governance and service to the people', calls for those serving in public offices to possess and uphold certain values which include honesty, integrity, accountability, and patriotism.

The study further revealed that this particular parliamentary debate was characterised by discursive polarisation in which members of parliament presented a world-view of 'Us' versus 'Them', where 'Us' positive self-presentation was juxtaposed with a negative presentation of 'Them' thereby creating in-groups and out-groups. Furthermore, the study demonstrated the debate was characterised by unequal power relations with the members of the ruling party enjoying more freedom than those of the Opposition.

DEDICATION

To my father Anderson Mwiinga

Daddy, I am so grateful for everything.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the first instance I would like to thank the Almighty God for keeping me in good health, providing me with a peace of mind, and for guiding me throughout my course of dissertation writing.

This work may be a modest one, but my debts are great and shall take this opportunity to express my gratitude. My heartfelt thanks go to my supervisor, Dr John Simwinga for the support, guidance and the patience he rendered to me during my dissertation writing. I am also grateful to Dr Kelvin Mambwe for the guidance and support he gave when compiling this work.

Sincere thanks also go to Mr. Musonda and Mr Chanda employees of Zambia National Assembly for the cooperation they gave me in accessing the copies of audio recordings of the debate session under study and a copy of the 2005 Standing Orders of the National Assembly.

I do not forget my colleagues in the Linguistic Science class of 2012/2013 intake of the University of Zambia. I am especially grateful to Mutinta Mweemba, for having been a formidable companion of mine while pursuing this course. Others include Ronald Chibwe, Maureen Nkolomwe, Maxwell Tembo and Clara Mumbi. Thank you colleagues for the companionship and encouragement you gave me during the course of study.

I wish to acknowledge the National In-Service Teachers' College (NISTCOL) Board for providing the funds for the study. I also thank my employers and colleagues of the Department of Literature and Languages of NISTCOL - Chalimbana for the understanding and cooperation they gave me while I was pursuing this course.

Lastly, I wish to thank all the Lecturers and staff of the Literature and Languages Department of the University of Zambia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENT	PAGE
Title of Dissertation.....	
Declaration	i
Copyright.....	ii
Approval	iii
Abstract	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	vii
List of Notation Convention Transcriptions.....	xi
List of Appendices.....	xii
Acronyms.....	xiii
Key Words	xiv
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 The National Assembly Zambia	1
1.2 Background to the Research Problem.....	2
1.3 Statement of the Problem	4
1.4 Purpose of the Study.....	4
1.5 Research Questions	5
1.6 Rationale of the Study.....	5
1.7 Contextual Framework of the Debate Session	6
1.7.1 The Activity Type of Parliamentary Debate	6
1.7.2 A Characterisation of the Activity Type of the Zambian Parliamentary Debates	7
1.7.3 Outline of the Debate Session of 15 th March.....	7
1.7.3.1 Deciding whether or not to go ahead with the Debate or Motion	7
1.7.3.2 Presentation of the Motion	9
1.7.3.3 Honourable Members' Reactions to the Motion	11

1.7.3.4 Conclusion of the Debate Session.....	13
1.7.3.5 Voting	13
1.8 Structure of the Dissertation.....	14
1.9 Summary of Chapter	15
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	16
2.0 Introduction.....	16
2.1 The concepts of Discourse and Discourse Analysis	16
2.1.1. Discourse	16
2.1.2. Discourse Analysis	17
2.2. Critical Discourse Analysis	17
2.2.1. The Importance of Critical Discourse Analysis	19
2.2.2. Politics and Critical Discourse Analysis	19
2.2.3. Discourse as Social Practice	20
2.3. Discourse, Ideology and Power Relations	20
2.4 Language and Politics	24
2.4.1 Politics and Ideology	25
2.5 Language and Ideology	27
2.6 Summary of Chapter	28
CHAPTER THREE LITERATURE REVIEW:.....	30
3.0 Introduction.....	30
3.1 Discourse Analysis in Zambia	30
3.2 Power and Discourse	31
3.3 Political Discourse	32
3.3.1 Political Discourse in General	32
3.3.2 Public Speaking and Political Discourse	42
3.4 Discourse in Other Public Domains	43
3.5 Summary of the Chapter	47

CHAPTERFOUR: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	49
4.0 Introduction.....	49
4.1 Study Design	49
4.2 Data Collection	49
4.2.1 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	49
4.2.2 Data Collection Technique	51
4.2.3 Document Analysis	51
4.3 Data Analysis	52
4.4 Summary of Chapter	52
CHAPTER FIVE: PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	54
5.0 Introduction	54
5.1 The Rhetoric Structure of Parliamentary debate Arguments	54
5.2 The Discourse of Individual Members of Parliament	59
5.3 The Implication of the Discursive Practice of the Debate Arguments	63
5.3.1 Covert Ideologies, Power Relations and Respect for Rule of Law.....	63
5.3.1.1 Covert Ideologies	63
5.3.1.2 Covert Ideologies and the Text	68
5.3.1.3 Unequal Power Relations	70
5.3.2 Leadership and Service to the People.....	73
5.3.2.1 Leadership and Accountability.....	74
5.3.2.2. Leadership and Level Headedness.....	76
5.3.3 Discursive Polarization	78
5.3.3.1 Discursive Polarization and Corrupt Practices.....	83
5.3.3.2 Discursive Polarization and Integrity.....	87
5.3.3.1 Discursive Polarization and abuse of Human Rights	92
5.3.4 Patriotism and Good Governance	96
5.3.4.1 Patriotism and Service to the People.....	98
5.3.5. Anticorruption and True Meaning of the Law.....	102

5.4 Conclusion.....	105
5.5 Summary of Chapter	105
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	106
6.0 Introduction.....	106
6.1 Conclusion.....	106
6.1.1 The Rhetorical Structure of Parliamentary Debate Arguments	106
6.1.1.1The Discourse of Individual Members of Parliament	107
6.1.2 The Role of Discourse in the Reproduction of Dominance and Inequality	108
6.1.3 Unequal Power Relations	110
6.1.4 Respect for the Rule of law and Good Governance.....	110
6.1.5 Discursive Polarization	111
6.1.6 True Leadership and Patriotism.....	113
6.2 Recommendations.....	113
REFERENCES.....	115
APPENDICES.....	125

LIST OF NOTATION CONVENTION TRANSCRIPTIONS

(.)	Just a noticeable pause
(.3), (2.6)	Timed pauses
↑word, ↓word	Onset of noticeable pitch rise or fall
A: word [word B: [word	Square brackets aligned across adjacent lines denote the start of overlapping talk. “[” shows where the overlap stops
Wo(h)rd	(h) is a try at showing that the word has “laughter” bubbling within it
Wor-	A dash shows a sharp cut-off
Wo:rd	Colons show that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound.
(words)	A guess at what might have been said if unclear
()	Unclear talk
A: word= B: =word	The equals sign show that there is no discernible pause between two speakers’ turns or, if put between two sounds within a single speaker’s turn, shows that they run together
<u>word</u> , WORD	Underlined sounds are louder, capitals louder still
>word word<	Inwards arrows show faster speech, outward slower
<word word>	
]]]]	represents a situation whereby there is some talk (by more than one person) in the background whilst somebody is talking
((sniff))	Effort at presenting something hard, or impossible, to write phonetically

LIST OF APPENDICES	PAGE
Appendix 1 The Debate Session -----	125
Appendix 2 Zambian Constitution 1996 Articles quoted during the Debate Session -----	179
Appendix 3 Standing Orders 2005 Articles quoted during the Debate Session -----	186

ACRONYMS

APNAC	African Parliamentarians Network against Corruption
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
DPP	Director of Public Prosecutions
GJIT	Government Joint Investigation Team
MMD	Multi Party Democracy
PF	Patriotic Front
SC	State Council
UPND	United Party for National Development

KEY WORDS

Argument

Covert Ideologies

Critical Discourse Analysis

Debate

Discourse

Discursive Polarization

Ideology

Parliament

Social Practice

Strategy

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The study examined the discorsal features of the parliamentary debate session on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President of Zambia in 2013 and then established the ideological implications of these features. This was done by analysing the linguistic items used in the discourse of members of parliament as they presented their arguments. The debate session in which the lifting of the Fourth Republican President's immunity was debated was chosen because of its sensitivity as it required that members come up with different strategies in order to convince others of whichever standpoint they took, and therefore is an ideal element for establishing the ideological implications of the language used in the National Assembly.

This chapter gives the background information to the study. It presents the specific problem under investigation and the rationale for the research. The chapter also outlines the purpose and objectives of the study with the specific research questions that were addressed. It further presents the contextual framework of the debate session, in order to place the study into context.

1.1 The National Assembly of Zambia

The unicameral National Assembly of Zambia is the country's legislative body. The current National Assembly, formed following elections held on 28th September 2011, has a total of 158 members. 150 members are directly elected in single-member constituencies using the simple majority (or First-past-the-post) system. The remaining 8 seats are filled through presidential appointment. All members serve five-year terms.

According to Article 62 of the Constitution of Zambia 1966, "Parliament" is a composite body consisting of the President and the National Assembly. The Republican President, through the powers conferred on him by the Constitution, calls Parliament to meet, orders elections to take place and gives final approval to laws (the Presidential Assent) but does not otherwise play an active role in parliamentary work. It is the National Assembly, which consists of elected and nominated Members of Parliament that carries out a wide range of important public responsibilities. These responsibilities include making laws (Acts of

Parliament), approving proposals for taxation and public expenditure, and keeping the work of the Government under scrutiny and review.

The Office of the Speaker in the Parliament of Zambia is established under Article 69 (1) of the Constitution of the Republic of Zambia, which states that “There shall be a Speaker of the National Assembly from among persons who are qualified to be elected as Members of the National Assembly but are not Members of the Assembly” (The Constitution of Zambia, 1996).

The election of the Speaker is the first business that a new Assembly transacts at its first meeting. This is so because Article 69 (3) of the Constitution of the Republic of Zambia states that “no business shall be transacted in the National Assembly (other than the election to the Office of the Speaker) – at any time when the Office of the Speaker is vacant” (The Constitution of Zambia, 1996). The Speaker is the Presiding Officer of the National Assembly and her/his authority is recognised and respected by all Honourable members of Parliament. He/she regulates debates and enforces strict observance of rules which govern orderly conduct in the House. She/he calls upon Members who wish to speak to do so. She/he preserves the order and dignity of proceedings in the Assembly.

Parliament generally has three functions: representation, legislation and parliamentary control, that is, hearings and inquiries. As part of their social activity, parliamentarians use language in a particular way to achieve their roles. Also as social actors acting within their field, parliamentarians produce representations of other practices as well as their own practices, in the course of their activity or parliamentary debate. Furthermore, they portray the constitution of identity of being as political leaders. All these activities have certain implications.

1.2 Background to the Research Problem

Politics is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. In this process, language plays a crucial role, because every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played through language (Fairclough, 1995). This study analyses the discourse of the parliamentary debate on the immunity lifting of the Fourth Republican President.

Given the role of parliament, it is crucial to decipher ideological traits typical of Zambian politics enshrined in the arguments of the parliamentary debates.

The term 'discourse' is used in various ways within the broad field of discourse analysis. First, 'discourse' in an abstract sense as a category which designates the broadly semiotic elements (as opposed to and in relation to other, non-semiotic, elements) of social life (language, but also visual semiosis, 'body language' and others). Second, 'discourse' as a count noun, as a category for designating particular ways of representing particular aspects of social life. For example, it is common to distinguish different political discourses, which represent say, problems of inequality, disadvantage, poverty, 'social exclusion', in different ways.

According to social theorists, such as Bourdieu & Wacquant (1992) and Bhaskar (1986), it is assumed that coherent accounts of the relationship between social structures and social events depend upon mediating categories, for which the term 'social practices' is used to mean more or less stable and durable forms of social activity, which are articulated together to constitute social fields, institutions, and organizations. There is a semiotic dimension at each of these levels. Languages (as well as other semiotic systems) are a particular type of social structure. The term 'order of discourse' is used for the semiotic dimension of articulated networks of social practices (Foucault 1984; Fairclough 1992, 2003). Social practices and, at a concrete level, social events, are articulations of diverse social elements, including semiosis.

Semiosis figures in social practices and social events in three ways. First, it figures as a part of the social activity, part of the action and interaction. For instance, part of doing a job, say, being in politics is using language in a particular way; so too is part of governing a country. Second, semiosis figures in representations. Social actors acting within any field or organization produce representations of other practices, as well as ('reflexive') representations of their own practices, in the course of their activity, and different social actors will represent them differently according to how they are positioned within fields or organizations. Third, semiosis figures in ways of being, in the constitution of identities, for instance, the identity of a political leader is partly a semiotically constituted way of being (Fairclough, 2000).

Furthermore, Semiosis as part of social activity constitutes 'genres'. Genres are diverse ways of interacting in their specific semiotic aspect. Semiosis in the representation and self-representation of social practices constitutes 'discourses'. Discourses are diverse representations of social life.

Finally, semiosis as part of ways of being constitutes 'styles' – for instance, the styles of business managers, or political leaders.

In parliamentary debates, the social practices and social events as well as genres, discourses and styles in the political realm are articulated together to produce certain results. The effects or impicature of this interaction account for the ideological implications of parliamentary debates.

This study investigates how members of parliament presented their arguments by examining the discorsal features in the linguistic items they used during the debate and then establishes their ideological implications. The question is: What are the ideological implications of discorsal features used in the discourse of the debate when members were presenting their arguments in parliament?

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Parliamentary debates are associated with certain discorsal features that carry with them particular ideological overtones. However, there has been no study that has investigated ideological implications of parliamentary debates in Zambia. It is in this regard that the study investigated parliamentary discourses and then established their ideological implications. The problem under investigation stated as a question is: What are the ideological implications of discorsal features used in the linguistic items of the parliamentary debate when members were presenting their arguments in parliament? Or did the discorsal features used in the linguistic items during the parliamentary debate reflect certain ideological implications? In a statement form, the problem under investigation is: we do not know the ideological implications of the discorsal features in the linguistic items of the parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The main objective of the study was to establish the ideological implications of discorsal features of the parliamentary debate on the lifting of immunity of the Fourth Republican President. Specifically, the objectives of the study were to:

- (i) analyse the rhetorical structure of the discourse used by members of parliament as they presented their arguments during the parliamentary debate.

- (ii) examine the discourse used by individual members of parliament when they were presenting their arguments during the debate.
- (iii) establish the relationship between discursive practices and their social function in the arguments of the debate.

1.5 Research Questions

Three specific questions concerning the ideological implications of the parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President were asked:

- (i) What was the rhetorical structure of the discourse used by members of parliament as they presented their arguments during the debate?
- (ii) What kind of discourse did individual members of parliament use in their arguments during the debate?
- (iii) What is the relationship between discursive practices and their social function in the arguments of the debate?

1.6 Rationale of the Study

Despite the substantial availability of literature on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), studies to do with this kind of analysis in Zambia are yet to be undertaken. Studies such as Simwinga (1992) and Njobvu (2010), done in the area of discourse analysis in Zambia have to a large extent focused on cohesion and coherence, thematic progression; while others such as Ngalande (2007) and Tambulukani (1985), have focused on functional analysis of information structure and logical analysis of texts. The present study examined the discoursal features of the parliamentary debate on the immunity lifting of the Fourth Republican President in order to establish the ideological implications of these features. This study is significant in that it may provide empirical data on the relationship between discursive practices and their social function by examining the discoursal features of the parliamentary debate. It is hoped that the investigation may provide further evidence and support for the theoretical position about Critical discourse analysis that ideologies reside in texts.

Over the past two decades, CDA has emerged as a major new multidisciplinary approach to the study of texts and contexts in the public sphere. CDA is the right place to perform an autopsy on the discourse, spoken or written, in order to find out about the ideologies

underlying it. Since very few studies have been done on parliamentary discourse and CDA in Zambia, the study might contribute new knowledge in the area of Sociolinguistics and Discourse Analysis. CDA, as an important branch of Discourse Analysis (DA), tries to focus on relations between ways of talking and ways of thinking, and highlights “the traces of cultural and ideological meaning in spoken and written texts” (O’Halloran 2005: 1946). CDA broadens the scope of linguistic analysis as it includes the larger socio-political and socio-cultural contexts within which discourse is embedded. It is therefore at this macro-level of analysis that we are able to unpack the ideological bases of discourse that have become naturalized overtime and are treated as common sense, acceptable and natural features of discourse (Fairclough 1995). In addition, the findings of this study will add substantial knowledge to the understanding of the nature of ideologies of parliamentary debates in particular and politics in general.

1.7 Contextual Framework of the Debate Session

This section presents the contextual framework of the debate session of 15th March 2013 in which the immunity of the Fourth Republican President of Zambia was lifted. The section discusses the Activity Type of Parliamentary Debates and brings out the kind of situation and circumstances in which the debate was undertaken as it places the debate session into context. Finally, the section outlines the debate session by giving a summary of the proceedings of the debate session from the beginning to the end.

1.7.1 The Activity Type of Parliamentary Debates

When rhetorical insights are incorporated into the analysis and evaluation of argumentation discourse, one necessarily needs to consider the argumentative reality as well, because the pragma-dialectical notion of ‘a critical discussion’ merely constitutes an idealised model. Due to this, Van Eemeren and Houtlosser (2005) introduced the term *activity type*. Activity types are institutional circumstances in which argumentative exchanges take place. The types can be distinguished by empirical observation of communicative practices in the various domains of discourse. Examples of domains are the legal, the political and the medical context. The activity type determines the exact borderline between a reasonable argument and an unreasonable one. Rhetoric refers to a style of speaking or writing which is intended to influence people.

1.7.2 A Characterisation of the Activity Type of the Zambian Parliamentary Debates

The unicameral National Assembly is Zambia's legislative body. The current National Assembly was formed following elections held on 20th September 2011, and has a total of 158 members. Out of this number, 150 members are directly elected in single-member constituencies using the simple majority (or First-past-the-post) system. The remaining 8 seats are filled through presidential appointment. The term of office for all these members to serve is five years.

The parliamentary session consists of several political parties, and all have their own agenda, formulated in their party programme. Every five years there are new, national elections in which Zambian citizens vote. Immediately after the elections, each party gets a certain percentage of the 150 seats available in the House, according to the number of votes received. The opposition, then, is formed by all parties that did not receive enough votes to be a candidate for the government. Those parties are free to stick to their party programme, but because of their minority it is less likely that those goals can be achieved.

The debate in the House is regulated by the Speaker, who is the chairperson, who leads the debate. Eventually the difference of opinion is settled by means of voting to determine the majority's decision. As a result, the debate may very well be no more than a formality, as the parties involved have determined their standpoint in advance and there may already be a majority prior to the debate.

1.7.3 Outline of the Debate Session of 15th March 2013

The debate session in which the immunity of the Fourth Republican President of Zambia was lifted can be divided into the following four categories (see Appendix 1). The first part is the uncertainty of going ahead with the motion, the second is the presentation of the motion itself, while the third part shows the reaction of the members to the motion and the fourth part gives the conclusion. Finally, the fifth part shows how the voting was done and that the votes for the motion were the majority, and therefore the question was agreed to accordingly.

1.7.3.1 Deciding whether or not to go ahead with the Debate or Motion

As Justice Minister then, Mr Winter Kabimba, SC presents the Motion, he is interrupted several times by point of orders raised by other Members of Parliament, majority of them

being Opposition members. The first point of order was raised by Mr Jack Mwiimbu, then Member of Parliament for Monze Central, citing the provisions of Articles 86 and 87 of the Constitution of Zambia, as read with Cap. 12 of the Laws of Zambia (see Appendix 2), the Standing Orders of the House (see Appendix 3), the various pronouncements that had been made by the Office of the Speaker and the existing precedents in the Commonwealth, pertaining to the Motion that was under consideration. The point was that since the matter was in court, it was not supposed to be discussed in the House (parliament) as it was *sub judice*. He argued, *your office has always said that once a matter is in court, your hands are tied and that there is nothing you can do until the matter is resolved in the courts of law*. Sub judice refers to a legal case or piece of evidence that is being considered by a judge or in a court and some details of it cannot be discussed in public. The Opposition Members of parliament supported this member by shouting, “*Hear, hear!*”

The point of order raised above was followed by an explanation from the Speaker of the National Assembly that under the Doctrine of the Separation of Powers, the House has a very unique freedom to determine and deal with its internal proceedings, arguing that the proceedings and procedures of the House are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the court. This was the ruling by the Speaker. After several interruptions and disorder in the House, the Minister of Justice, Mr Kabimba, continued as follows:

Mr Speaker, thank you for giving me an opportunity . . . to move a Motion that, in terms of Article 43 (3) of the Constitution of Zambia, . . . this House do resolve that Mr Rupiah Bwezani Banda, who has held, but no longer holds the office of President, may be charged with any criminal offence or be . . . amenable to the criminal jurisdiction of any court, in respect of any act done or omitted to be done by him in his personal capacity while he held the office of President and that such proceedings would not be contrary to the interest of the State. Mr Speaker I beg to move.

The moving of the motion by Mr Winter Kabimba was followed by some disorder in the House with the Patriotic Front Government members supporting the Motion, and the Opposition members of parliament opposing to the Motion. Due to this disorder, the Speaker of the National Assembly announced that he was suspending Business for fifteen minutes. The suspension of Business was done in order to give some explanation and reasoning to the

members of the House about the motion. Business was suspended from 14 42 hours until 16 30 hours.

When Business resumed, the Speaker of the National Assembly explained that after very extensive discussion and consultation to and fro, it was agreed that it would be in the best interest of the Business of the House to proceed with the Motion. The Speaker was at pains to explain in order to convince the Members of parliament, especially the Opposition members, who felt that it was not in order to have gone ahead with the Motion. He finally dictated to the House that they had to proceed. *...I must state that proceeding we are and obstruction there will not be*, charged the Speaker.

There was also a concern as to whether the Minister of Justice was in order to present the Motion when he was not the President. This was with reference to the fact that the previous removal of the immunity of a former Head of State (Dr Frederick Titus Jacob Chiluba) was presented to the House by the occupant of the Office, the Head of State himself, then Mr Levy Patrick Mwanawasa. The Speaker of the National Assembly responded by explaining that what happened during the Chiluba case was that the President gave an address to the members of the House and that afterwards it was realised that in that address there was no Motion. The members therefore had to frame the motion afterwards. The Speaker justified that the Minister of Justice was in order to present the Motion. Finally the Minister of Justice presented the motion.

1.7.3.2 Presentation of the Motion

The Minister of Justice started by giving a background from the time the late former President (Dr Levy Patrick Mwanawasa) was elected for the second term in 2006 and how Mr Lupando Mwape, who was Vice President then, lost the elections in the same year as Member of Parliament. He went on to explaining how Mr Rupiah Bwezani Banda was appointed Republican Vice President, how the late President Dr Levy Patrick Mwanawasa suffered a stroke and how he finally died in France on 19th August 2008. He further explained how Mr Rupiah Bwezani Banda ended up being the Republican President of Zambia after the Presidential by-elections of October 2008.

Mr Kabimba further explained that one of the major steps that was taken by the Banda administration was the amendment to the Anti-Corruption Act which saw the removal of the

clause with the provision for abuse of authority of public office. This clause was later reinstated by the PF Government in 2012 after winning the September, 2011 Presidential and General Elections. The restoration of the clause was intended to send a clear message to the public and the international community that the PF Government was serious and uncompromising about the fight against corruption and that the PF had maintained that stance through several public pronouncements by His Excellency the Republican President, Mr. Michael Chilufya Sata.

Mr Kabimba continued with his explanation stating that during the period 2008 to 2011, there was public concern about allegations of prevalent acts of abuse of office and corruption by serving public officers and honourable Ministers in the Banda administration. These allegations also extended to Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda, as President, and some members of his family. Later, there was mounting public demand to investigate the alleged acts of corruption and misappropriation of public funds and to bring those involved to account for such offences, including former President Rupiah Bwezani Banda.

In response to this public demand, the Government, in 2011, established the Government Joint Investigation Team (GJIT) to probe and prosecute cases of corruption, fraud and money laundering through the established criminal justice system which presumes an accused person innocent until proven guilty by an impartial tribunal after a fair trial. The GJIT had since secured convictions against some individuals while the prosecution of others was still ongoing. Mr Winter Kabimba also informed the House that when the GJIT invited the Former President for interview over allegations of corruption and criminal activities, his lawyers replied that Mr Banda could not be interviewed since he enjoyed immunity according to Article 43 of the constitution of Zambia.

In view of the foregoing, the House was moved, by article 43 (3) of the Republican constitution to resolve that any criminal proceedings instituted against Former President Rupiah Bwezani Banda would not be contrary to the interest of the state.

The Grounds of the Allegations were:

- (a) Abuse of Authority of, corrupt acquisition of public property and misappropriation and/or revenue or moneys and revenue in respect of crude oil contracts with the Nigerian Petroleum Corporation.

- (b) Importation and Customs Clearance of Movement for Multi-party Democracy Campaign Material.
- (c) Acts of Corruption in Respect of the Mpundu Property Development Trust.
- (d) Money laundering activities by former President Banda and members of his family in the acquisition of assets.

The Justice Minister ended by saying,

In view of the foregoing, I hereby submit before this August House that the House should resolve that criminal proceedings against Mr Banda would not be contrary to the interest of the State whatsoever, and that the Government Joint Investigation Team (GJIT) must proceed to prosecute him on the evidence, so far, established against him. Mr Speaker, I beg to move.

1.7.3.3 Honourable Members' Reactions to the Motion

Members of parliament reacted to the motion differently. While some supported the motion, others did not. At this time the members spoke for or against the motion justifying their positions. Some Opposition members of parliament even walked out of the House in protest of going ahead with the motion.

Mr Bwalya, then Honourable Member of Parliament for Lupososhi Constituency supported the Motion indicating that the lifting of the immunity of the Former President had to be done in the best interest of the rule of law since the rule of law cannot be separated from good government. Col Kaunda, the then Deputy Minister of Works, Supply, Transport and Communication also supported the Motion arguing that corruption is a cancer in the country which must be dealt with and that immunity is not a right, but a privilege given by the people of Zambia to those in authority and that it could be removed at any time.

Mr Mbewe, then Honourable Member of Parliament for Chadiza constituency did not support the Motion indicating that a very bad precedence was being set for their children and future leaders. He argued, *there is a need to remove the clause regarding the President's immunity in the Constitution so that the President can be questioned while he is in office . . . because this occurrence will continue into future generations.* He ended by complaining that ... *Sir, I*

feel victimized because there was not enough time given to the opposition to defend this matter before the House.

The Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, then Mr Gabriel Namulambe supported the Motion asserting that lifting the immunity was a move to help the former Head of State clear the allegations that had been leveled against him. In other words, the Former Head of State was innocent until proven guilty.

The Honourable member of Parliament for Kalomo, then Mr Request Muntaga did not support the Motion citing how a lot of resources were wasted during the removal of the Second President's immunity lifting (Frederick Chiluba), yet the money was not recovered. He went on to saying that he would rather the mover of the motion told them a little bit more about where the money could have come from. He submitted that the allegations required more information in order to convince the members of the House that there was actually a need to remove the immunity of the former president.

Honourable Belemu, Member of Parliament for Mbabala then, did not support the Motion for three reasons. Firstly, by then there was record that the PF as a party in Government had abused a number of already existing laws and a number of innocent citizens, therefore could not be trusted. To allow the immunity of Mr Rupiah Bwezani Banda to be removed, would be subjecting Mr Banda to be in the hands of a Government that had got a record of abuse of human rights. Secondly, the PF Government had blatantly abused the Public Order Act. It had even abused the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP), which was being directed to investigate people for owning cattle. Thirdly, the PF government had even abused the powers of the president to appoint Ministers from among Members of Parliament.

The Minister of Chiefs and Traditional Affairs, then Professor Nkandu Luo, supported the Motion indicating that true leadership demands accountability and that leaders are there to serve the people, not enriching themselves. She further pointed out that the lifting of the immunity acted as a reminder to those in public office that they are not omnipotent and not above the law. Mr Lubinda, Member of Parliament for Kabwata also supported the Motion asserting that it was a matter of reflection for the members of the House and the citizens to also invoke the other provisions of their statutes to ensure that they, too, live above board.

1.7.3.4 Conclusion of the Debate Session

In conclusion, the Minister of Justice, Winter Kabimba, the mover of the Motion, submitted that the issue of the removal of immunity was not peculiar to Zambian jurisdiction. He cited the Former president of Chile, President Pinochet, who was arrested in London; and that there was an extensive debate over the issue of how and when you remove the immunity of a former President. President Pinochet had arm-twisted the senate of Chile to confer upon himself life immunity for the period that he was in office. He was however, prosecuted for kidnapping and killing the citizens of his country, as the lawyers argued that no president is ever elected by his or her people to kidnap and kill citizens of their country or in this particular case to steal from citizens of her/his country. Mr Kabimba justified, *we bring this Motion without any aorta of bad faith against any individual and in particular, the former President, Mr Banda. We bring this Motion in the interest of the country and not as an afterthought.*

1.7.3.5 Voting

Since it was a constitutional resolution, there was need to record the number of Honourable members agreeing or disagreeing with the Motion by voting. The voting was done electronically, and the following were the results.

Those who voted 'Yes' were eighty (80), while the 'No' votes were three (3). Abstentions were four (4) and those that were Present but did not vote was one (1). Therefore the Question accordingly was agreed to.

As pointed out above, some members of the Opposition walked out of the House after trying hard to convince the movers of the motion that it was not in order to debate the motion since the matter was in court. The implication of walking out by the Opposition as regards the legality of discussing the matter or debating the motion of the proposal of lifting the immunity of the Fourth Republican President was counter persuasive. The Opposition felt that going ahead to debating the motion would be a violation of the rule of law. The irony is that the PF members moved the motion and defended themselves as having done so in respect of the rule of law, while the Opposition felt that going ahead with the motion would be a violation of rule of law. The departure from the House by the Opposition suggests that they

had not sufficiently been persuaded. The Opposition therefore walked out of the House out of frustration.

The few Opposition members who remained in the House tried to argue out their case by indicating that it was wrong for the PF to have been the ones proposing the immunity lifting of the Fourth President as they were also corrupt. The Opposition members used counter persuasive strategies to oppose to the motion of immunity lifting. For instance, they accused the PF members of not respecting the rule of law just as the PF accuse the Opposition of not respecting the rule of law. The Opposition members also referred to the Chiluba case in which the resources of the nation were used to pursue the case after lifting the immunity, but the stolen money was never recovered. The argument was that it was not very helpful to lift the immunity of a former president and use resources to pursue the case, and in the end not recover those stolen resources. The Opposition used the questioning of the rationale behind immunity lifting as a counter persuasive strategy.

1.8 Structure of the Dissertation

This dissertation is divided into six chapters. Chapter one introduces the study by giving background information to the investigation, giving the specific problem under investigation and the rationale for the research. The chapter also gives the purpose and objectives of the study with the specific research questions that were addressed. It further presents the contextual framework of the debate session. It brings out the kind of situation and circumstances in which the debate session under investigation was undertaken. This is done in order to put the study into context.

Chapter Two, gives the theoretical framework that guided the study. In order to adequately analyse the discourse of the parliamentary debate, the study used the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) theory as its guide. CDA is a theory which endeavours to reveal how power relations are enacted in discourse, and is therefore ideal in the present study since the study is to do with the ideological bases of discourse. The study adopts a combination of models in CDA, of Fairclough's (1989; 1993; 1995; 1998; 1999) unveiling of opaque ideological relations between discourses and socio-cultural practices; and van Dijk's (1993; 2001; 2004) investigation of the hidden power structures that ideological discourses reflect.

Chapter Three presents the literature related to the study. This is in order to place the investigation within the context of similar studies, thereby making the present study rich as well as justifying it.

Chapter Four provides the research design and methodology. It indicates the study design, sources of data, sample size and sampling techniques, and how the data were analysed in the study. The purpose of this analysis is in order to provide answers to the research questions presented in chapter One.

Chapter Five presents an analysis and discussion of the findings about the discourse of the parliamentary debate under investigation and then a critical discourse analysis is done. The presentation is arranged according to the objectives and research questions of the study presented in chapter one.

Finally Chapter Six provides overall conclusions regarding the ideological implications of the parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President in Zambia. Based on the findings, the chapter gives suggestions for future actions in the form of recommendations. Appendices follow the last chapter.

1.9 Summary of Chapter

This chapter has introduced a critical discourse analysis of the Parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President in Zambia. The presentation began with the background information on the National Assembly Zambia and the use of language in politics. The chapter has also presented the problem under investigation, the objectives and specific questions through which the objectives are addressed and the rationale of the study. It further has presented background information on how parliamentary debates are conducted in Zambia by showing the activity type of parliamentary debates. It also describes the Zambia National Assembly by bringing the composition of the members found there and their status.

Finally, the chapter gives an outline of the debate session under investigation from the time Mr Kabimba first attempted to present the motion up to the time the members concluded the discussion and voted, and how the question was accordingly agreed to. The chapter concludes with an outline of the structure of the dissertation. The next chapter discusses the theoretical framework that informed the study.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

The previous chapter provided background information on critical discourse analysis of the Parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President. This chapter explains the theoretical framework which informed the study. As pointed out in chapter one, the study examines the discursal features of the parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President in order to establish the ideological implications of these features. In order to adequately analyse the discourse of this debate, the study uses the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) theory as its guide. CDA is a theory which endeavours to reveal how power relations are enacted in discourse, and is therefore ideal in this study since the study is to do with the ideological bases of discourse. To unpack the theory of Critical Discourse Analysis, it is imperative to first explain the terms, discourse and discourse analysis and this is done in the first part of the chapter. The second part discusses CDA, its importance, its relation to politics, and to social practice, and discourse, ideology and power relations. The third part focuses on language and politics, and language and ideology.

2.1 The concepts of Discourse and Discourse Analysis

2.1.1. Discourse

Discourse is a broad term with various definitions which “integrates a whole palette of meanings” (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak & Vetter, 2000:42), covering a large area from linguistics, through sociology, philosophy and other disciplines. According to Fairclough (1989:24) the term refers to “the whole process of interaction of which a text is just a part”. The word *discourse* has its genesis from the Latin word ‘discursus’ which denoted ‘conversation speech’ Wassniewsk (2006). Crystal defines discourse as “a continuous stretch of language larger than a sentence, often constituting a coherent unit such as a sermon, argument, joke, or narrative” (1992:25). Discourse is also understood as naturally occurring language or language in use (Stubbs, 1983; Cook, 1989). On the other hand, Dakowska (2001:81) identifies unity of communicative intention as a vital element in defining the term discourse. Discourse therefore, is any instance of language use for communication by real

human beings in a real-life setting in either spoken or written form. It may consist of a single word or utterance or a series of words or utterances.

2.1.2. Discourse Analysis

Discourse Analysis refers to the analysis of language in use beyond a sentence in a real life situation (Crystal, 1992). It focuses on investigating connected, naturally occurring spoken or written instances of language use in order to establish patterns or regularities for the purpose of having a better understanding of human communication (Fairclough, 1995). Discourse Analysis seeks to establish how naturally occurring language is determined by, and in turn determines, the ways in which knowledge is acquired, stored and used by the human mind as well as how language is shaped by the ways in which people interact with one another within their social and cultural contexts (Stubbs, 1983; Cook, 1989).

2.2. Critical Discourse Analysis

According to Fairclough (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) refers to the use of an ensemble of techniques for the study of textual practices and language use as social and cultural practices. It is a type of discourse research which primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, produced and resisted by text and talk in social and political context. CDA focuses on the relationship between power and discourse. Fairclough (1993:135) aptly states that Critical Discourse Analysis is discourse analysis which aims to:

systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practice, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony.

From the quotation, it is clear that CDA deals with any aspect of power, domination and social inequality. Critical discourse analysis examines language as a form of culture and social practice. It is also considered to be an approach that allows the description and interpretation of social life as it is represented in talk and text in social and political context. As such, there is a society end and a language end. The critical techniques of critical discourse analysis are derived from various disciplinary fields which include pragmatics, narratology and speech act theory. These disciplinary fields argue that texts are forms of social action that occur in complex social contexts (Fairclough, 1989). Critical discourse

analysis uses analytical tools from these fields to address persistent questions about larger systemic relations of class, gender and culture. The principal unit of analysis for critical discourse analysis is the text. Texts are taken to be social actions, meaningful and coherent instances of spoken and written language use. Yet their shape and form is not random or arbitrary. Specific text types serve conventional social uses and functions. For instance business letters are likely to feature discourses of finance and business; different news papers will project different types of Discourse. For instance, government papers and private newspapers will report the same news differently. CDA employs interdisciplinary techniques of text analysis to look at how texts construct representations of the world, social identities, and social relationships. The theory further aims at challenging social orders and practices that we accept as natural but are in actuality naturalized (Fairclough 1995; Chouliaraki & Fairclough,1999).

According to Kommaluri and Ramamurthy (2011), CDA is an approach to discourse analysis in which two senses of the term discourse – the linguistic sense and the critical theorist’s sense - are equally relevant. The ‘critical’ in CDA refers to a way of understanding the social world drawn from critical theory. Within that paradigm reality is understood as *constructed*, shaped by various social forces. These, however are frequently naturalized - in every day discourse, as opposed to critical discussions of it, reality is presented not as the outcome of social practices that might be questioned or challenged, but as simply “the way things are”. Naturalization obscures the fact that ‘the way things are’ is not inevitable or unchangeable. CDA also seeks to make visible the common-sense social and cultural assumption which despite being below the level of conscious awareness, are embedded in all forms of language that people use (cf. Fairclough, 1995). The central claim of CDA is that the way certain realities get talked or written about - that is, the choices speakers and writers make in doing it - are not just random but ideologically patterned. Fairclough (1989:30) uses discourse analysis techniques to provide a political critique of the social context - from a Marxist viewpoint. He defines what he calls critical language study thus:

Critical is used in the special sense of aiming to show up connections which may be hidden from people - such as the connections between language, power and ideology...critical language study analyses social interactions in a way which focuses upon their linguistic elements and which sets out to show up their generally hidden determinants in the system of social relationships, as well as hidden effects they may have upon that system.

The present study applied CDA to political discourses in order to discover the realities which have been naturalised as ‘non-ideological common sense’ (see section 5.3.3).

2.2.1. The Importance of Critical Discourse Analysis

According to O’Halloran (2005:1946), CDA tries to focus on relations between ways of talking and ways of thinking, and highlights “the traces of cultural and ideological meaning in spoken and written texts”. CDA broadens the scope of linguistic analysis because it includes the larger socio-political and socio-cultural contexts within which discourse is embedded, as it is at this macro-level of analysis that we are able to unpack the ideological bases of discourse that have become naturalized overtime and are treated as common sense, acceptable and natural features of discourse (Fairclough 1995; van Dijk 2004).

2.2.2. Politics and Critical Discourse Analysis

Politics is one of the fields or topics which invite CDA to perform its valuable job. Demonstrations, parliaments, presidential campaigns and political debates are all the fields of ideological battles. This perspective is so because, as van Dijk (2004:11) contends, “it is eminently here that different and opposed groups, power, struggle and interests are at stake. In order to be able to compete, political groups need to be ideologically conscious and organised”. One of the key factors that determine the political figures’ success in reaching their goals and winning the public consensus in this continuous power struggle is their ability to persuade and impress their audience. During the debate under investigation in the present study, members had to persuade others of their view points in order to make good impressions.

Teittinen (2000:1) further posits that “the winner is a party whose language, words, terms and symbolic expressions are dominant once reality and the context have been defined”. Therefore the need for critical listening and reading is felt more than any other time to realise what the reality is and how it is distorted through delicate and skilful use of language. Like the coroner, people have to dissect the discourse, find the distortion, go through it and discover the reality at last (cf. Fairclough, 1995). The present study uses this approach to dissect the discourse of individual members of parliament during debate in order to discover the reality at last.

2.2.3. Discourse as Social Practice

According to Fairclough (1995; 1989), CDA sees discourse as a form of social practice and he argues that all linguistic usage encodes ideological positions, and studies how language mediates and represents the world from different points of view (cf. Van Dijk 2004). It is the connection between ideas, language, power and the ordering of relationship within society that is important for those involved in CDA. While DA focuses on the relationship between language forms and a limited sense of context and tends to be oriented to a narrow understanding of the larger social, cultural and ideological forces that influence our lives, CDA goes much further toward addressing the ideological dimensions of discourse. It is a version of discourse that does not posit language use free of ideological conditions. CDA is particularly suitable for investigating why the participants say what they say, and how they say it, and what underlying intentions are there in the statements they make. To handle these concerns, the broader definitions offered by Fairclough (1995) and Fowler (1996) seem relevant and relatively more all encompassing. CDA treats discourse as a social practice and analyses the influences of social, political and cultural contexts on discourse. Since CDA sees discourse as both produced and shaped by ideology, it stresses the essential linguistic characteristics of social relationships, social structures, and the power distributed among them. Van Dijk (1993) adds that CDA examines the way in which powerful gatekeepers in society influence social beliefs and values, and shape ideologies, through the standards they set for what is and is not acceptable, therefore revealing the power asymmetry in discourse.

Furthermore, Wodak (1996:17) explains that “discourses are multi-layered and CDA studies discourses ‘distorted by power and ideology’, in order to investigate how they are embedded in cultural forms of life, which they co-constitute”. The analysis used in the present study is a combination of models in CDA, of Fairclough’s (1989; 1993; 1995; 1998; 1999) unveiling of opaque ideological relations between discourses and socio-cultural practices; and van Dijk’s (1993; 2001; 2004) investigation of the hidden power structures that ideological discourses reflect. The study, in its analysis of individual members’ discourse brings out covert ideologies which are hidden in the text which is the debate session itself (see section 5.3.1.2).

2.3. Discourse, Ideology and Power Relations

Fairclough (1995) argues that language is linked to social realities and brings about social change. He explains that the government manipulates and uses language in significant ways,

and is particularly concerned with the linkage between discourse, ideology and power relations within society. He uses the linguistic orientation of systemic-function grammar of Halliday. However, Fairclough does not limit DA to the study of texts and specific discursive practices. He emphasises a text as the product of a process in which discourse is closely related to social structures in its production and interpretation, thereby critically examining specific situations where relations of power, dominance and inequality are instantiated in discourse.

Fairclough's model of CDA stresses that while macro-structures of society may determine the micro-structures of discourse, these in turn reproduce the larger social and ideological structures. Thus it operates with a dialectal relationship between the micro-structures of discourse (linguistic features) and the macro-structure of society (societal structures and ideology).

In 2005, Fairclough made an attempt to highlight and enrich a transdisciplinary approach to CDA that was first introduced into CDA by Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999). The feature central to Fairclough's approach is that of transdisciplinarity and dialectics of discourse in relation with other non-discoursal elements of social life. He contends that transdisciplinary research can be further developed and enhanced through dialogue of all the disciplines and theories involved, which he exemplifies by the treatment of genre and genre analysis in the version of CDA. Fairclough further claims that CDA can benefit from research in other disciplines and theories, and vice versa.

The relevance of CDA is that it can expose the transformations in language and discourse favouring such trends. It can enlighten how the discourse shapes and reshapes the given reality. CDA has set out a dialectical view of the relationship between discourse and other facets of the social world. Fairclough (1999) further takes up this theme of "the duality of social structure and human agency" by insisting that there is a mutually constituting relationship between discourses and the social systems in which they function. He maintains that the task of discourse analysis is thus to examine this dialectical relationship and to expose the way in which language and meaning are used by the power to deceive and oppress the dominated. The present study endeavoured to expose the way in which language and meaning are used by the power to deceive and oppress the dominated by exposing the hidden

schemes of the ruling party to deceive the Opposition during the debate session (see section 5.3.3.2)

Van Dijk (1985) holds that texts are not used just to inform us of some reality. They in addition, based on the ideological standpoints of the person, organisation, or whoever or whatever is involved in their production, construct the reality. One of the main tenets of CDA, then, is to reveal the sources of dominance and inequality observed in the society by analysing texts (written or spoken). The reason is to find the discursive strategies utilised to construct or maintain such inequality or bias in different contexts. The present study endeavoured to identify the crucial role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance and inequality in Zambian politics by analysing parliamentary discourse (see section 5.3.1.3).

Van Dijk's (2004) seminal work, *Politics, Ideology and Discourse*, proposes a worthwhile framework for political discourse analysis. This work describes the political discourse as the most ideological. Van Dijk (2004:11) argues that

The social organization of the field of politics, and hence of politicians and political groups, is largely based on ideological differences, alliances and similarities. The overall organization of social beliefs as a struggle between the Left and the Right is the result of the underlying polarization of political ideologies that has permeated society as a whole ... Indeed, political ideologies not only are involved in the production or understanding of political discourses and other political practices, but are also (re)produced by them. In a sense, discourses make ideologies 'observable' in the sense that it is only in discourse that they may be *explicitly* 'expressed' and 'formulated'. Other political practices only implicitly show or experience ideologies, for instance in practices of discrimination on the basis of sexist, racist or political ideologies.

Van Dijk defines political discourse not only in terms of discourse structures but also in terms of political contexts. He contends that it is not sufficient to observe, for instance, that political discourse often features the well-known 'political' pronoun *we*. It is crucial to relate such use to such categories as *who is speaking, when, where and with/to whom*, that is, to specific aspects of the *political situation* (2004:13).

Van Dijk's (2004) framework consists of two main discursive strategies of 'positive self-representation' (semantic macro-strategy of in-group favouritism) and 'negative other-representation' (semantic macro-strategy of derogation of out-group) which are materialised through some other discursive moves such as 'actor description', 'authority', 'burden'

(‘opos’), ‘categorisation’, ‘comparison’, ‘consensus’, ‘counterfactuals’, ‘disclaimer’, ‘euphemism’, ‘evidentiality’, ‘example’/‘illustration’, ‘generalisation’, ‘hyperbole’, ‘implication’, ‘irony’, ‘lexicalisation’, ‘metaphor’, ‘selfglorification’, ‘norm expression’, ‘number game’, ‘polarization’, ‘Us-Them’, ‘populism’, ‘presupposition’, ‘vagueness’, ‘victimization’ (van Dijk's 2004: 59).

Drawing from van Dijk's (2004) framework, the present study makes use of these two strategies of in-group favouritism and derogation of out-group with the discursive moves such as ‘polarization’, ‘Us-Them’, ‘self-glorification’, ‘generalisation’, ‘comparison’, and ‘number game’ representations in the analysis of discourses of individual members of parliament. For instance, polarized views of ‘Us-Them’ representations are revealed in the present study when members of the Opposition on one hand are praising themselves and condemning the members of the ruling PF for being corrupt, while on the other hand the members of the ruling PF glorify their actions and condemn the Opposition (the MMD) for being corrupt (see section 5.3.3.1). The study also attempts to deconstruct covert ideologies which are hidden in the text, the debate session (see section 5.3.1.2).

Since language users do not function in isolation, but in a set of cultural, social and psychological frameworks, in the present study, the connections between textual structures are examined and the social context taken into account in order to explore the links between textual structures and their function in interaction within the society. In this case the arguments of parliamentary debates (textual structures) are examined and the political field (social context) taken into account to establish the ideological implications in society (function in interaction with society). Thus the arguments are examined as to how persuasive they are, that is, the effectiveness of argumentation in convincing people of a certain viewpoint. After that, the arguments are examined to establish how reasonable they are, that is, the standards with which the discourse should comply in order to be sound (Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004; Eemeren & Houtlosser, 2005). The persuasiveness and reasonableness of arguments help in achieving the understanding of the function of interaction of society and textual structures thereby bringing out the ideological implications of these texts.

From the foregoing, it can be summed up that CDA is mainly interested in the role of discourse in the instantiation and reproduction of power and power abuse, and hence

particularly interested in the detailed study of the interface between structures of discourse and the structures of power. Issues of politics and society are thus not merely abstract systems of social inequality and dominance, but they actually “come” down in the forms of everyday life, namely through the beliefs, actions and discourses of group members (cf. Fairclough, 1995). CDA is specifically interested in the discursive dimensions of these abuses, and therefore must spell out the detailed conditions of the discursive violations of human rights. For instance, when newspapers publish biased accounts about the marginalised, when managers engage in or tolerate sexism in the company or organisation, or when legislators enact neo-liberal policies that make the rich richer and the poor poorer (cf. van Dijk 2004).

The present study gives a critical discourse analysis of the discourse of the parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President, with a view to establishing the ideological implications of this discourse. Using Critical Discourse Analysis framework, the study investigates how the candidates of different political affiliation try to justify their ideas and persuade their audience by utilising subtle ideological discourse structures in their speech.

2.4 Language and Politics

This section discusses the close affinity shown between language and politics to work out the discursive practices apparent in public political discourses. As pointed out above, politics is concerned with power - the power to make decisions, to control resources, to control other people's behaviour and often to control their values. The acquisition of power and the enforcement of one's belief systems can be achieved in a number of ways. One such method is through physical coercion or by indirect means of coercion through the legal system. However, it has been argued that it is often much more effective to persuade people to act voluntarily in the way one wants, that is, to exercise power through the manufacture of consent or at least acquiescence towards it. To achieve this voluntary action, an ideology needs to be established. One which makes the beliefs which one wants people to hold appear to be “common sense”, thus making it, difficult for them to question that dominant ideology (Locke 2004). The present study establishes how this ‘voluntary action’ is achieved by examining the discourse of individual members of parliament during the debate.

Locke (2004) further posits that political discourse is not simply a genre, but a class of genres defined by a social domain, namely that of politics. In simpler terms, political discourse is the

discourse of politicians. This means that the discourse is political when it accomplishes a political act in a political institution, such as governing, legislation, electoral campaigning, parliamentary debate and so on. The argument goes on to asserting that since political discourse is a broad category, studies on political language have included investigation into very different sub-genres such as electoral language, party political language, the language of diplomacy and international relations, the language of social conflict, the language of parliament and others. We can therefore say that language is a means of communication, a means of presenting and shaping argument and political argument is ideological, in that it comes from a series of beliefs. Besides, language is not something somehow separate from the ideas it contains, but the way language is used says a great deal about how the ideas have been shaped. The implication therefore is that when analysing the language of a political text, it is important to look at the way the language reflects the ideological position of those who have created it, and how the ideological position of the readers will affect their response too.

Chilton (1993) identifies two approaches in this regard, descriptive and critical, for dealing with this issue of politics and language. Descriptive approach relies on redescribing rhetorical devices, the verbal behaviour of politicians and their ideology; whereas critical approaches incorporate social theories dealing with the relationship between language and power, control and dominance and orders of discourse. Chilton (1993) while elaborating on the modern descriptive approaches, recasts the traditional rhetorical aspects like persuasive, deceptive and manipulative, in terms of phonological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic and textual levels of description. He places the devices of alliteration, assonance and rhythm on the phonological level; the use of agent less passive on the syntactic level; and on the lexical level, emphasis is on “jargon” words. These are words characteristic of some closed group of speakers, neologisms, acronyms and word formation. He further posits that on the semantic level the interest is in semantic reconstruction and shifts arising from, for instance, paraphrasing, and euphemism. On the textual and pragmatic levels, commentators have noted modes of argumentation.

2.4.1 Politics and Ideology

The concept of ideology is crucial in political science and since ideologies are defined in terms of basic beliefs shared by the members of groups; this also means that political discourse is the site where politicians’ multiple ideological identities are enacted. Political

and ideological discourse analysis is usually based on individual discourses, so it will not be strange at all to find influence of various ideologies (van Dijk, 1985). The social identity of politicians are also defined by such categories as membership devices, activities, aims and goals, norms and values, relations to other groups and resources or “capital”. Van Dijk (2001) has roughly defined the ideological self identity of politicians as professionals in the following ways. Identity criterion which involve election to political office, activities which involves “doing” politics as in representing citizens, legislating and so on. Besides, there is aim which entails governing a country, state or constituency, norms and values such as democratic values, honesty and integrity, position, relation to other groups which is concerned with relation with constituents, and resource which entails political power.

The above implies that if politicians regularly criticise other politicians for ‘not listening to the voice of the people’, as is often the case in populist political discourse, then we may assume that the basic activities and norms defining the ideology of politicians involve not listening to the voice of the people’. If there are political ideologies, then they must specifically apply in the domain of politics, and organise political attitudes and political practices. Van Dijk (2001) further contends that when the focus is on politicians, at least two ideologies are expressed in their text and talk: firstly professional ideologies that underlie their functioning as politicians and secondly the socio-political ideologies they adhere to as members of political parties or social groups. Thus ideology, politics and discourse form a triangle that poses interesting theoretical and analytical questions. As van Dijk (2001) goes on to say when defined as socially shared representations of groups, ideologies are the foundations of group attitudes and other beliefs, and thus also control the biased personal mental models that underlie the production of ideological discourse. Besides, the point of ideological discourse analysis is not merely to discover underlying ideologies, but to systematically link structures of discourse with structures of ideologies. This therefore means that if ideologies are acquired, expressed, enacted and reproduced by discourse, this must happen through a number of discursive structures and strategies (cf. van Dijk, 2004).

According to van Dijk (2004) in theory and depending on context, any variable structure of discourse may be ideologically “marked”. Van Dijk stresses that ideologies may only influence the contextually variable structures of discourse and that the obligatory, grammatical structure cannot be ideologically marked because they are the same for all

speakers of the language and in that sense ideologically neutral. He however points out that there may be some debate on whether some general grammatical rules are really ideologically innocent. Some variable structures are more ideologically “sensitive” than others. He uses syntactic structures and rhetorical figures such as metaphors, hyperboles or euphemisms to emphasise or de-emphasise ideological meanings, but acknowledges that as formal structures they have no ideological meaning. Van Dijk (2004) further posits that a general tendency among the organisation of ideological discourses is the strategy of positive self-presentation (boasting) and negative other-presentation (derogation). He concludes by submitting that there are many discursive ways to enhance or mitigate our / their good / bad things, and hence to mark discourse ideologically.

2.5 Language and Ideology

Ideology refers to a body of ideas that reflects the beliefs and interests of a nation, political system, and underlies political action. It also refers to a set of beliefs by which a group or society orders reality so as to render it intelligible (Collins, 2012). An ideology is a set of conscious and/or unconscious ideas which constitute one's goals, expectations, and actions. It is a comprehensive normative vision, a way of looking at things, as argued in several philosophical tendencies, and/or a set of ideas proposed by the dominant class of a society to all members of this society thus a "received consciousness" or product of socialisation. Ideologies therefore are systems of abstracted meaning applied to public matters, thus making this concept central to politics. Implicitly, in societies that distinguish between public and private life, every political or economic tendency entails an ideology, whether or not it is propounded as an explicit system of thought.

According to James and Steger (2010), ideologies are patterned clusters of normatively imbued ideas and concepts, including particular representations of power relations. These conceptual maps help people navigate the complexity of their political universe and carry claims to social truth.

Language ideology is a concept used primarily within the fields of anthropology, sociolinguistics, and cross-cultural studies to characterise any set of beliefs or feelings about languages used in their social worlds. When recognised and explored, language ideologies expose connections between the beliefs speakers have about language and the larger social and cultural systems they are part of, illustrating how these beliefs are informed by and

rooted in such systems. By doing so language ideologies link the implicit as well as explicit assumptions people have about a language or languages in general to their social experience and political as well as economic interests.

Irvine (2012), aptly states that language ideologies are conceptualisations about languages, speakers, and discursive practices. Like other kinds of ideologies, language ideologies are pervaded with political and moral interests and are shaped in a cultural setting. To study language ideologies, then, is to explore the nexus of language, culture, and politics. It is to examine how people construe language's role in a social and cultural world, and how their construals are socially positioned. Those construals include the ways people conceive of language itself, as well as what they understand by the particular languages and ways of speaking that are within their purview. Irvine further contends that language ideologies are inherently plural: because they are positioned, there is always another position - another perspective from which the world of discursive practice is differently viewed. Their positioning makes language ideologies always partial, in that they can never encompass all possible views - but also partial in that they are at play in the sphere of interested human social action. She goes on to saying that approaches rooted in disciplinary linguistics, such as CDA, are anthropology's close kin, while political and social theorists writing on "ideology" are of obvious relevance. Because the concept of language ideology is so fertile, it connects to more disciplines and issues other than the ones mentioned here.

2.6 Summary of Chapter

The chapter has outlined the theoretical framework for the study. The major concepts discussed include discourse, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis, the theory guiding the study has been discussed in detail bringing out its importance and is applied to politics and to discourse as social practice. To unpack the theory further, the concepts discourse, ideology and power relations have been outlined and explained in detail. All these concepts are important to the analysis of parliamentary discourse in the present study. In addition other concepts related to the study have been explained to place the study into context. These include language and politics which outlines the close affinity shown between language and politics, to work out the discursive practices apparent in public and political discourses. The concept of language and ideology has also been discussed bringing out its importance to the field of linguistics and its relation to the

present study. The next chapter presents the review of the literature related to the present study. This is in order to place the investigation within the context of similar studies thereby enriching it as well as providing a justification for it.

CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

3.0 Introduction

The previous chapter provided the theoretical framework for the study and gave a detailed explanation of some of the core concepts relating political discourse. This chapter presents a review of the literature related to the present study. The studies cited are those that have examined discursual features in politics and other public domains. The studies on political discourse have to a large extent to do with presidential speeches or politics in general. The presentation of the related literature is organised under four sections. The sections focus on studies that were conducted on discourse analysis in Zambia, and those that examine discourse in other countries. Others are those which are to do with power and discourse, those studies that highlight political discourse and those that deal with discourse in other public domains. All the studies highlight discourse as used in public domains or naturally occurring language.

3.1 Discourse Analysis in Zambia

Studies done in the area of discourse analysis in Zambia have to a large extent focused on cohesion and coherence, thematic progression (Simwinga 1992 & Njobvu, 2010); while others have focussed on functional analysis of information structure and logical analysis of texts (Ngalande 2007 & Tambulukani 1985). The most relevant work to this study is the one done by Musakabantu (1984) on some linguistic and discursual features of law reports and their pedagogical implication in preparing reading courses for students of law at NIPA. In his study, Musakabantu examined the overall structure of the discourse of law reports, investigated the acts which constitute the communicative event, and explored the linguistic features which pertain to the individual acts in the discourse. He did this by analysing ten law reports and discussing a number of issues pertaining to them with some people, mainly his colleagues on the MSC course.

The findings revealed that law reports, despite their apparent similarities to other genres have specific combinations of linguistic features. They have no rigid format but consist basically of abstract and synopsis. The abstract pre-announces the content of the synopsis while the latter is the law report proper. It was found that law reports contain typically legal terms which are used in combination with linguistic features of other genres to create legal

discourse. The study by Munsakabantu is related to the present one in that it examined linguistic features of law reports just like the present study examined linguistic features of the parliamentary debate. However, Munsakabantu looked at the linguistic features of law reports and their pedagogical implication, and not a critical discourse analysis of these reports. The present study fills this gap by undertaking a critical discourse analysis of the parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President.

3.2 Power and Discourse

Power and discourse refers to the form of discourse focusing on power relationships in society as expressed through language, cultural and social practices. It accounts for the relationships between discourse and social power. Power and discourse focuses on the connection between ideas, language, power and the ordering of relationship within society that is important for those involved in CDA (Fairclough, 1995; Van Dijk, 1985, 2004; Locke, 2004).

A number of studies outside Zambia have been undertaken in the area of discourse analysis. Two studies are cited here as follows. Rudvin (2005) examined the issue on power as a governing factor in the community and public service. While Huckin, Andrus, and Clary-Lemon (2012) did a Critical Discourse Analysis of Rhetoric and Composition.

Rudvin (2005) examined the issue of power as a governing factor in community and public service interpreting strategies by using Fairclough's distinction between power *behind* discourse and power *in* discourse. That is, hidden power that guides the interpreter's status and role, guiding the interpreter's discourse and interpreting strategies. Three categories of institutional relationships are examined: relations between actors in any institutional setting, these same relations in cross-cultural encounters, and these same relations in interpreter-mediated public service encounters. Lastly, the paper discusses power in relation to the interpreter's role.

This study was related to the present one in that in the debate session under investigation, the members had to interpret the other parties' arguments and then generated their own arguments. In addition, members of parliament negotiated power, manipulated it and rejected it according to the discourse used and the person using it. Thus the assumption that ideology,

discourse and power are intimately connected, and that discourse is the mouthpiece of ideology, as indicated in the theoretical framework in chapter two, was established in the study. Power is thus negotiated, manipulated, expressed, rejected and challenged interpersonally through discourse in settings defined by institutional power asymmetry.

Huckin, Andrus, and Clary-Lemon (2012) performed a Critical Discourse Analysis of Rhetoric and Composition writing. Their work surveys much of the recent literature, noting how rhetoric/composition has incorporated CDA methodology in a variety of studies of inequality, ethics, higher education, critical pedagogy, news media, and institutional practices. They posit that CDA brings to rhetoric and composition a number of important methodological features. First and foremost is the importance of grounding a broad contextual perspective in detailed textual analysis. Although rhetoric/composition also takes into account this macro/micro dualism, it does not always do so systematically or rigorously. Second, a defining feature of CDA is its concern with issues of social justice and the abuse of power. CDA scholarship typically consists of theorising and documenting such abuses, framed by a democratic code of ethics. The present study uses this concern of CDA to bring out instances of abuse of power by those in public offices through the respect of the rule of law in general and article 43 (3) of the laws of Zambia in particular (see section 5.3.5).

3.3 Political Discourse

3.3.1 Political Discourse in General

Political discourse is a broad category. It is the discourse of politicians. Discourse is political when it accomplishes a political act in a political institution, such as governing, legislation, electoral campaigning, parliamentary debate and so on. Studies on political language include investigation into very different sub-genres such as electoral language, party political language, the language of diplomacy and international relations, the language of social conflict, the language of parliament and others (Locke 2004).

A number of studies on political discourse have been conducted outside Zambia. Most of these studies focus on presidential speeches, and to some extent debates. From Europe Andreassen (2007) did a Critical Discourse Analysis of Margaret Thatcher's and Tony Blair's farewell addresses. He did so by examining how the two leaders went about in order to influence and persuade their listeners and voters that both of them had done, however

unpopular, what was right for the nation; and that they were still doing what was in their mightly to make Britain a better place to be, and that the only way forward was that forked out by their respective parties. The hypothesis of the study was that the ideologies advocated by Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair respectively were present in the language they used. The aim of the two leaders was a discursive reproduction of their account of the world – by means of access to different discourses and through the power of definition inherent in their positions as Prime Ministers.

The political discourse under scrutiny in Andreassen's (2007) study were Margaret Thatcher's address to the Parliament on Friday 23rd November, 1990, just hours after she had formally resigned both as Leader of the Conservative Party and Prime Minister. The other one was Tony Blair's last address to his own party, on Tuesday 26th September, 2006, after his much-publicised decision to step down both as Party leader and Prime Minister. In addition, a collection of five newspapers representing different owners, which presumed different political affiliations, as well as different socio-economical readerships, were analysed to provide a representative selection of the British national newspaper market. The newspaper material were collected from the day after Blair and Thatcher held their speeches, from *The Sun*, *The Daily Mirror*, *The Daily Mail*, *The Guardian*, and *The Daily Telegraph* respectively.

The findings of the study reveal that both Thatcher and Blair leant on the extremely polarized view of the world that is so common in two party political systems. To polarize is to divide into clearly separate groups with opposite beliefs, or opinions, or to make people to do this.

Thatcher's resignation statement read as indicated by Andreassen (2007:41-42):

Having consulted widely among my colleagues, I have concluded that the unity of the Party and the prospects of victory in a General Election would be better served if I stood down to enable Cabinet colleagues to enter the ballot for the leadership. I should like to thank all those in Cabinet and outside who have given me such dedicated support.

In Thatcher's speech there are two main topics. The first one is that Britain has prospered under Conservative rule. The second is that the Labour Party had left, and would leave again if given the chance, Britain in ruins with their socialist policies.

Many of Thatcher's derogatory remarks are overtly expressed, and leave nothing to the imagination. Other comments are more subtly iterated, and can only be inferred from positive statements about her own party, or they are presupposed if Thatcher's assumptions and logical deductions are to hold water. This parliamentary session serves as evidence of the polarized world of British politics, it is a battle between the two main parties and their respective leaders, and as much effort is put into criticising the opposition as is into idealising one's own party's achievements. This is seen in the way Thatcher uses the lexis, especially the active verbs, when describing her party's efforts. She asserts, *the Conservatives have 'changed' all that Labour ruined, they have 'brought unparalleled prosperity to our citizens at home', they have 'given power back to the people on an unprecedented scale', they have 'given control back' to the people and given them 'choice in public services'* (Andreassen 2007:47).

The Labour Leader, Blair chose to focus on what Britain and the British people had achieved under his premiership, half-heartedly disguised under the mantra: (New) *Labour has transformed Britain*. Presupposed that Britain had moved in the right direction, implying that the nation was in a horrendous state before Labour and Blair took over in 1997. Secondly, Blair looks ahead and, tries, with grandeur to act as a self-appointed elder statesman and gives advice to his successors. He advises that in order to win a fourth election, *Labour must change their policies to adapt to new, global challenges*.

Subordinate to each of these two overarching topics there are many minor ones. As for the first, Blair explains why a change was called for and how they changed Britain. The second main topic revolves around what the Labour party, and thus *Britain, can achieve in the future*, as Blair briefly tackles many – if not most – of the political issues of today which all become sub-topics in his speech. The following excerpt shows in parts Blair's actual words uttered in his speech.

Terrorism isn't our fault. We didn't cause it, Blair blatantly states. *It's not the consequence of foreign policy*, he continues in a stern defence of Britain's involvement in Afghanistan and Iraq. Terrorism is a *struggle* against an *enemy* with an *ideology*. *It is an attack on our way of life*, Blair continues, emphasizing the *Us* versus *Them* dichotomy. The polarization is further reinforced by the use of images and metaphors: terrorists *prey on every conflict*, and *exploit every grievance*; they are the ones that *slaughter the innocent* with their *sectarian death squads*. That is why it

will be *committing a craven act of surrender* to retreat from Afghanistan and Iraq now or to withdraw as *America's strongest ally*. However, Blair is quick to add that *not a day goes by or an hour in the day when I don't reflect on our troops with admiration and thanks* – with the extraordinary bravery of being out of range, one might add. (Andreassen 2007:61).

Andreassen concludes that the contents and aims of Blair's speech are almost identical with those of Thatcher sixteen years earlier. They are both fighting the same battle, both personally and on behalf of their parties, in an attempt to create a polarized world of *Us* versus *Them*, where they themselves belong to the positively represented in-group and the opposition is firmly placed in the out-group, negatively or derogatorily portrayed whenever possible. The main focus, as always in politics, is to win the forthcoming election (cf Rashidi and Souzandehfar, 2010).

Both Thatcher and Blair, although from complete opposite perspectives, glorified their own good achievements, omitted the dubious ones, but heavily criticized and blamed the Opposition for almost everything that was wrong in Britain. Speeches were brilliant tokens of the most central technique of polarization: positive self-presentation and negative other presentation. This confirmed the hypothesis that both Thatcher and Blair tried to cement their legacies through the language they used, by access to influential discourses, and through power of definition – and that the two farewell addresses mirrored each other.

The study by Andreassen (2007) is related to the present one in that the present study attempts to establish whether political ideologies of the ruling government or political parties were present in the language or discourse used in the parliamentary debate and to ascertain their influence. The present study ascertained this view in that members of the ruling party maintained that the main reason why they were proposing the immunity lifting of the former present was the fight against corruption. Coupled with this is the plight for the ordinary citizens who suffer as a result of the plunder. The immunity lifting therefore would help to recover the stolen resources for the benefit of the ordinary citizens. These ideologies of both the ruling party and the Opposition are present in each group's discourse. For instance, in their discourse, the PF members of parliament bring out the fact that at the centre of the fight against corruption is the individual or the ordinary citizen and without the ordinary Zambian, the fight against corruption is rendered void. One member justifies, ... *as a matter of fact, as*

Honourable Mweetwa has come to realise, Zambia is quite well respected in so far as the fight against corruption is concerned on the continent and globally (see section 5.3.4).

In America a study about a Critical Discourse Analysis of the Debates between Republicans and Democrats over the continuation of war in Iraq, Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010), used van Dijk's (2004) framework adopted from politics, ideology and discourse to detect discursive structures within the transcripts of the candidates' speeches to discover the ideologies underlying them. The purpose of the study was to show how a single reality, that is, the continuation of war in Iraq by the American troops, was presented and viewed by the two major American political parties' (Republican and Democratic) candidates of the United States presidential primaries of 2008. The macro strategies of 'positive self-representation' and 'negative other-representation', which are intimately tied up with 'polarization' of in-group versus out-group ideologies or *Us-Them*, plus the other 25 more subtle strategies have turned out to be very accurate criteria for the evaluation of attitudes, and opinions (see section 2.3).

The speeches selected in the study were given by the candidates in a range of time from 5th September, 2007 to 7th February, 2008. Below is one of the sample speeches used in the analysis of the debates.

Text 1 Transcript of Senator John McCain's CPAC Speech on February 7th, 2008

...

Senator Clinton and Senator Obama will withdraw our forces from Iraq based on an arbitrary timetable designed for the sake of political expediency, and which recklessly ignores the profound human calamity and dire threats to our security that would ensue. I intend to win the war, and trust in the proven judgment of our commanders there and the courage and selflessness of the Americans they have the honor to command. I share the grief over the terrible losses we have suffered in its prosecution. There is no other candidate for this office who appreciates more than I do just how awful war is. But I know that the costs in lives and treasure we would incur should we fail in Iraq will be far greater than the heartbreaking losses we have suffered to date. And I will not allow that to happen.

The text uses *negative other presentation*, and *lexicalizations* as 'arbitrary timetable' which is designed for the sake of 'political expediency'. The speaker tries to exaggerate the gravity of the situation by using *hyperbolic* phrases such as 'profound human calamity' and 'dire threats' implying that the continuation of the war in Iraq is inevitable. He shows the troops

and the American people as his, and consequently the republicans' *friends and allies* through *polarized* terms like 'our forces' in the first line and 'our security' in the last line of the first paragraph. Particularly, the phrase 'dire threats to our security' could be considered as a political strategy to win the consensus of the whole nation. After criticising democrats in the first paragraph of the transcript, Senator McCain employs *positive self-presentation* to glorify his own measures which would be taken in the future ('I intend to win the war') and his party's activities which have been done so far ('the proven judgment of our commanders').

The results of the study show that, Critical discourse analysis in political discourses provides a great opportunity to discover the realities which have been naturalised as 'non-ideological common sense' (van Dijk, 2004). It also helps critical discourse scholars to make a more specific contribution to getting more insights into the crucial role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance and inequality. This study is related to the present one in the sense that the present study attempted to ascertain whether the discourse used in the debate reproduced dominance and inequality in the political realm and whether members of parliament used strategies of 'positive self-representation' and 'negative other-representation'. The study affirmed the reproduction of dominance and inequality in the discourse of the debate as Critical discourse analysis in political discourses provides a great opportunity to discover the realities which have been naturalised as 'non-ideological common sense'. This perspective was seen in the way members of the ruling Patriotic Front tried to cement their legacies through the language they used, by access to influential discourse, and through power of definition. In addition, the discourse used in parliament revealed that members of the ruling PF enjoy more freedom than those of the Opposition parties in the House. Furthermore, polarized views of positive 'Us' versus negative 'Them' representation between members of the ruling party on one hand and those of the Opposition on the other were identified. For example, the ruling PF praised themselves for fighting corruption and that, that is why they were proposing the immunity lifting of the former president thus positive *us* representation, and condemned the Opposition MMD for having been involved in corrupt practices during their reign thus negative *Them* representation (see section 5.3.3).

Muralikrishnan (2011) undertook a study on Critical Discourse Analysis of politics and verbal coding. He discusses the close affinity shown between language and politics to work out the discursive practices apparent in public political discourses. The features of such

writing or speech are taken from various political domains. The results reveal that issues of politics and society are thus not merely abstract systems of social inequality and dominance, but they actually “come” down in the forms of everyday life, namely through the beliefs, actions and discourses of group members. CDA is specifically interested in the discursive dimensions of these abuses, and therefore must spell out the detailed conditions of the discursive violations of human rights. The study by Muralikrishnan (2011) is related to the present one because the present study identified a number of discursive practices in the discourse of parliamentary debates. The present study demonstrates that parliamentary discourse was characterized by unequal power relations with the members of the ruling party enjoying more freedom or influence than those of the Opposition. In addition, it came out clearly that the arguments of the parliamentary debates are divided into two groups of the ruling PF members on one hand and those of the Opposition on the other (see section 5.3.3). The fact that the Opposition members of parliament were not enjoying equal freedom as the members of the ruling party, and the division of the members of parliament into two groups, is violation of human rights.

Horváth (2008) examined the persuasive strategies of President Obama's public speaking as well as the covert ideology, enshrined in his inaugural address. In his analysis, Horváth adopted Fairclough's (1995) assumptions about critical discourse analysis, that ideologies reside in texts, that it is not possible to 'read off' ideologies from texts and that texts are open to diverse interpretations. The selected corpus' ideological and persuasive components were assessed, thus revealing Obama's persuasive strategies. For instance, in his inaugural speech Obama exploits the ideology of love by quoting from the Bible as shown in the excerpt below.

Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres. Love never fails. (1 Corinthians, 13:4)

When I was a child, I talked like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I put childish ways behind me. Now we see but a poor reflection as in a mirror; then we shall see face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I am fully known. And now these three remain: faith, hope and love. But the greatest of these is love. (1 Corinthians, 13:11)

(Horvath, 2008:54)

Horváth demonstrates through the results of the study that the overall, underlying theme of the speech was inspired and empowered by the ‘strength from our heroic past’, which should be used as a resort for rebuilding the nation in the time of the global financial crisis and the threat of global terrorism. The excerpt below from the inaugural speech illustrates this view.

My fellow citizens: I stand here today humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust you have bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors.

Recall that earlier generations faced down fascism and communism not just with missiles and tanks, but with the sturdy alliances and enduring convictions. They understood that our power alone cannot protect us, nor does it entitle us to do as we please. Instead, they knew that our power grows through its prudent use. Our security emanates from the justness of our cause; the force of our example; the tempering qualities of humility and restraint. We are the keepers of this legacy, guided by these principles once more, we can meet those new threats that demand even greater effort, even greater cooperation and understanding between nations.

(Horvath 2008:50, 51)

Furthermore, in the study the discursive event and discursive structure interrelatedness idea proposed by Fairclough was confirmed. The inaugural address – the discursive event shaped the text – the discursive structure, plus, the discourse became subject of interpretation by the audience, which in turn shaped the following discourse practice of Obama. The relationship between Horvath’s study and the present one is that the present study endeavoured to establish the interrelatedness of the discursive event and the discursive structure of the debate, and to ascertain whether ideologies reside in texts as regards the debate. The results of the present study reveal that these views were confirmed in the study. The immunity lifting, which is the discursive event shaped the debate session, which is the discursive structure (see section 5.3.3). It was also confirmed that ideologies reside in texts when members brought out the political ideology of the nation by recounting what had been happening in the nation before the current event in the efforts of fighting corruption. For instance, the members referred to the immunity lifting of the second Republican President Frederick Chiluba and the reinstating of the corruption clause as efforts in fighting corruption in the near past, as ways of combating corruption.

Nelson (2002) adopted Chouliaraki and Fairclough’s (1998) two-level definition of intertextuality; the combination of genre and the combination of voices within the discourse, in his study on intertextuality as discourse strategy in the no confidence debates in Thai Land.

He argues that intertextuality can be a strategy to produce the most effective discourse within that particular context. The study further adopted discourse analysis's assumption that language has a dialectical relationship with society which was affirmed during the study. It was also concluded that intertextuality serves as a strategy to create the most effective discourse which operates in the face of two or more competing conjunctures. Intertextuality allows us to attend to the limitation of the conjunctures within one discourse, thus creating a compromising discourse which can overcome the given constraints.

Relating to the above, the present study attempted to examine whether similar trends are present, that is, whether language has a dialectical relationship with society in Zambia, as stated in the theoretical framework, and it was confirmed in the study (see section 2.3). The study exposes the way in which language and meaning are used by the power to deceive and oppress the dominated by the ruling party but the Opposition challenged this oppression by use of conversational implicature, presupposition and background knowledge. In the debate session under investigation, the members of the ruling party used the fact that *the internal procedures of the House are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the court* and the respect of the rule of law to deceive and dominate the Opposition. The ruling PF members also hid behind the belief that *the House has a very unique freedom to determine and deal with its internal proceedings* (see sections 5.3.1.1; 5.3.1.2; 5.3.1.3). For instance, the Speaker of the National Assembly insisted to the members of the House that the motion goes ahead as a way of maintaining order in the House. He insists, *...proceeding we are, obstruction there will not be*. The Opposition tried to challenge this by referring to past events.

In America, Dunmire (2005) used Halliday's Systemic-Functional framework, to examine President Bush's speech of 7 October 2002, which presented the President's rationale for war against Iraq to a lay, public audience. The study demonstrated how representations of the future were embedded in and projected through political discourse and how the public was implicated in those representations. The analysis showed that the nominalisation 'threat' functions in multiple ways to construe a particular vision of future reality. Dunmire also considered the speech within the context of Bush Administration's National Security Strategy, particularly its 'policy of preemption'. The argument he puts forward is that the president's speech played a significant role in facilitating the conceptual, linguistic, and political change articulated through the preemption policy.

In the present study, there is a relationship with Dunmire's (2005) study since the present study investigated whether representations of the future were embedded in and projected through political discourse that was used during the debate session under examination and how the members of parliament would be implicated in those representations. The results indicate that representations of the future were embedded in and projected through political discourse that was used during the debate session. The study by Dunmire (2005) posits that an important ideological component of political discourse derives from its representation of the future and the rhetorical functions of those representations serve in implicating more immediate material and discursive actions. This view was demonstrated in the present study by the Opposition members who debated against the motion by indicating that the PF members that they were not supposed to propose the motion of the lifting of the immunity of the former president, because they were not upright themselves. The Opposition insisted that the ruling PF members were setting a precedence which would catch up with them shortly after the session or that they would also face prosecution in future (section 5.3.3.3).

Within Africa, a study was undertaken by Adetunji (2006) who examined the use of deixis for personal, spatial and temporal anchorage of political discourse. The database used for the paper was two thematically and contextually different speeches of Nigeria's President Olusegun Obasanjo. The paper established how politicians could associate with or dissociate from actions taken by them or their officers at different times and how they conscript their subjects into accepting their views on controversial issues or positions.

The study by Adetunji (2006) fits into the present study in that the present study seeks to establish how politicians, in this case, members of parliament, endeavour to conscript others into accepting their views on controversial issues such as that of immunity lifting of a former president. The members of the House, especially those of the ruling party, tried to be persuasive in their arguments in order to convince others of their view point. However, the results of the study suggest that members of the ruling PF coerced other members (the Opposition) into accepting the arguments put forward for the justification of the lifting of the immunity of the former president. Members of the House were therefore coerced, not persuaded.

3.3.2 Public Speaking and Political Discourse

Bernstein (1975) argues that the concept of “public language” is significant in understanding political discourse. Public language validates established beliefs and strengthens the authority structures of the polity or organization in which it is used. Public speaking is therefore the language form supporters of regimes or organizations rely on to demonstrate to others and to themselves that they deserve support to minimise guilt. They also use public speaking to evoke feelings in support of the guilt, to evoke feelings in support of the polity, and to engender suspicion of alternatives and of people identified as hostile. It can take many political forms. As Edelman (1977) asserts, exhortation to patriotism and to support for the leader and his/her regime are obvious ones. Jason and Peccei (2003) have outlined some strategies employed by politicians to influence people’s political and ideological views for their own advantage. These are presupposition implicature, and persuasive language. This study fits into the present one in that these strategies were identified in the present study as having been used by members of the House to influence others of ideological views to their own advantage during the debate session as shown below.

Members of the ruling PF used persuasive strategies to support the motion of the lifting of the immunity of the former president by citing high poverty levels and the suffering of the ordinary citizens as a result of the plunder of resources. This view is illustrated by excerpts from the debate session presented below.

We now know that some of these issues and the poverty that we have been experiencing is as a result of the colossal sums of money that have been mentioned in this Motion being misapplied. I now understand why the Musele/Katuta/Soboni Road cannot be graded.

It is very painful that we have to unveil our own beloved former President. However, must we keep quiet and allow the misapplication of funds to an extent that the people of Ikeleng’i and Lunte cannot even access medical health care?

Opposition members of parliament used counter persuasive strategies to oppose to the motion of the lifting of the immunity of the former president. The two excerpts below illustrate this view.

I have had to use the help of a television to see the face of the Honourable member of Justice as he moved this Motion and I have arrived at a very safe, albeit unfortunate position. I do not trust him or his word. Mr Speaker, this is important because what is under discussion is a very serious matter.

The PF Government has demonstrated a total lack of fidelity, and I am using the word 'fidelity' to mean loyalty to this country.

Heatherington (1980) lists the sorts of language exploitation indulged by politicians. These include good feelings - evocating feelings of patriotism, for instance 'vote for 'Us' is patriotic, good, while a vote for 'Them' is non-patriotic, treacherous'. There is also direct flattering of audience, for instance 'the sensible voter; and reference to "the record", for instance, his/her voting record, wisdom, skill and their benefits for his/her audience (cf. van Dijk, 2004). Others are bad feelings- evocating emotions of fear, anger and scorn against the values mooted by the Opposition. Finally, fog which is the use of buzz or fad words with a high fog index, that is, abstract, non-referential and often polysemous signs. This technique appears most often when a politician is in trouble and is trying to justify his/her behaviour "to the folks back home". The fog makes it nearly impossible to assign responsibility to anyone, least of all to the speaker. Heatherington (1980) also identifies three characteristics that often distinguish propaganda from ordinary persuasion. These are a consistent choice of loaded language over more value-free language, a heavy use of stock phrases, and a flavour of having the answers readymade.

Heatherington's findings are related to the present study as instances of language exploitation indulged by politicians were identified in the debate session under investigation. For instance, the Speaker of the National Assembly evokes feelings of fear and anger in the Opposition members when he tells them that, *you can take any other civil measures against the Honourable Mr Speaker, but not obstruction because, then, you will be exceeding your rights*. The study also identified the 'Us-Them' representations of polarization, thus evocating good feelings and evocating bad feelings respectively, by the members of the Opposition on one hand and those of the ruling party on the other (cf Rashidi and Souzandehfar, 2010; van Dijk, 2004).

3.4 Discourse in Other Public Domains

Taking a critical discourse analysis (CDA) perspective, Bhatia (2006) analyses textual data from press conferences involving the former Chinese President Jiang Zemin and the United States President George W. Bush. The two presidents come from different ideological

backgrounds, and share differences in other dimensions such as age, experience, economic status, socio-political influence and political objectives. The study allows a closer look at diplomatic talk to communicate political differences in a positive way to smooth out socio-political and ideological discrepancies that often divide prominent political figures.

The study shows that certain terms and phrases are used repetitively, not just in one press conference, but also through others to emphasise a general statement, while highlighting the mechanical and prescriptive nature of political press conferences as shown in the excerpt below.

China and the United States are different in their national conditions, so it's normal that there are certain disagreements between us.

(Jiang Zemin, 19.10.01)

We live in a world of diversity. Given the differences in national conditions, it is not surprising that there are certain disagreements between China and the United States.

(Jiang Zemin, 19.10.01)

We're living in a world of diversity. As two major countries with different national conditions, China and the US have indeed, had certain disagreements.

(Jiang Zemin, 21.2.02)

Given the differences in the national conditions of the two countries, it is natural for China and the United States to disagree on some issues

(Jiang Zemin, 21.2.02)

Given their different national conditions, it is only natural for China and the United States to disagree from time to time.

(Jiang Zemin, 25.10.02)

In these excerpts it can be noted that there is a pattern of repetition running through different press conferences, all at different times. Political press conferences are packed with such predictable, clichéd statements, which are used almost verbatim by the leaders, to make the press conferences as insipid and sedate as possible in order to give the media little chance to publicise any hostile feelings between the politicians. This is a very powerful strategy typical of this genre, which helps them to complete a contribution without offering any significant new input. This also suggests that press conference speeches are not spontaneous but scripted in advance.

Bhatia (2006) also established that influence is displayed in the justification of one's actions. This is especially true in the case of Bush, who uses his power as a political leader in order to defend what he believes in and how he behaves. Related to the concept of emopolitical blackmail is the discourse of morality, where an attempt is made to persuade the other speaker by bringing in an element of morality as illustrated in the excerpt below.

These are evil people and the deeds that have been conducted on the American people are evil deeds. And anybody who would mail anthrax letters, trying to affect the lives of innocent people, is evil. (Bush, 19.10.01)

The findings of the study reveal three major themes: positivity for the reinforcement of mutual trust, respect and progress; influence and power for subtle persuasion; and evasion to hedge or avoid responses to probing and inconvenient questions from the media. In this article, CDA proved to be a useful tool in the analysis of the political press conferences because it allowed for the realisation of the interdependency of language and ideology; ideology and socio-cultural practices; and socio-cultural politics. CDA also made it possible for the research to excavate meaning from underneath the surface level of utterances, enabling more accurate and informed interpretations of press conference statements.

The study by Bhatia (2006) fits into the present study since the present study analyses parliamentary discourse using CDA and establishes the same realisation of the interdependency of language and ideology, and the hidden meaning of the discourse in the debate session is unearthed as pointed out in the theoretical framework (see section 2.4.1). The study exposes the way in which language and meaning are used by the power to deceive and oppress the dominated. For instance, during the debate, the PF members use the respect for rule of law and fight against corruption as persuasive strategies. This view is also seen when the Speaker of the National Assembly tends to manipulate the issues during the debate session in the pretext that the House had its own unique freedom of dealing with its internal proceedings and procedures (see section 5.3.1.1).

In a project of discourse intervention – an effort to change the social reality by altering the discourses that help constitute it, Karlberg (2005) did a project aimed at advancing, deconstructing the dominant Western-liberal discourse of power. The aim was that of clarifying elements of an alternative discourse of power, and presenting a case study of an alternative discourse community and the alternative models of social practice that it is constructing. The article began with the basic premise of discourse theory: the ways we think and talk about a subject influence and reflect the ways we act in relation to that subject. The paper outlines an analytical schema for thinking and talking about power in its relational and distributive dimensions. This schema helps individuals to recognise and respond to

oppressive power relations that are a cause of widespread conflict and instability in the world around them, while it simultaneously enables them to articulate and work toward more just and peaceful alternatives.

From peace studies standpoint, it reminds people of how the power of discourse, helps them evaluate contemporary discourses of power, and enables them to recognise discourse intervention as an important area of social theory and praxis. The findings of Karlberg (2005) are related to the present study because the present study examines the relationship between discourse and power and brings out trends similar to the findings of Karlberg (2005). The results of the present study reveal that the Opposition, during the debate session, used such a schema to recognise the oppressive tendencies of the ruling PF and used counter persuasive strategies to respond to these oppressive power relations by the ruling PF. For instance, the Opposition members urged the PF members to live clean lives even as they proposed the immunity lifting of the former president or else the same law they were using on others would be used against them in future. The Opposition also contented from the beginning that debating the motion concerning the matter which was in court, was disregarding the rule of law (see sections 5.3.3.1; 5.3.3.2).

Viñales (2009) undertook a study with the aim to understanding how discourses feature in the making of Cuba's information regime, and the tensions, struggle or contradictions emerging as a consequence. Based on Fairclough's (1995) framework for critical discourse analysis, the research attempts to understand the ways in which dominant and oppositional discourses come into play in shaping the scope and definition of information policy in contemporary Cuba. The deployment of discourse-analytic categories is demonstrated through an example: the analysis of a political debate on the Internet in Cuba.

The results demonstrate that it is becoming clear that one of the features of discourses on information in Cuba that show some consistency across social practices is the tendency to configure a parallel structure that runs simultaneously with the legal system and, on occasions, has the power to bypass the law. This parallel structure tells people how to conduct themselves in the absence of legislation. An example can be found on Internet policy: no legislation specifically prevents Cuban from accessing, distributing or contributing information to websites that contravene the official ideology. Cuban citizens "know"

nonetheless, especially from political discourse, that engaging in such activities inevitably derives in very serious consequences, and that a number of administrative, technical, or economic sanctions are in place to punish deviant behaviour.

The above views can be related to the present study in that given the official ideologies of the nation such as anticorruption and respect for the rule of law, the members of parliament and in this case the Heads of state, are supposed to automatically conform by being accountable and transparent in their dealings in their constituencies and ministries. Besides, the members of the House are intuitively aware from the official ideology of the nation, that matters before the courts of law are not supposed to be discussed anywhere including the National Assembly. That is why members of the Opposition present a counter persuasive strategy by insisting on proper procedure for handling the motion of immunity lifting of the former president (see section 5.3.1.1).

Focusing on the speeches by Tony Blair, Fairclough (2005) examined time's move towards a regime of international relations and international security from a discourse analytical perspective. The study shows how Tony Blair had contributed to the emergence of a new hegemonic discourse of international relations and international security in speeches between 2000 and 2003. This study by Fairclough (2005) is related to the present study since the findings of the present study reveal that members of the ruling PF in their individual discourse bring out hegemonic connotations. In the analysis, this view came out clearly when bringing out the different power relations among the members of the House in which the ruling PF members enjoy more freedom and influence than the Opposition. For instance, within the debate session, Mr Kabimba, the mover of the motion is reported to have been threatening to deal with members of the Opposition and the Former President Banda in public (see section 5.3.3.2). Also one PF member ridicules the Opposition MMD by asserting that the party had been hit by a political tsunami and was therefore headed for extinction. Such activities, it seems, were exclusive to the ruling party members. It seems that the Opposition members have no freedom of indulging in such activities.

3.5 Summary of Chapter

This chapter has presented a review of some of the available literature related to the study. The studies cited looked at the discourse focusing on functional analysis of information structure, logical analysis of texts as well as institutional and political discourse. Even though

there are studies on political discourse, they have to a large extent to do with presidential speeches or politics in general, giving us very little information to improve our understanding on the ideological implications of discorsal features of arguments of parliamentary debates. This study therefore fills this gap. The study investigates how members of parliament present their arguments by examining the discorsal features in the speech acts and linguistic items they use and then establishes the ideological implications of these features. The next chapter discusses the methodology employed to collect and analyse data in order to provide answers to the research questions presented in chapter one of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.0 Introduction

The previous chapter has presented a review of some of the available literature related to the study. The present chapter presents the research design of the study. It discusses the research procedures and techniques adopted in the study in order to provide answers to the research questions presented in chapter one. In addition, the chapter presents the data collection procedures, sampling techniques, how the data were collected and analysed.

4.1 Study Design

Study design is the framework within which a given research exercise is to be undertaken. It is a systematic plan to study a scientific problem and provides the basis for the selection of appropriate research methods to be used in investigating a given phenomenon. The present study employs a non-experimental descriptive analytical approach, in which the verbatim recordings of the parliamentary debate session of 15th March 2013, were transcribed and analysed. According Leedy and Ormrod (2001) a Non-experimental research design describes something that has occurred, or examines the relationships between things. It is directed toward determining the nature of a situation as it exists at the time of the study. The aim is to describe 'what exists' with respect to the variables or conditions in a situation. There are four types of non-experimental designs namely, descriptive, correlational, survey, and ex post facto. The present study employs descriptive with a combination of analytical type of non-experimental approach.

4.2 Data Collection

The present study employs a qualitative method of research. Strauss and Corbin (1990) posit that qualitative research is one that produces findings by non-statistical procedures. The data in the study were collected using the procedures outlined below.

4.2.1 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

Samples can be chosen on either a probability or a non-probability basis. A probability sample is selected according to mathematical guidelines whereby the chance for selection of each unit is known. Whereas, a non-probability sample often relies on the fact that respondents are available, convenient and prepared to participate. Non-probability sampling

involves two systematic forms, which include purposeful sampling and quota sampling. The present study employed a purposeful sampling technique to select the debate session of 15th March, 2013. The verbatim recordings of this debate session constituted the sample for the study. There was only one debate session that was conducted on the immunity lifting of the Fourth Republican President, and therefore this session was automatically selected for the study. The sample was selected after considering the nature of the topic or motion, and the interest that the members held about the topic of immunity lifting and about the person Rupiah Banda the Fourth Republican President of Zambia, and the second president to have his immunity lifted. The researcher envisaged that the combination of the controversial topic of immunity lifting, the personality Rupiah Banda and being the second Former Republican President to have immunity lifted was very contentious and that it would bring out real ideologies about Zambian politics. This sample gave adequate information on the ideological implications of discursal features of the parliamentary debate under investigation. This particular debate session therefore was chosen because of its sensitivity; it contains contentious connotations about parliamentary discourse, and is therefore an ideal element for establishing the ideological implications of the language used in parliament.

Sampling refers to a process of selecting a few (sample) from a bigger group (the sampling population) to become the basis for estimating or predicting a fact, situation or outcome regarding the bigger group in which one is interested. Robson (1993) explains sampling in social research as 'the search for typicality'. He further asserts that sampling is an important aspect of life in general and enquiry in particular and that judgements are made on the basis of fragmentary evidence. According to Rudestam and Newton (1992) a sample is a subset of the population that is taken to be a representation of the entire population. They believe that regardless of its size, a sample that is not representing the entire population is inadequate for testing purposes and the results cannot be generalised. Kane (1995) contends that it is important to sample because studying the entire population would be very costly and time consuming. She however, emphasises the fact that the results of the sample should be similar to those which would be obtained if the entire population was involved in the study. The sample should closely relate the real population.

Taking into account the arguments by the scholars cited above, the present study used purposeful sampling. A purposeful sampling is one where a sample is selected according to a specific pre-determined criterion. Patton (1990) states that, the logic and power of purposeful

sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for in-depth study. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of research. The debate session under study is one such case where the debate session of 15th March 2013 was selected purposefully because of its sensitivity as it contains contentious connotations about parliamentary discourse.

4.2.2 Data Collection Technique

The following procedure was used to obtain the recordings of the parliamentary debate session of 15th March 2013. The researcher first approached the authorities at National Assembly to seek permission to undertake research there. At National Assembly she was directed to see the Chief Editor who granted her permission to conduct the research. The researcher then requested for the recordings of the debate session under investigation and she was told to go back after a few days. After one week she returned there and the recordings were availed to her by the Deputy Chief Editor. The secretary to the Deputy Chief Editor copied the debate session onto a format of recordings of three CD-ROMs with the total duration of three hours. The researcher then played the CDs using DVD and computer and transcribed the proceedings of the debate session verbatim (see Appendix 1). In addition the researcher did a notation convention transcription to show how the Members of Parliament were actually speaking during the debate (see page xi).

4.2.3 Document Analysis

The present study relied on document analysis as its source for data. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2001), content analysis or document analysis is a detailed and systematic examination of the contents of a particular body of material for the purpose of identifying patterns, themes, or biases. Content analyses are typically performed on forms of human communication, including books, newspapers, films, television, art, music, video tapes of human interactions, and transcriptions of conversations. Document analysis is employed in the present study because the study is purely qualitative as Nherera (1999) states, analyses which employ qualitative method assist in probing underlying questions involving why and how certain phenomena occur the way they do. While Patton (1990) submits that the significance of document analyses in qualitative inquiry is that they yield excerpts, quotations, or entire passages from organisational, clinical, or programme records, official publications and reports. Apart from providing valuable information to the researcher by

directly reading them, available documents on an issue provide stimulus for generating questions that can be pursued through direct observation and interviewing. In the present study, the researcher was able to generate significant information about the parliamentary debate and the ideological implications of parliamentary discourse from the recordings of the debate session of 15th March 2013, which were transcribed verbatim, as it proved to be a very significant source of information.

4.3 Data Analysis

The qualitative data were analysed by identifying themes from the document or text analysis as indicated above. The analysis was done by establishing the patterns of the arguments and the implicature of linguistic units that were found in each of the discourses examined. Afterwards the ideological implication of these discourses was established. The study was undertaken between November and December 2013. The transcribed recordings of the debate session were analysed by first identifying the linguistic items present in the discourse of members of parliament. Then the implications of these linguistic items were identified in themes, and finally these implications were used to establish the ideological dimensions of Zambian politics. The pattern of the arguments were categorised to establish the underlying representations. The study therefore used three stages of Critical Discourse Analysis as given by Fairclough (1989: 26), as follows:

The first stage is description which is the stage which is concerned with the formal properties of the text. The Second one is interpretation which is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction – with seeing the text as a product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation. The third stage is explanation which is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context – with the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation, and their social effects.

The study further makes use of a combination of models in CDA, of Fairclough's (1989; 1993; 1995; 1998; 1999) unveiling of opaque ideological relations between discourses and socio-cultural practices; and Van Dijk's (1993; 2001; 2004) investigation of the hidden power structures that ideological discourses reflect.

4.4 Summary of Chapter

The chapter has provided information on the research design, data collection procedure, sampling techniques and analysis methods where qualitative approach was applied. The

research findings and conclusions from this study are not based on the data from the researcher alone. They are juxtaposed to, and supported by the theoretical framework presented in chapter two of this dissertation. The findings are also compared with the findings from the studies highlighted in the literature review in chapter three and are further echoed in chapters five and six of the study. The next chapter presents the findings and discussion of the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5.0 Introduction

The previous chapter has provided information on the research design, data collection procedure, sampling techniques, sampling and sample size and data analysis methods where qualitative approach was applied. The present chapter presents and discusses the findings of the study. It presents samples of excerpts by members of parliament during the debate session. The main purpose of the presentation is to show the kind of discourse presented by individual members of parliament during the debate session. The presentation is done in order to answer the research questions outlined in chapter one. The first research question was intended to bring out the rhetorical structure of the arguments of the parliamentary debate. The second question sought to examine the kind of discourses used by individual members of parliament during debate session. The third one was intended to establish the relationship between the discursive practices and their social function in the arguments of the debate.

5.1 The Rhetoric Structure of Parliamentary Debate Arguments

The first research question was answered by analysing the structure of discourses of individual members of parliament as they were presenting arguments. The formal structure of the debate session is in such a way that there is the Speaker who is the presiding officer of the National Assembly and controls Business in the House. The others are Members of Parliament from various portfolios. A motion is moved by one of the members of the House and others respond to the motion negatively or positively. Those who speak for the motion, support the motion, and those who speak against the motion do not support the motion. When a motion is moved, the Members of Parliament indicate desire to speak so that they are given chance by the Speaker of the National Assembly to do so. The Speaker chooses whoever he wishes to speak at a given time.

All the arguments by members of parliament follow the sequence of indicating the stance taken by the member giving an argument, for example they would begin like this, *Thank you Mr Speaker for giving me this opportunity. I support this motion....* If they are against the motion they would say, *Thank you Mr Speaker for giving me this opportunity. I do not support the motion.....* Then they would go on to giving the reasons why they are in support

of the motion or why they are not in support of the motion. They would give a detailed explanation to justify their stance. At the end of the argument they would give a summary reflecting their stance. The excerpt below illustrates the rhetorical structure of an argument.

Excerpt 1

Sir, as Vice-chairperson for the global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption and President at the continental level, I support this Motion wholeheartedly. That is the reason he does not want the government to remove abuse of office clause from the anti-corruption act.” This day is a big day and I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Chiefs and Traditional Affairs that my Dear Professor, do not regret that former President, Mr. Banda, was not reminded. He was forewarned in this House. When he was Vice-president as well as when he was President, that these laws would follow him. He was also forewarned when he called for the amendment of the Anti-Corruption Act. We said to him that the government that would come would perform one major function, which was the re-introduction of the abuse of office clause, and that those who would be found complicit would be caught up with. Indeed, the time has come. I have heard some colleagues say that these are allegations. Indeed, they are, and that is why the government has decided to do that which is required for those allegations to be proved, and to give the accused the opportunity to vindicate themselves. That is what good governance is all about, to give people an opportunity to defend themselves from public ridicule. This is in answer to the question raised by my good friend, Hon. Muntanga, who asked where it would stop. It shall start stopping now because the current President is aware of the fact that this law is in the status books. He has allowed his hon. Minister of Justice to come and remove the immunity of this predecessor. Naturally, he knows that if he misconducts himself, he too, will have to face the same wrath. Is it not a mark of honesty for a person to say, I am clean and I intend to remain clean? Judge me by this standard. This is a matter of prudent utilization of entrusted power. For a person to have been entrusted with power for three years and, in those three years, be able to accumulate more than US\$11 million to spend in a campaign is miraculous, to say the least. I am sure that all of us would like to learn from that story. Sir, I support the motion and I thank you.

This excerpt begins by indicating the position the member is taking about the motion, in this case proposing to the motion. The member of parliament in the above excerpt indicates, *I support this Motion wholeheartedly,* Then the member goes on to justifying why he is supporting the motion by giving a lot of detail including facts, reasons and examples. He talks of the former president deserving to have his immunity lifted because he was forewarned. He argues *.....he was forewarned in this House. When he was Vice-president as well as when he was President, that these laws would follow him... We said to him that the government that would come would perform one major function, which was the re-introduction of the abuse of office clause, and that those who would be found complicit would be caught up with.*

This Member of Parliament also clarifies that what was being laid down were allegations and that the lifting of the immunity would give an opportunity to the former president to defend and vindicate himself. He explains, *indeed, they are, and that is why the government has decided to do that which is required for those allegations to be proved, and to give the accused the opportunity to vindicate themselves.* He goes further to talking about where the precedent of lifting the immunity of presidents would end, as asked by one of the members of the House, by indicating that it would stop there since the then president was aware of what was going on. He asserts, *it shall start stopping now because the current President is aware of the fact that this law is in the status books. He has allowed his hon. Minister of Justice to come and remove the immunity of this predecessor. Naturally, he knows that if he misconducts himself, he too, will have to face the same wrath.* Finally, he ends by giving a summary as to why he supports the motion by the phrases, *I am sure that all of us would like to learn from that story. Sir, I support the motion and I thank you.*

The rhetorical structure of parliamentary argument therefore follows the sequence of first indicating the position the member is taking, then giving reasons to support that position in terms of facts, reasons and examples, and finally by summarising the whole argument indicating the stance as shown by excerpt 1. The excerpt illustrates the whole argument by an individual member from the time they are allowed to speak up to the time they finish. All the arguments by the members of the House follow this same pattern.

Excerpt two below shows how individual members justify their stance, especially how they try to be reasonable and persuasive in their discourse. The excerpt shows how a member opposed to the motion justifies his stance giving reasons for that stance.

Excerpt 2

Mr Speaker, I would have been happier and actually supported this Motion on the floor, if it talked about removing the immunity of all those who have held the Office of President, including the current one, in this country, so that we settle this matter once and for all. Whether they like it or not, now, we have a pattern and the movers of this Motion on the floor, will have themselves to blame if the current President's immunity is also brought before this House at some future date to be removed. It sounds very good today that we can talk about immunity of the former president alone but we do not want this pattern to continue. As for me, I would have wanted this country to have a fresh start... That is why, as a person and as a representative of the people of Mbabala constituency, I am opposed to their Motion.

The Member of Parliament is giving reasons for not supporting the motion arguing that precedence was being set of lifting the immunity of each president that would come to power. This member therefore suggests that it would have been better if the immunities of all presidents were lifted even for the one who was still in power so that the issue is sorted out at once. *I would have been happier and actually supported this Motion on the floor, if it talked about removing the immunity of all those who have held the Office of President, including the current one, in this country, so that we settle this matter once and for all*, he submits. The Member of Parliament feels that going ahead with the motion was not the best at that time. He looks to the future and feels for the sake of peace and unity, more consideration should have been accorded to the motion. This view is in line with Dunmire (2005) who contends that presentations of the future are embedded and projected through political discourse, since the speaker focuses into the future. The parliamentary debate therefore connects matters at hand with the past in order to project the future.

The projection of the future is used as a counter persuasive strategy, that for a better tomorrow the motion should have been handled with care. This Member of Parliament also submits that he had wanted the country to have a fresh start or new start without referring to

past events with the phrases, *as for me, I would have wanted this country to have a fresh start.... that is why ... I am opposed to their Motion*. All these reasons this member has given are not supporting the motion but are persuasive in the opposite direction, that is, he is saying that the immunity of the former president should not be lifted and hence a counter persuasive strategy.

Having justified their positions by giving reasons either for lifting the immunity or for not lifting the immunity of the former president, members end by giving a summary of their argument to emphasise their standpoint. This is illustrated in excerpt 3 below.

Excerpt 3

Mr Speaker, I submit that the allegations we have heard this afternoon require more information so that we are convinced that there is, actually, a need to remove the immunity of the former President. I hope that this is not mere speculation.

This excerpt gives a summary of why this member of parliament does not support the motion indicating that what was given were allegations which required more information to prove that they were not just speculations. He expresses himself, *I submit that the allegations we have heard this afternoon require more information*. This is also a counter persuasive strategy by an Opposition member insisting that the House should not go ahead with the motion. This excerpt summarises all the arguments that this member has presented which include his position of opposing to the motion, and his justification for opposing to the motion, which brings out the real focus of the argument. He ends by showing suspicion that this could have been a mere speculation with the phrase; *I hope that this is not mere speculation*.

From the three excerpts above, it can be noted that the rhetorical structure of the parliamentary debate argument follows the sequence of first indicating position, then justifying the position and finally summarising the reasons for that position. The arguments of the debate therefore follow the same pattern as follows: first a member will indicate whether they are for or against the Motion. This indication gives a focus on what the member is going to say next and prepares the members of the House to focus their minds on what that member is going to say next either for or against the Motion. After the member has indicated

their stance, they would then justify why they are in support or against the Motion. This is the stage where members bring out a lot of detail in an effort to convince others of the standpoint they are taking. Here members use different strategies with the aim of making sure that other members are convinced with what they are saying and possibly side with them. Finally, the members would conclude by stating the point clearly by giving a summary which is a recap of the whole argument.

5.2 The Discourse of Individual Members of Parliament

The second research question was addressed by assessing how reasonable and persuasive the discourses of individual members of parliament are. The findings reveal that when presenting their arguments, members tried to be persuasive and at the same time reasonable in their discourses, in order to convince other members to accept their point of view. The two excerpts below show this perspective. The persuasion is done when members are justifying their stance by way of giving facts, examples and reasons. Excerpt number four below shows how a member from the ruling PF, supporting the motion, justifies why she is supporting the motion.

Excerpt 4

Mr. Speaker, unlike other presidents of this country, Mr. Rupiah Banda was elected President when there was a serious economic credit crunch in the world. While other presidents were looking for ways of protecting their countries so that they could even find policies that would make it better for their people, our president found it fit to start siphoning money, taking up illegal deals and building the Mpundu Trust. Mr Speaker, in my own constituency, I believe K3 billion was spent in order for me not to win Munali Constituency. I saw the mugs, the underwear which were all pre-branded. I think, as a country, we are sending the right signals that when all of us get into public offices must serve the people of Zambia. I, for one, was elected by the people of Munali Constituency to serve them. They did not elect me to go to my ministerial office, take money, and get into deals and bank money all over the place. I think, that is not leadership and, this time, we should start galvanizing ourselves in understanding what leadership is and in trying to protect the people who have given us the privileges that we are enjoying.

The excerpt is justifying why the immunity of the Former President should be lifted. It focuses on the plight of the citizens of the country and that when resources of the nation are plundered; the ones that suffer are the ordinary citizens. The Member of Parliament reflects that the former president should have used the time he was in office to serve the Zambians, instead of plundering the resources. She submits, *while other presidents were looking for ways of protecting their countries so that they could even find policies that would make it better for their people, our president found it fit to start siphoning money, taking up illegal deals and building the Mpundu Trust.* She goes on to explaining what true leadership entails by the statement, *I think, that is not leadership and, this time, we should start galvanizing ourselves in understanding what leadership is and in trying to protect the people who have given us the privileges that we are enjoying.* This is a strong argument meant to convince other members to agreeing into the lifting of the immunity of the Former President. The member who spoke this utterance points out that as a leader one is supposed to serve and protect the citizens of the nation and come up with strategies to take the development of a nation forward, and not plundering the resources. Therefore this argument is persuasive and reasonable at the same time.

Having shown how members justified their positions when supporting the motion persuasively and reasonably, the excerpt below presents an argument from the Opposition which is against the motion but persuasive as the member uses counter persuasive strategy since the persuasion was in the opposite direction.

Excerpt 5

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your guidance. In very simple and straight forward terms, this executive has, on a number of occasions, breached the constitution. That is why I am saying that it is immoral for it to be the one to talk about removing the immunity of other people when its members also need their immunity to be removed. Sir, I wish not to take too long on the floor. This is a serious matter on which we need to reflect very seriously even as we make a decision. In conclusion, the PF Government has demonstrated a total lack of fidelity, and I am using the word 'fidelity' to mean loyalty to this country. I think that the disregard of various institutions or provisions in the law in the past is enough reason for us to question the motive behind what it is proposing to do today.

The Opposition member expresses himself in this excerpt since he feels that the law has been violated and refers to the past to show how the ruling PF had been disregarding the law in several instances. He argues, *in very simple and straightforward terms, this executive has, on a number of occasions, breached the constitution*. The member who spoke these words is wondering how the PF members could use the rule of law to lift the immunity of the fourth president when all the while they themselves had not respected it. He justifies, *that is why I am saying that it is immoral for it to be the one to talk about removing the immunity of other people when its members also need their immunity to be removed*. This is therefore a very serious counter persuasive strategy by the Opposition, and is a very persuasive utterance since it is aimed at convincing the members not to go ahead with the motion at hand. The member is presenting an argument that the immunity of the fourth president should not be lifted because the correct procedures had not been followed. The other reason is that the members of the ruling party themselves had violated the law and were involved in corrupt activities, had disregarded the human rights of individuals and were not loyal to the citizens of the nation. He negatively 'others' the PF members by using the terms *this executive* and *what it is proposing*, distancing himself from the act showing the extent of the disregard of the law by the ruling PF and therefore feels that he is not part of the decision. All these reasons justify why the immunity of the former president was not supposed to be lifted.

The above excerpts therefore illustrate that when justifying their positions members bring out a lot of detail that render the arguments of parliamentary debates persuasive as well as reasonable. To try and achieve persuasion, members use different strategies when presenting arguments.

In support of the motion, members referred to past events such as the amendment of the clause on corruption which was done by the Banda Administration which resulted into rampant corrupt activities by the former ruling party, the MMD. The ruling PF members reasoned that going ahead with the motion and prosecuting the former president, would reduce corrupt activities since other members in public offices would learn a lesson and live clean lives.

Other Members of Parliament focused on the plight of the Zambian people by citing the problems such as poor infrastructure including poor road network, lack of equipment, inadequate farming inputs and other vices which resulted into negative development of the

nation and suffering of ordinary citizens, which are as a result of abuse of office, as a persuasive strategy. Yet others referred to provisions within the law as a persuasive strategy. The immunity of the former president had to be done in respect to the rule of law. For instance, article 43 (3) of the constitution was used when moving the motion of the proposal of the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth President.

On the other hand members of the Opposition used counter persuasive strategies nevertheless in a persuasive manner. For instance, they also referred to past events to oppose to the motion of the lifting of the immunity of the former president. They referred to the second Republican President Dr Frederick Chiluba whose immunity was lifted in a case in which he was allegedly accused of plundering the national resources. The members of the Opposition justify their arguments by pointing out that a lot of resources of the nation were used to pursue the case yet nothing was recovered. They are therefore questioning the rationale of lifting of the immunity if nothing comes out of it, unless it was meant to merely persecute the former president.

The Opposition members also use past events to refer to the respect of rule of law. Following certain provisions of the law, in the past cases which were before the courts of law were not supposed to be discussed outside the court for it could be sub judice. Opposition Members try to argue that the motion should not go ahead as a way of respecting the rule of law. Furthermore, the Opposition opposes to the motion by accusing the ruling PF members of being corrupt and that they were not supposed to talk about the immunity lifting because they were not clean themselves. Even though these were arguments in the opposite direction, they came out to be persuasive and reasonable.

However, it is important to note that persuasion was not achieved during the debate session as none of the two groups managed to convince others of their stand point. Even though those who were for the motion managed to win during voting at the end of the session, they only managed to do so due to other factors such as allegiance to the party that each member belonged to. The other reason is that at some stage some Opposition members walked out of the House in protest to the motion and never participated in the voting, which gave the ruling party advantage of numbers during voting.

The above view confirms van Dijk's (2004) framework of discursive strategy of number game that is used as derogation of out-group which materialised through the discursive move of number game in the present study (Rashidi & Souzandehfar, 2010). The ruling PF used number game strategy to win the motion as they were relatively more in number than the Opposition. The members of the ruling PF were saying that there was need to respect the rule of law by lifting the immunity of the fourth president while the Opposition was saying that the procedure used to present the motion proposing the lifting of the immunity of the fourth president was violating the rule of law. The two groups therefore accuse each other of not respecting the rule of law.

5.3 The Implication of the Discursive Practices of Parliamentary Debate Arguments

The third research question was tackled by bringing out the implications of the discursive practices of the arguments presented by members by analysing a number of excerpts from the debate session in themes. The relationship of the discursive practices and their social function is brought out by relating the linguistic form to communicative function. The analysis of the excerpts is done ideologically. Several ideological implications emerged from the debate session of which most of them are to do with how language is used to show power and political influence. The analysis and interpretation of the ideological aspect of the session attempts to link the parliamentary debate's discourse with the social processes and to decipher covert ideology of this text. The ideological analysis, whose main focus is objective number three, at the same time tackles objectives one and two with more examples in addition to the above illustrations. The excerpts are presented below in themes that emerged from the debate session.

5.3.1 Covert Ideologies, Power Relations and Respect for the Rule of Law

This section discusses covert ideologies and power relations brought out during the debate session by members of parliament. The members of the House brought out covert ideologies when they were arguing that the rule of law should be respected when dealing with the issue of immunity lifting of the former president. Both the members of the ruling party and the Opposition gave reasons for respecting the rule of law in different directions.

5.3.1.1 Covert Ideologies

To unpack the concept of covert ideologies, it is imperative to explain the terms ideology and covert. According to Collins (2012), ideology refers to a body of ideas that reflects the beliefs

and interests of a nation or political system, and underlies its political action. It also refers to a set of beliefs by which a group or society orders reality so as to render it intelligible. Covert refers to something that is not openly done or acknowledged. The word covert often connotes deception and misdirection. Covert ideologies therefore are ideas or beliefs not expressed openly; these are constructions whose real meaning is hidden in the words or discourse used. The ideas or beliefs in the discourse are not clearly expressed but the meanings are embedded within the words or texts in the discourse (Collins, 2012). In simpler terms covert ideologies are ideas or beliefs held by a group or society whose real meanings are not clearly expressed by the linguistic items used in the discourse. This section therefore brings out such instances of expressions during the debate session. The members of the House used discorsal features to hide some of their real meaning or intention in order to justify their stance yet achieving their intentions indirectly.

Excerpt 6

Your office has always said that once a matter is in court, your hands are tied and that there is nothing you can do until the matter is resolved in the courts of law. You always guided very diligently that when a matter is before the High Court or any court in Zambia, this August House should not discuss that matter because it is sub judice. The motion that is being raised is a subject of litigation in the High Court of Zambia. As a result of the same being in the court, we feel, arising from the guidance you have always given, that we will not be in a position to debate the matter because it will be sub judice. In that light, we need to have your guided direction on this matter, considering that the issues that are going to be debated are the ones that are going to be discussed in court.

In the excerpt there is emphasis that the rule of law must be respected since that had been the trend in the past. This argument was given as a counter persuasive strategy for not going ahead with the motion that was proposed. The Member of Parliament who presented this argument insists, *you always guided very diligently that when a matter is before the High Court or any court in Zambia, this August House should not discuss that matter because it is sub judice*. Reference is made to cases in the past whereby the Office of the Speaker of the National Assembly, through the Office of the Clerk of the National Assembly, had written

letters to various political parties pertaining to expulsions of Honourable Members who had been appointed, who had resigned or were being disciplined and had taken the cases to court.

The member in the excerpt uses the phrase, *arising from the guidance you have always given*, indicating that there must have been some procedure that was supposed to be followed. This Member of Parliament calls for consistency and fairness in dealing with issues in the House. This view clearly shows that members of the House insist that correct procedures are followed by respecting the rule of law.

The Speaker of the National Assembly responded to these concerns in the excerpt below. He seems to manipulate the issues by hiding behind the House's allegedly 'unique freedom to determine and deal with its internal proceedings' to justify the disregard of the law that the Opposition challenges.

Excerpt 7

In another ruling before this House, I indicated that under the doctrine of the Separation of Powers, the House has a very unique freedom to determine and deal with its internal proceedings. . . . I did issue a very elaborate ruling indicating that in so far as the internal proceedings and procedures of the House are concerned, they are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the court.

In this excerpt, the Speaker of the National Assembly justifies the need to go ahead with the Motion at hand even though the matter was in court, in the pretext that the House has its own way of dealing with its own internal matters. He argues, *in another ruling before this House, I indicated that under the doctrine of the Separation of Powers, the House has a very unique freedom to determine and deal with its internal proceedings...* The Opposition Members of parliament called this double standards. The Speaker of the National Assembly insists, *I did issue a very elaborate ruling indicating that in so far as the internal proceedings and procedures of the House are concerned, they are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the court.*

This stance seems to suggest that the ruling PF government were set to make sure that the former president is convicted and prosecuted, though they do not say it directly. The claim

that the internal proceedings of the House are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the court seems to suggest the hidden schemes that the ruling PF were exploiting to cover up for their ill intentions. The Opposition members are able to infer this stance by the PF members, by applying the idea of pragmatic implicature. The Opposition members' arguments tend to indicate that all what the PF wanted was to punish the former president since they were in authority. This view is seen in the manner in which the members of the ruling PF are insisting on presenting and proceeding with the Motion in parliament.

What is interesting here is the fact that while the Opposition members use the respect for the rule of law as a counter persuasive strategy not to go ahead with the motion, the ruling PF members use the respect for the rule law as a justification for lifting the immunity of the former president and therefore as a persuasive strategy. The Opposition uses the knowledge of background information to make inferences by referring to the past activities such as the fact that the cases of members of parliament that were before the courts of law could not be discussed in the House.

The Speaker of the National Assembly further explains the need to go ahead with the Motion and justifies the move in the next excerpt, now with more covert ideologies by explaining that everybody in the House had consented to going ahead with the motion.

Excerpt 8

After very extensive discussions and consultations to and fro, we have all agreed that it would be in the best interest of the House to proceed with the Motion as earlier indicated.

In this excerpt the Speaker of the National Assembly explains that all the members of the House had agreed to go ahead with the Motion after extensive discussions. Although the Speaker of the National Assembly uses inclusive terms such as *extensive discussions and consultations* and *we have all agreed that...*, some members of the House expressed different views by indicating that they were not accorded enough time to deliberate on the matter. On the surface the pronoun *we* and the phrase *...in the best interest of the House to proceed with the Motion* indicate unity and cooperation in the House as regards matters of national concern, but some members of the House refute this indicating that it was not the case.

The view to proceed with the motion seems to have been supported more by the ruling PF members and the Speaker of the National Assembly and very few of the Opposition members of the House and therefore seems to show that parliament instead of functioning as one, may at times be divided on party lines.

Excerpt 9

My decisions are also open to review. If whatever will transpire this afternoon violates any law, constitutional or otherwise, it will be impeached. Quite frankly, I would be the last person to preside over proceedings which are underpinned with illegalities. However, you are all free to decide, at the end of the day, whether that is the route to go. In the meantime, we need to proceed in an orderly fashion.

The views presented in this excerpt indicate that parliament as a House feels that it is important for everyone to be accountable for every action taken. This entails that whatever would be the outcome of the matter, it should be owned by all the members of the House. The act of giving everyone the freedom to decide the way to go champions democracy.

However, this was not what seems to have been obtaining on the ground, as some Opposition members indicate that their views were being undermined. The Speaker of the National Assembly in the phrase, *my decisions are also open to review*, shows that he is ready to accept advice. However, even at this particular time his decision was being reviewed in a way by the Members of Parliament who were opposing to going ahead with the motion, but he seemed not to get the advice. All this seems to suggest the covering up for the hidden schemes by the ruling PF to proceeding with the motion and eventually lifting the immunity of the Fourth Republican President.

Besides, in the sentence, *you are all free to decide, at the end of the day, whether that is the route to go* indicates that the members were free to oppose to the Motion and decide whether or not to go ahead with the Motion, but the Speaker of the National Assembly insists on *proceeding in an orderly fashion* thereby seemingly coercing the members to side with him and the ruling party. The Speaker of the National Assembly is concerned with orderliness and integrity of the House as he insists, *quite frankly, I would be the last person to preside over*

proceedings which are underpinned with illegalities. The Speaker of the National Assembly refers to the law, *if whatever will transpire this afternoon violates any law, constitutional or otherwise, it will be impeached,* he states. By using these words the Speaker of the National Assembly was upholding the rule of law that the move of immunity lifting was being done in respect for the rule of law.

However, the Opposition members felt that the rule of law was being violated and that is why they were shouting *rule of law!* *rule of law!* The Speaker of the National Assembly maintains that the integrity of the House should be upheld.

5.3.1.2 Covert Ideologies and the Text

The Speaker of the National Assembly seems to be exhibiting dictatorial tendencies when he tells the members of the House that they were proceeding with the motion and that there would not be any obstruction.

Excerpt 10

The bottom line is that we need to maintain the dignity of this August House and it is my responsibility to ensure that this is done. I spent almost two hours reasoning and appealing, but if that has been without avail, that is something else. I insist that we shall not have any obstruction although you can challenge the Honourable Mr Speaker. You can take any other civil measures against the Honourable Mr Speaker, but not obstruction because, then, you will be exceeding your rights. As we all know, there are limits which are prescribed by the Constitution itself.

From the excerpt, the views presented by the Speaker of the National Assembly seem to be dictatorial. The Speaker states that, *I spent almost two hours reasoning and appealing ...* as though at the end of the reasoning, there was an agreement reached, yet there was no agreement as members point out later in the session. On the surface it appears as though the Speaker of the National Assembly was pleading or reasoning with the members of the House, when in actual fact he was commanding them to obey his orders by insisting on *no obstruction*. He threatens, *you can take any other civil measures against the Honourable Mr Speaker, but not obstruction because, then, you will be exceeding your rights.*

The Speaker seems to be hiding behind maintaining the dignity of Parliament as seen when he asserts, *the bottom line is that we need to maintain the dignity of this August House and it is my responsibility to ensure that this is done*. This stance also shows the power and influence that the Speaker of the National Assembly commands.

Further pragmatic implicature here is that the Opposition members were somewhat powerless as they were being threatened to accepting the views of the ruling PF without question. The Speaker refers to obstruction as exceeding one's rights when the members of the House were defending the rule of law, which they felt the Speaker of the National Assembly was violating. All these views seem to suggest the broader dictatorial tendencies of the PF government.

From the foregoing, it can be noted that the excerpts above bring out covert ideologies which are hidden in the text which is the debate session itself. This comes out clearly from the discourse by the Speaker of the National Assembly when he speaks to the members of the House as though he was pleading and reasoning with them yet he was commanding them to proceed with the Motion by insisting on *no obstruction*. This perspective illustrates the covert ideology which is 'hidden' in the text, stemming from the theoretical conceptualization of Batstone (1995: 198-199) who asserts that, "critical discourse analysis seeks to reveal how texts are constructed so that particular perspectives can be expressed delicately and covertly".

The study therefore attempts to deconstruct covert ideologies which are hidden in the text or the debate session. From these excerpts, it is clear that it was difficult for the other members of the House to challenge the Speaker of the National Assembly on what he said due to the power and influence he commanded which was evident from the language he used. This is because covert ideologies are difficult to challenge. As Batstone further comments, "because they are covert, these ideologies are elusive of direct challenge, facilitating 'retreat into mystification'" (Batstone 1995: 198-199).

Furthermore, it is also clear from the foregoing that there is a mutually constituting relationship between discourses and the social systems in which they function as proposed by Fairclough (2005). Since there is a relationship between discourses and the social systems in which they function, the study exposes the way in which language and meaning are used by the power to deceive and oppress the dominated. In the debate session under investigation,

the members of the ruling party used the fact that ‘the internal procedures of the House are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the court’ to deceive and dominate the Opposition (see section 3.4).

5.3.1.3 Unequal Power Relations

Unequal power relations refer to the imbalance in the exertion of influence and freedom between two groups in a given situation. This imbalance could be due to the fact that one group is stronger than the other or enjoys more privileges than the other depending on the social standing or powers at their disposal (Collins, 2012). This section therefore brings out the unequal power relations between the members of the ruling PF and those of the opposition during the debate session. The results reveal that the members of the ruling party enjoyed more influence and freedom than did the Opposition.

Further analysis of the excerpts above shows that the members of the ruling party exclusively enjoy certain privileges. For instance, during the debate, Mr Kabimba is reported to have been threatening to deal with members of the Opposition and the Former President Banda in public. This perspective shows what happens outside parliament and reiterates the unequal power relations between the members of the Opposition and those of the ruling party in the political realm. This view further seems to indicate that Members of the ruling party have certain privileges or enjoy more freedom than do Opposition Members. There seems to be inequality even among members of parliament in the way they operate in public depending on the party they are affiliated to. Threatening to deal with fellow human beings; fellow members of parliament and the former President, is an act of abuse of human rights done publicly and yet the ruling party seemed to condone this, contrary to their claim that they were a fair and clean government.

The perspective presented above in a way implies lack of freedom and justice during the reign of the PF government. Further contrast can be made from the PF’s campaign tool prior to assuming governance, in which they preached freedom and justice. Freedom in this case is defined in terms of the social and political rights of individuals as “immunity from interference from others in his or her life, either by the state or church or by other individuals” (Taylor, cited in Hunter 1991:114). Justice on the other hand is “understood in terms of equality and the end of oppression in the social world - fair play” (Taylor, cited in

Hunter 1991:114). However, the analysis of the excerpts above seem to reveal abuse of freedom and justice by the ruling PF as it threatens to deal with individuals from the Opposition.

The perspective illustrated above is in line with Muralikrishnan (2011) who reveals that issues of politics and society are thus not merely abstract systems of social inequality and dominance, but they actually “come” down in the forms of everyday life, namely through the beliefs, actions and discourses of group members. He further posits that critical discourse analysis is specifically interested in the discursive dimensions of these abuses, and must spell out the conditions of the discursive violations of human rights (see section 3.3.1). All the above mentioned views illustrate power and hegemony by the Patriotic Front members during their reign.

Further unequal power relations between the members of the Opposition and those of the ruling party are seen in excerpt number seven above in which the Speaker of the National Assembly was justifying that it was alright to proceed with the Motion even though the matter concerning the corruption charges of the Fourth Republican President was in court, arguing that the House had its own way of dealing with its internal matters. This view brings out the power and influence that the members of the ruling party commanded compared to the Opposition. It seems that the ruling party had the freedom to do whatever they wanted at any time without taking into consideration the proper procedures.

When the members of the ruling party are challenged by the members of the Opposition for not following proper procedures, the members of the ruling party justify their actions by indicating that the House has its own way of dealing with its matters. The Speaker of the National assembly justifies *...so far as the internal proceedings and procedures of the House are concerned, they are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the court.* This was one of the persuasive strategies used by the Speaker of the National Assembly and the ruling PF. These words spoken by the Speaker of the National Assembly are so powerful that they control the direction of this particular debate session as the words seem to be justifying that the House proceeds with the motion at hand. The members of the Opposition use a counter persuasive strategy by arguing that the rule of law must be respected by not going ahead to debating the motion since the matter was in court. Even though the counter persuasive strategy was very

strong and reasonable, the motion goes ahead because of the influence that the ruling PF members of parliament commanded in the House.

The perspective presented above clearly shows the difference in power relations between the ruling party and the Opposition with the ruling party having more influence. This view tends to agree with Fairclough's assumptions that ideologies reside in texts (Fairclough, 1995). From the language used by the Speaker of the National Assembly, it is clear that the ruling government has power to control the Opposition in the House and even to make certain decisions independent of the Opposition. This perspective is evident from the discourse they used, thus ideologies residing in texts. The views also confirm Fairclough's (1993) assertion that CDA deals with any aspect of power, domination and social inequality.

Excerpt number ten above also brings out the differences in power relations between the Opposition and the ruling PF. The Speaker of the National Assembly in this excerpt seems to be pleading with the members of the House while in actual fact he is commanding them to obey his orders and to proceed with the Motion. The Speaker insists, *proceeding we are, obstruction there will not be*. He even uses thematic fronting to show emphasis that he did not want any obstruction by any member, by making the themes *proceeding* and *obstruction* marked, making them assume the subject positions instead of being predicates. This thematic fronting is used because according to the Speaker of the National Assembly, as the one regulating the deliberations in the House, the important thing is to proceed with the motion and eventually lifting the immunity of the Fourth Republican President, which according to him, members of the House were not supposed to object.

The thematic fronting which the Speaker of the National Assembly uses is a persuasive strategy to make sure members accept to go ahead with the motion. It also shows the power and influence that the Speaker of the National Assembly commands as he is the one who endorses every decision that is made in the House. Since the Speaker of the National Assembly belongs to the ruling party, he tends to be biased towards the views of the members of ruling PF than those of the Opposition. The motion of the proposal of the immunity lifting of the former president was presented by Mr Winter Kabimba, then Minister of Justice, who belonged to the ruling party. These views tend to agree with Muralikrishnan (2011), who shows close affinity between language and politics by working out discursive practices in public political discourses and demonstrates that political discourse is characterised by

unequal power relations. This perspective implies that the members of the ruling party were enjoying more freedom or influence than those of the Opposition (see section 3.3.1).

5.3.2 Leadership and Service to the People

This section presents how members of the House were admonished to be true leaders by being servants to the people who elected them instead of glorifying their selfish ends. The section goes further to bringing out the negative consequences of plundering of resources which include negative national development and suffering of the innocent citizens.

Excerpt 11

We now know that some of these issues and the poverty that we have been experiencing is as a result of the colossal sums of money that have been mentioned in this Motion being misapplied. I now understand why the Musele/Katuta/Soboni Road cannot be graded. Even just to put gravel has been a problem. For the past twenty years, the people have had problems because K21 billion, as we have heard, was spent on buying campaign materials.

The excerpt brings out how the plundering of the resources of the nation leads to negative development of the nation whose results are poverty, poor infrastructure, poor road network, inadequate healthy facilities and other vices. This view is revealed by the expression, *I now understand why the Musele/Katuta/Soboni Road cannot be graded. Even just to put gravel has been a problem.* It is a call for proper management of a nation's resources for positive development and benefit of all citizens. The excerpt further brings out the ugly face of poverty, resulting into the suffering of innocent citizens by the statement, *we now know that some of these issues and the poverty that we have been experiencing is as a result of the colossal sums of money that have been mentioned in this Motion being misapplied.*

A generalisation has been made in that even though the misappropriation of funds was done two years before the time of this debate session, it is assumed that even the problems of the nation that happened twenty years before were as a result of this mismanagement of funds. The Member of Parliament justifies, *for the past twenty years, the people have had problems because K21 billion, as we have heard, was spent on buying campaign materials.* The Member of Parliament uses generalisation as well as example/illustration strategy from van

Djik's (2004) framework to make a strong argument (Rashidi and Souzandehfar, 2010). He generalises the problems resulting from mismanagement of national resources and gives examples of the consequences of the plunder. He also illustrates the consequences of the plunder by mentioning the roads that had never been tarred or graded for twenty years.

The conversational implicature is that the whole period when the former ruling party, the MMD had been in power, the resources of the nation were misapplied, and generally that the poor management of resources results into negative development of the nation. The Member of Parliament who presented this argument is able to communicate effectively with the members of the House because of the background knowledge that they share together. The members of the House are able to make inferences of what the Member of Parliament speaking is communicating because they share this background knowledge with him. The reference to the past is used as a persuasive strategy. This Member of Parliament was justifying why the motion was important and why the immunity of the Former President was to be lifted. When the corrupt activities by those in public offices are brought to a halt, then the resources of the nation will be used for the benefit of the people thereby achieving positive development. The arguments put forward here are persuasive by bringing out the suffering of people as a result of plundering resources, and reasonable by indicating that when corruption is eradicated the resources of the nation will be used to uplift the lives of all the people in the nation thereby attaining positive national development. All these arguments show what true leadership entails.

5.3.2.1 Leadership and Accountability

In the following excerpts, Members of Parliament argue that accountability is a prerequisite to good leadership. They do so by pointing out the consequences of bad leadership and by giving concrete examples in the country.

Excerpt 12

Mr Speaker, authority requires one to be accountable. Accountability is a prerequisite of good governance. It requires that the rule of law is respected. It is very painful that we have to unveil our own beloved former President. However, must we keep quiet and allow the misapplication of funds to an extent that the people of Ikeleng'i and Lunte cannot even access medical health care? . . . Sir, leadership demands

transparency and accountability. Who else can answer for this apart from Mr Rupiah Banda?

The importance of being transparent and accountable when in authority is being emphasised in the phrase; *authority requires one to be accountable*. It is a reminder to all serving ministers that these are prerequisites of good governance which require respect for the rule of law. The implicature is that everyone should be responsible of their deeds while in authority and should be thus accountable accordingly. The member who presented the argument reasons *...must we keep quiet and allow the misapplication of funds to an extent that the people of Ikeleng'i and Lunte cannot even access medical health care? . . . Sir, leadership demands transparency and accountability*.

Further analysis of the linguistic form versus communicative function is that much as this Member of Parliament seems kind and sympathetic to the Fourth Republican President, the meaning being communicated seems to be harsh as it suggests that the Fourth Republican President must face the law and be prosecuted for the actions he did. It is against this fact that the Former President had to account for his actions that he performed while in power as the Member of Parliament submits, *who else can answer for this apart from Mr Rupiah Banda?* Furthermore, it can be inferred that this view is a call for the leaders not to plunder the resources of the nation at the expense of the citizens of the country. Leaders should serve the people who ushered them into office rather than glorifying their selfish ends.

The Member of Parliament who presented this excerpt argues that much as it is painful to lift the immunity of the former President, it had to be done in respect for the rule of law and for the good of all citizens of the country. The example/illustration strategy from van Djik's (2004) framework has been applied here. The Member of Parliament gives examples and illustrations of the plunder and its effects on the ordinary citizens and the development of the nation. For example, the people of Ikeleng'i and Lunte could not access medical care because of the resources that had been plundered.

5.3.2.2 Leadership and Level Headedness

The members of the House had to be level headed by confronting the issue of immunity lifting of the former president without considering the status, relationship or influence of the person involved. This move is what was expected of them as leaders.

Excerpt 13

Mr Speaker, the Zambian people must understand that there are no intentions of vengeance or revenge in what we are doing today. Apart from Honourable Chikwanda and Honourable Wina, I might be the only one close enough to the former President to stand here and support this Bill. I do it with a heavy heart, but it must be done. It is like a boil in an embarrassing place, which really hurts, but must be removed. It is important not only for Rupiah Banda, but for the future.

The members maintain that the act of immunity lifting must be done in order to preserve the dignity of the Office of the President. This stance called for fairness in dealing with issues of national concern, in respecting the rule of law. The argument is that the problem was not the person Rupiah Banda, but rather the wrong committed, in this case, the misapplication of the funds, as the member indicates, *there are no intentions of vengeance or revenge in what we are doing today.*

Besides, to do the right thing requires courage or level headedness, as expressed in the phrase, *it is like a boil in an embarrassing place, which really hurts, but must be removed.* The action was not just for 'now' but had to be done in order to safeguard the future generations. This stance in turn champions patriotism. Furthermore, fairness cuts across all personal boundaries or individual status. For instance, this Member of Parliament says that he is close to the Former President, but he is supporting the Motion, *I do it with a heavy heart, but it must be done*, he says. This means that the right thing had to be done irrespective of the nature of the person concerned and members of the House as leaders were to be level headed to face the matter as it was.

As stated in the theoretical framework, political and ideological discourse analyses are based on individual discourses giving way to influence of various ideologies as seen here (van Djik, 2001). The ruling PF uses fairness as a persuasive strategy and try to be reasonable in that

this Member of Parliament indicates that the act was done not to punish Rupiah Banda but in order to do what was right and to safeguard the future.

Excerpt 14

Mr Speaker, we must all insist that all forms of corruption are prosecuted. Corruption is a cancer in this country which should be dealt with. If we let go of this case, then, nobody will learn a lesson. Immunity is not a right, but a privilege given to those in authority by the people of Zambia. It can be removed at any time.

The excerpt reveals that those in authority are supposed to lead by example in fighting corruption, not perpetuating it. The pragmatic implicature is that leadership is about people whom leaders should owe their leadership to, and that it is the people who can determine how much privilege is to be enjoyed by those in authority as *immunity is not a right, but a privilege* which can be removed at any time. In simpler words, the leaders are in office because of the people. Since it is the people that usher leaders into office, they are supposed to be served diligently, and that when this service is denied, the people have the right to withdraw the privilege given to leaders at any time. The Member of Parliament justifies, *if we let go of this case, then, nobody will learn a lesson.*

The lifting of the immunity had to be done in order to show that nobody is above the law and for everybody to learn from that move. Again this was done in order to safeguard the citizens of the nation and the future generations and therefore required level headedness. This view is in line with Dunmire (2005) who posits that representations of the future are embedded in and projected through political discourse, in that the discourse that was used during the debate session was pointing to what could happen in the future and thereby safeguarding the future generations. The idea is therefore that the sole purpose of a leader is to serve the citizens that they are leading.

In the excerpts above, there is mention that the suffering and the poverty that the nation had been experiencing were as a result of the misapplication of the colossal sums of money that were mentioned in the Motion. The pragmatic implicature is that during the whole period when the former ruling party the MMD had been in power, there were a lot of problems as a result of the plunder of national resources which in turn resulted into negative development of

the nation. For instance, during the MMD reign, there were programmes which included the Structural Adjustment Programme and the liberalization of the economy, which led to loss of employment by a number of citizens and resulted into poverty and the problem of street kids, which contributed negatively to the development of the nation. It was also during the MMD reign that the second Republican President, Dr Frederick Chiluba, plundered the national resources at the expense of the ordinary citizens. All this reference to the past events was a persuasive strategy by the members of the ruling party.

The generalisation as well as example/illustration strategy from van Dijk's (2004) framework has been used to make a strong argument (Rashidi and Souzandehfar, 2010). The Member of Parliament is justifying why this motion is important and why the immunity of the Former President should be lifted. He gives examples and makes illustrations by bringing out the suffering of people as a result of the plundering of resources by those in public offices, and by indicating that when corruption is eradicated the resources of the nation will be used to uplift the lives of all the people in the nation. The excerpts also focus on accountability and transparency. It is a call for the leaders not to plunder the resources of a nation at the expense of the innocent citizens of the country. Thus the misapplication of funds should not be allowed at the expense of the ordinary citizens of the nation. The National Assembly therefore is concerned with the plight of the Zambian citizens.

5.3.3 Discursive Polarization

According to the *Webster's New College Dictionary* (2010), polarization refers to a sharp division, such as a population or group, into opposing factions. This section presents instances of discursive polarization of the discourse of the debate in which we see the arguments of the members of the ruling party on one side and those of the Opposition on the other, thereby bringing out discursive practices. The American Heritage (2013) defines discursive practice as a theory of the linguistic and socio-cultural characteristics of recurring episodes of face to face interaction, episodes that have social and cultural significance to a company of speakers.

At the beginning, members in the House spoke in line with the presenter of the Motion, justifying why the immunity of the Former President was to be lifted. Majority of these

members belonged to the ruling party and gave convincing reasons and tried to be persuasive in their argumentation.

Excerpt 15

Mr Speaker, one of the major steps taken by the Banda Administration was the amendment to the Anti-Corruption Act which saw the removal of the clause with the provision for abuse of authority of office of public officers. This clause was later reinstated by the PF Government in 2012 after winning the September 2011 Presidential and General Elections. Mr Speaker, the restoration of the clause was intended, and I repeat, was intended to send a clear message to the public and the international community that the PF Government was serious and uncompromising about the fight against corruption.

The first part of the excerpt is ‘negative other’ presentation of the Opposition MMD for having removed the anticorruption clause to suit themselves. The Member of Parliament does so by using the term ‘Banda Administration’ which is more of ridicule instead of former ruling party or MMD. The member further implies that the MMD were corrupt and that they amended the clause on corruption in order to avoid prosecution. After criticising the Opposition MMD, this Member of Parliament employs ‘positive self presentation’ to glorify the measures taken by the PF government by reinstating the corruption clause. He uses the words, *the restoration of the clause was intended, and I repeat, was intended to send a clear message to the public and the international community that the PF Government was serious and uncompromising about the fight against corruption*, which glorify the measures taken by the ruling party.

The excerpt therefore shows how the members of the ruling party presented a polarized view of the world which is common in two party systems which tends to agree with Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010). The ruling PF were saying that they were better in that they were fighting corruption whereas the former ruling party, the MMD, is presented negatively for amending the clause against corruption and for being involved in corrupt activities. The Member of Parliament explains, *one of the major steps taken by the Banda Administration was the amendment to the Anti-Corruption Act which saw the removal of the clause with the provision for abuse of authority of office of public officers*. The excerpt was presented by the Minister of Justice claiming that the PF Government was one with integrity in that they

wanted to be free from corruption and therefore had resolved to fight it seriously as he justifies, *this clause was later reinstated by the PF Government in 2012 after winning the September 2011 Presidential and General Elections.*

The foregoing is an instance of in-group favouritism of self glorification representation as presented by van Dijk's (2004) framework (see section 2.2.3). Thus the PF government advocated integrity by all its members and all those in public offices during their reign. Nevertheless during the debate session some members indicated that 'not everybody among the PF members were clean', alleging that there could have been some members that were still indulging in corrupt practices among the ruling PF members. This perspective shows that the ideologies advocated by the members of parliament were present in the language they used with the aim of a discursive reproduction of their account of the world by means of and access to different discourses through the power of definition inherent in their positions as members of parliament (Andreassen, 2007).

The fact that the ruling party advocated integrity is a justification to the Motion in that since the government of the day wanted to eradicate corruption, the immunity of the former President had to be lifted in respect for the rule of law. This would in turn make everybody live above board which would contribute to positive development of the nation. It means that justice must be done regardless of the status of the person involved. In the session, reference back to history is made by bringing out how Dr Kaunda and Chiluba, the two former Republican Presidents before Rupiah Banda, were detained and prosecuted by the courts of law respectively. This perspective shows that no one is above the law and therefore everybody is supposed to live above board. This further brings out the relationship between language and ideology and tends to agree with Bhatia (2006) who asserts that there is an interdependency of language and ideology; ideology and socio-cultural practices; and socio-cultural politics. The political ideology of the nation here comes out by recounting what had been happening in the country before the current event (see section 3.4).

The relationship between discursive practices and their social function is further brought out when members were presenting general arguments. For instance, an Opposition Member of Parliament feels that the right procedures when handling the motion had not been exhausted or rather the time given to consider the issue was not enough as indicated below.

Excerpt 16

Mr Speaker, I do not support the Motion before the House because what the Minister of Justice has brought before this House are allegations. Since they are allegations, I feel the method used to lift the immunity has not been fully followed. In my opinion, justice should prevail, but the right procedures should be followed. Sir I feel victimised because there was not enough time given to the Opposition to try and defend this matter before the House.

The excerpt was uttered by an Opposition Member of Parliament who feels that procedures had not been exhausted or rather that the time given to consider the issue was not enough. He also points out that what the mover of the motion had presented were allegations which required more investigations. He reasons, *what the Minister of Justice has brought before this House are allegations. Since they are allegations, I feel the method used to lift the immunity has not been fully followed.*

Further, the Opposition members do not seem to have adequate information about the issue as do the members of the ruling party, from the sentence, *Sir I feel victimised because there was not enough time given to the Opposition to try and defend this matter before the House.* We can infer that the ruling party therefore has more authority and access to information than the Opposition since they have the advantage of being in control of government machinery. It seems that the Speaker of the National Assembly and the ruling PF members, rush into making decisions and on proceeding to debating the motion without exhausting all the channels and without reasoning with all the members of the House. This is a mechanism of discursive practice and its social function with the need to create and maintain differences in power relations (Andreassen, 2007). From the above excerpt it seems that the members of the ruling PF had enough time to deliberate on the matter, while the Opposition members were not accorded enough time to do so. The members of the Opposition use derogation of out-group generalisation and comparison representations from van Dijk's (2004) framework in that after comparing themselves to the ruling party, they realise they do not have enough information and are not accorded enough time to deliberate on the matter. From this they make generalisations about the stance of the ruling PF concerning the former president, that may be the PF just wanted to punish him. The Opposition therefore uses a counter persuasive

strategy by insisting on proper procedure in order to be accorded a chance to air out their views about the matter.

As pointed out in the theoretical framework, critical discourse analysis in political discourses thus provides a great opportunity to discover the realities which have been naturalised as 'non-ideological common sense' (Fairclough, 1995). This view brings out the crucial role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance and inequality which is in line with Fairclough (1995). This perspective is seen in the way members of the ruling Patriotic Front tried to cement their legacies through the language they used, by access to influential discourse, and through power of definition. For instance, that they had done well by fighting corruption and respecting the rule of law (see section 5.3.3.2).

Excerpt 17

Mr Speaker, I have been prompted to debate by the debate by the Honourable member of parliament for Nalikwanda who insinuated that some people had become intellectually bankrupt instead of being morally bankrupt. Mr Speaker, I think that my former party has been affected by a political tsunami. Due to the intellectual bankruptcy in the leadership, my former party does not have new ideas of how to win elections. It started in Mpongwe, the tsunami, it has gone to Livingstone, to proceed to Kapiri Mposhi, to go to Lukulu west and eventually in the Zambezi River, then we forget about them.

This excerpt was presented by a PF member and shows that members in the House can include information that is not relevant to the topic at hand. The Member of Parliament 'negatively others' the Opposition MMD by using lexicalization in the phrase *my former party has been affected by a political tsunami*. This also brings out further discursive polarization. The member speaking here had just defected from Opposition MMD to joining the ruling PF. Since he belongs to the ruling party, he feels he enjoys certain powers than do the Opposition members to talk about Opposition members the way he did. He brings out irrelevant information by ridiculing the Opposition MMD thus, *due to the intellectual bankruptcy in the leadership; my former party does not have new ideas of how to win elections*.

The unequal power relations between the two parties in parliament, that is, members of the Opposition on one hand and the members of the ruling PF on the other, with the members of the ruling Party enjoying more political influence than the Opposition, are evident here. This member even goes further to ‘negatively othering’ the members of the MMD by showing how the party had been losing by-elections and prophesying the extinction of the party, in a ridiculing manner when he says, *it started in Mpongwe, the tsunami, it has gone to Livingstone, to proceed to Kapiri Mposhi, to go to Lukulu west and eventually in the Zambezi River, then we forget about them*. This perspective also brings out the rivalry that existed between the two parties (PF and MMD), since this happened in less than two years after the PF took over power from the MMD. The Member of Parliament expresses positive ‘Us’ and negative ‘Them’ representation by alleging that the MMD lacks new ideas and as a result had been losing elections, implying that his present party, the PF, had new ideas of winning elections.

The pragmatic implicature of the above excerpt is that the member who spoke these words used language more for ridicule than advice. This is hegemony and is in line with Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 258) who argue that, in any way, discourse has major repercussions for society; it gives rise to important issues of power, and it has major ideological effects. Discursive practices “can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people”.

The study therefore established that discursive polarization is used by Members of Parliament regardless of their ideological position in order to present a world-view of ‘Us’ versus ‘Them’, where ‘us’ positive self-presentation is juxtaposed with a negative presentation of ‘Them’ as postulated by van Dijk’s (2004) framework, which is common in two party systems which is in line with Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010). During the debate session, when justifying whether or not to go ahead with the Motion, the members of the ruling party are on one side supporting the motion and the Opposition is on the other, opposing to the motion.

5.3.3.1 Discursive Polarization and Corrupt Practices

The excerpts below present the views from the Opposition members of parliament who with strong arguments tried to remind those in the ruling party to be cautious of their conduct and

to be honest about themselves while in office. Further, some of them even tried to challenge the rationale behind the lifting of the former President's immunity, in a persuasive manner. As they were doing so they were presenting themselves to be better than the ruling party members.

Excerpt 18

Mr Speaker, therefore I want to appeal to the other Honourable members to realise that the precedent that we have been setting is that all of you will be searched when you are out of those positions. I know that some of you may claim to be clean, but it is not all of you who are. That is a fact. Do not think that when you are doing certain things, people do not know about them because they do. ...Sir, I want to state that even as they remove the immunity of the Former President, not everyone is clean.

This excerpt is aimed at reminding the members of the ruling party that they should reflect upon their deeds, that the same whip they were using against others would be used on them as well in future if they are not living clean lives. The Member of Parliament does so by using lexicalisation in the phrases *you will be searched*, and *... it is not all of you who are*. He warns, *I want to appeal to the other Honourable members to realise that the precedent that we have been setting is that all of you will be searched when you are out of those positions*. This claim seems to point to the members of the ruling party that they could also be doing some bad things, or could be involved in corrupt activities. The member insists, *I know that some of you may claim to be clean, but it is not all of you who are. That is a fact. Do not think that when you are doing certain things, people do not know about them because they do*.

The view presented above is a counter persuasive strategy and is seen by the way this Member of Parliament distances himself from the action by using exclusive pronouns *they* and *other* in the discourse. The Member of Parliament who spoke these words is an Opposition member of parliament of the United Party for National Development (UPND), who distances himself from the activities of the ruling Patriotic Front Government as he concludes, *Sir, I want to state that even as they remove the immunity of the Former President, not everyone is clean*. This perspective is an instance of polarization in that we see two groups here; the Opposition on one hand and the ruling PF on the other with the view 'Us' versus 'Them' representation. The Opposition here is implying that they are living a better

life than the members of the ruling party thus glorifying the Opposition's activities or positive self-presentation which is in line with Andreassen (2007) (see section 3.3.1).

On the other hand, the Opposition members condemn the activities of the ruling PF by alleging that some members of the ruling PF could have been indulging in corrupt activities, thus 'negative other' representation. They use derogation of out-group generalisation and comparison representations in line with van Dijk's (2004) framework by comparing the ruling PF and the former ruling party the MMD and that both parties were involved in corrupt practices and therefore that the ruling PF should not accuse others of the things they were doing themselves. In line with this, Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010), asserts that, politics is all about establishing clear alternatives, or, creating in-groups and out-groups. Such discursive polarization is used by all the political parties regardless of the ideological position in order to present a world-view of 'Us' versus 'Them', where 'our' positive self-presentation is juxtaposed with a negative presentation of 'them'. Politicians always seem to have a number of 'enemies' that they seek to 'other' (see section 3.3.1). The Opposition here is implying that they are living a better life than the members of the ruling party.

Excerpt 19

Mr Speaker, it is hoped that more investigations might come. However, if that will not happen, we want to ensure that Zambian money will not be used on things that will not yield results. We come from a time when we removed the immunity of our former late President and I do not think that, at the end of it, there is anything that came out.

This excerpt indicates that the resources of the nation should not be wasted in an attempt to recover stolen money, and in the end not recover that money. Reference is made to the previous case of lifting of the immunity of a former President, where all the efforts in attempting to recover stolen money, yielded to almost nothing, yet the resources of the nation were used to pursue that case. The member argues, *for this particular one, the ones investigating might spend more than is alleged to have been stolen*. He uses counter persuasive strategy by questioning the rationale of going ahead with the immunity lifting of the Fourth President, unless there was surety that the resources of the nation would be recovered.

The pragmatic implicature of this excerpt is that the act of immunity lifting is not worthwhile if it does not yield to anything or if it does not end up achieving its ultimate purpose of recovering the stolen resources. The Member of Parliament persuades the House to ensure that resources of the nation are used wisely. He insists, *we want to ensure that Zambian money will not be used on things that will not yield results*. This argument although in the opposite direction is convincing and reasonable in that the members are told that if the immunity is lifted; they should make sure stolen resources are recovered. This member used comparison of Chiluba's case and Rupiah Banda's as a counter persuasive strategy for not going ahead with the motion.

Furthermore, the excerpt presents a polarized view in that this member seems to be saying that the members of the ruling party as movers of the motion are the ones that would lift the immunity of the former president and thereafter pursue the case in an effort to recover the stolen resources, thus negatively othering the ruling PF. This Member of Parliament and other Opposition members seem to be outside the circle, which should not have been the case since they are part of the House. The member who spoke the above utterance therefore exhibits positive self presentation of himself and the other Opposition members.

To make his argument strong, the Member of Parliament makes reference to what happened in the Chiluba case where a lot of money was used to pursue the case but nothing was recovered. He reminded the House, *we have come from a time when we removed the immunity of our former late president and I do not think that, at the end of it, there was anything that came out*. This is how the rationale of going ahead with the immunity lifting of the Fourth President was being questioned, unless there was surety that the stolen resources would be recovered. The Opposition seem to be suggesting that time and resources should not be wasted at the expense of the innocent citizens, for if the resources of the nation are used to pursue cases where stolen resources would not be recovered, then the citizens of the nation would be deprived of their resources twice.

This argument is a counter persuasive strategy, which is convincing and reasonable in that the movers of the motion, who were the ruling PF members were being warned that if the immunity is lifted, they should make sure stolen resources are recovered. The polarized view comes out in that the Opposition are presenting the ruling PF as bad or doing wrong for

proposing the lifting of the immunity and that the Opposition reasons better by arguing that the resources of the nation should be used where positive results would be realised. In simpler terms, *Us* Opposition ‘we are good’ and *Them* ruling PF ‘they are bad or they are wrong for proposing the immunity lifting of the former president’ and not looking into the future, in line with Andreassen (2007) (see section 3.3.1). This perspective is also in line with van Dijk (2004) who submits that a general tendency among the organisation of ideological discourses is the strategy of positive self-presentation (boasting) and negative other-presentation (derogation). There are therefore many discursive ways to enhancing or mitigating our / their good / bad things, and hence to mark discourse ideologically as indicated in the theoretical framework (see section 2.4.1).

5.3.3.2 Discursive Polarization and Integrity

The arguments in this section show how the members of the Opposition continue to ‘other’ the ruling PF members’ activities. At this stage of the debate session, the Opposition members focus on personal integrity in relation to the motion at hand and argue that the mover of the motion was not in order to do so, by referring back to history.

Excerpt 20

Mr Speaker, allegations are allegations. Unfortunately, for a Head of State, a precedent has been set. Others may be there making noise, but if you are Head of State, you must wonder what you are doing. I would be very happy if we considered this Motion carefully. Our President has been very tactful. He has not come to this House to lay out all the allegations. He has left it to the Honourable Minister of Justice so that if he fails, in future, we just face the Honourable Minister of Justice as one who may have told the House a lot of lies.

The Member of Parliament is reiterating the fact that the Motion needed much more time for consideration and investigation than it had been given, from the phrases, *Mr Speaker, allegations are allegations*, and *I would be very happy if we considered this Motion carefully*. He challenges the manner in which the Motion was handled, especially the person who presented it. The excerpt implies that consistency should be upheld referring back to the previous immunity lifting of a former Head of State, where the President himself went to the House to lay allegations against the former Head of State. This member also cautions the Minister of Justice to reflect whether he was in order to be the one presenting this kind of

Motion when he says, *our President has been very tactful. He has not come to this House to lay out all the allegations.* The issue here is not the immunity lifting, but rather, the manner in which the Motion was being handled. The Opposition members feel that enough time should have been accorded to reflect upon the issue, in order to see how best it would have been handled with ease than was the case at that time.

The conversational implicature is that there is mistrust or lack of confidence by members of the House about Mr Kabimba who presented the motion. It seems members of the House had no confidence in him and therefore did not take him seriously. The phrase ... *in future, we just face the Honourable Minister of Justice as one who may have told the House a lot of lies,* reveals this mistrust. Furthermore, the excerpt brings out polarization in that this Member of Parliament and the other Opposition members distance themselves from the motion by insinuating that what was being presented in the House were allegations or lies and that they were not part of it. This view 'negatively others' the mover of the motion Mr Kabimba and seems to suggest that from the point of view of the Opposition, the ruling PF members were wrong and the Opposition members were right, thus positive 'Us' and negative 'Them' representations (Rashidi & Souzandehfar 2010, Andreassen 2007). This further shows how the Opposition cemented their legacies through the discourse they used and through power of definition in line with the findings of Andreassen (2007).

Excerpt 21

Mr Speaker, is the Honourable Minister of Justice in order to present to this House a very serious matter of national concern, the proposed removal of the immunity of the Former President, when he is not the President of this country and does not even know what is in that office? A precedent has been set in this country where the removal of the immunity of a former Head of State was presented to this House by the occupant of the office, the Head of State himself. I need your serious ruling on this matter.

The member speaking is indirectly saying that the Minister of Justice was not the right person to have presented the motion because he was not the President. He uses comparison strategy from van Dijk's (2004) framework, by comparing Mr Kabimba and a president and that the motion was not supposed to be debated since the Opposition felt that using Mr Kabimba to

move the motion was a violation of the rule of law since Mr Kabimba was not on an equal footing with the president. The Member of Parliament interrogates, *is the Honourable Minister of Justice in order to present to this House a very serious matter of national concern, the proposed removal of the immunity of the Former President, when he is not the President of this country and does not even know what is in that office?* This is a counter persuasive strategy by insisting that the rule of law must be respected and by comparing the last immunity lifting case and the current one.

The above view is a call for consistency, that is, members feel that the procedure used when lifting the immunity of the second president in which the President himself presented the Motion to the House, should have been followed. The Member of Parliament uses the phrase, *a precedent has been set in this country where the removal of the immunity of a former Head of State was presented to this House by the occupant of the office, the Head of State himself,* as an indication that there must be or there is a procedure that should be followed. Members feel that the parliamentary debates should therefore be consistent in the way they deal with certain issues. This perspective seems to be a call to the members to make them realise the manipulative tendency of the ruling Patriotic Front government and to guard against this manipulation by following what was done previously. These views are supported by Bhatia (2006) and Karlberg (2005) as they aim at exposing the way in which language and meaning are used by the power to deceive and oppress the dominated (see section 3.4).

Excerpt 22

Mr Speaker, is this House in order to allow the Honourable Minister of Justice to move this Motion, in fact, making him a Judge in his own cause since he is the one who is going to defend the position of the Government, and it is a notorious fact that the same Honourable Minister of Justice has been in the public threatening to deal with honourable members of the Opposition and the Former President, Mr R. B. Banda, to be specific, thereby making it political prosecution in the eyes of the ordinary citizens? Are we in order to allow him, when he has been quoted so many times, to become a Judge in his own cause?

Mr Kabimba's not being fit to move the Motion about the lifting of the immunity of the former President is shown through his behaviour towards the Opposition and the former

President himself. The threatening of the Opposition members and the former President by Mr Kabimba is not good and allowing him to present this Motion entails *making him Judge in his own cause when defending the position of government*. The Member of Parliament uses the phrases, *is this House in order to allow the Honourable Minister of Justice to move this Motion?* and *are we in order to allow him?* These interrogations seem to show the collective responsibility of members of the House since whatever decision and outcome would come out of the House, all the members of parliament would be in it together, not just the PF. That is why the members wanted the right thing to be done.

On the other hand, the excerpt brings out the fact that members of parliament in the ruling party feel that they can say and do anything since they feel protected by the government. Furthermore, the pragmatic implicature is that Mr Kabimba should not have moved the motion because of his bad behaviour outside parliament, and therefore the motion should not have been debated. The excerpt reflects what happens outside the House. The members of the House are able to connect meanings from the arguments due to the background knowledge that they share and therefore make inferences based on this knowledge.

Furthermore, the excerpt above reveals abuse of freedom and justice by the ruling PF as it threatens to deal with individuals from the Opposition. The Opposition members used a schema that helps to recognize and respond to oppressive power relations, by the ruling party. This view is supported by Karlberg (2005). The excerpt also brings out discursive polarization as it seems to be pointing out that by allowing Mr Kabimba to present the motion, the ruling PF is wrong, and them (the Opposition) are reasoning correctly, thus negatively *othering* the ruling PF and positively presenting themselves.

Excerpt 23

Mr Speaker, I submit that the allegations we have heard this afternoon require more information so that we are convinced that there is, actually, a need to remove the immunity of the former President. I hope that this is not mere speculation.

This excerpt indicates that members of the House were not convinced that there was need to lift the immunity of the former President. This stance is a counter persuasive strategy reiterating that matters of procedure are important. This stance is revealed in the statement, *I submit that the allegations we have heard this afternoon require more information so that we*

are convinced that there is, actually, a need to remove the immunity of the former President. Furthermore, the arguments by the Opposition members imply lack of trust in the ruling party and especially the person who presented the Motion, Mr Winter Kabimba, by the phrase, *I hope that this is not mere speculation.* This view brings out the importance of being a serious, good and honest person in life through the activities that one does in order for others to take you seriously. This view seems to suggest that Mr Kabimba's way of life or behaviour and actions outside parliament were not good. Due to this fellow members in the House seem not to listen to him as regards the motion at hand. All these views bring out polarization of *Us* and negative *Them* representations as the Opposition seem to indicate that the ruling PF was wrong to have presented the motion which required more information before it was to be presented.

Excerpt 24

I have had to use the help of a television to see the face of the Honourable member of Justice as he moved this Motion and I have arrived at a very safe, albeit unfortunate position. I do not trust him or his word. Mr Speaker, this is important because what is under discussion is a very serious matter. There are three reasons I do not agree with the Motion on the Floor of the House today. Firstly, by now, we have a record of the PF, as party in Government. We cannot trust them because they have abused a number of already existing laws and a number of innocent citizens.

The excerpt questions the integrity of the PF Government by referring to their activities in the past that were contrary to what they were professing, such as abuse of human rights and lack of respect for the rule of law. The member who spoke the utterance, who is an Opposition member presents the ruling PF negatively. This view is revealed by the statement, *we cannot trust them because they have abused a number of already existing laws and a number of innocent citizens.*

The pragmatic implicature of the above view is that a government that was violating the law could not judge others using the same law. It is important therefore to be a clean person first before judging others. This seems to suggest that even though there was a need to have the immunity of the former President to be lifted, some of the members of the House were sceptical because the person who presented the Motion together with the party where he

belonged seemed not be trusted. The Member of Parliament reveals that the issue deserved to have been considered seriously in the phrases, *I do not trust him or his word. Mr Speaker, this is important because what is under discussion is a very serious matter.* This further brings out polarisation even clearer as the Opposition presents itself using the positive ‘Us’ pronoun while presenting the ruling PF with the negative ‘Them’ pronoun. Thus the Opposition are saying ‘*we are right*’ and to the PF that ‘*they are wrong*’ thereby bringing out the positive ‘Us’ presentation and negative ‘Them’ presentation which is in line with Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010) and Andreassen (2007).

5.3.3.3 Discursive Polarization and abuse of Human Rights

This section brings out the concerns on the abuse of human rights by the ruling PF as alleged by the Opposition members of parliament. In the following excerpts the Opposition maintains and tries to justify how the members of the ruling party fell short of being in a position to judge others as regards plundering of the national resources and abuse of human rights.

Excerpt 25

We are worried and concerned with the level of abuse of individuals, institutions, offices and, sadly, even various provisions within the law by the current Government. So, if we allow them to use this opportunity to vent anger or whatever they have to settle with Mr Rupiah Banda, it will be unfortunate. That is why, as a person and as a representative of the people of Mbabala Constituency, I am opposed to the Motion. Secondly, Sir, whatever arguments they are advancing today, I think that it is also immoral for the PF Government, especially, to be the ones that bring the Motion proposing the removal of the immunity of Former President, Mr Rupiah Banda. It is immoral because their hands are contaminated.

The excerpt reflects what was happening outside the House and the Opposition reiterates that the ruling PF had not lived up to the standard that far. The Opposition allege that the members of the PF had abused individuals by referring to what was happening outside parliament, for example, denial of police permit and police brutality towards Opposition parties who wanted to hold political rallies. That is why this member or the members of the Opposition were concerned with *the level of abuse of individuals, institutions, offices and, sadly, even various provisions within the law.* The ruling PF had also abused the Public Order

Act and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP), which was even being directed to investigate people for owning cattle. With all these deeds the Opposition felt that it was not in order for the PF to have been the ones to propose the lifting of the immunity of the Former President. The Member of Parliament insists, *whatever arguments they are advancing today, I think that it is also immoral for the PF Government, especially, to be the ones that bring the Motion proposing the removal of the immunity of Former President, Mr Rupiah Banda. It is immoral because their hands are contaminated.* The Opposition seem to imply that before you call for others to be upright, you should be an upright person oneself.

The discursive practices continue coming out in that there is a presentation of the two groups, the Opposition and the ruling party, with the positive 'Us' presentation and negative 'Them' presentation respectively. This is in line with Andreassen (2007) in that the Opposition are presenting the ruling PF as wrong (negative othering), doing bad things such as human right abuse against the citizens instead of protecting them and that if given chance to vent their anger with the former president, they would do him more harm than good. The Opposition maintain that all these facts were evident from past events done by the ruling PF. The Opposition members present themselves as good people (positive presentation), who feel for the former president and concerned with the plight of the citizens of the country.

This view is also supported by Karlberg, (2005) who proposes a schema that helps to recognize and respond to oppressive power relations. In the debate session, the Opposition uses such a schema to recognise the oppressive tendencies of the ruling PF and use counter persuasive strategies to respond to these oppressive power relations by the ruling PF. For instance, they argue that it was not in order for the PF members to propose the immunity lifting of the former president because they were not upright themselves. They also refer to past events such as the immunity lifting of Frederick Chiluba and what was happening outside parliament and the abuse of the Public Order Act and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) as indicated above, to argue out their case.

Excerpt 26

The PF Government has demonstrated a total lack of fidelity, and I am using the word 'fidelity' to mean loyalty to this country. I think that the disregard of various

institutions or provisions in the law in the past is enough reason for us to question the motive behind what it is proposing to do today.

The member speaking here distances himself and other Opposition members from the Motion thus presenting the members of the ruling party negatively. This stance is revealed by the use of the phrase *what it is proposing to do today*, showing that it is a Motion for the PF ruling party, and not for the Opposition members or the whole House in the National Assembly. The Opposition is seen here negatively *othering* the ruling party and though not said directly they use the positive ‘Us’ to refer to themselves as the Opposition (Andreassen 2007).

What the Opposition seem to be bringing out here is that because the ruling PF was not living up to the required standard, they were not taken seriously with their actions. This is revealed by these words, *the PF Government has demonstrated a total lack of fidelity, and I am using the word ‘fidelity’ to mean loyalty to this country*. This view seems to suggest that the bad reputation of the ruling PF in turn dilutes a very good Motion which is a national concern in which the resources of the nation had been plundered and needed to be paid back, yet is not taken seriously due to the ruling party’s allegedly immoral activities. The member insists, *I think that the disregard of various institutions or provisions in the law in the past is enough reason for us to question the motive behind what it is proposing to do today*. This perspective seems to unearth the hidden schemes of the ruling PF towards the former President wanting to punish him and as pointed out during the debate session that the Minister of Justice had been threatening to deal with the Opposition and in particular the former President Rupiah Banda. This reiterates discursive polarization of the ‘Us’ versus ‘Them’ with the Opposition claiming to be better in their dealings than the ruling PF. Threatening to deal with fellow human beings is an abuse of human rights and is a negative attribute which the Opposition is condemning here and therefore present themselves positively.

Excerpt 27

Mr Speaker, it sounds alright today to them but let me summarise by saying that the die is cast and the time is ticking and their moment of truth will come very soon. Their time is coming. They sound excited today, but some of them, soon and very soon, indeed, will face the music of this same law that they are trying to use today against others.

In the excerpt, self reflection on the part of the ruling PF is being admonished; that the actions they were doing of judging and punishing others or abusing human rights, would also be used on them. This excerpt 'negatively others' the ruling PF members. This view is brought out by the words *...but some of them, soon and very soon, indeed, will face the music of this same law that they are trying to use today against others*. This is an indirect call to the members, especially those in the ruling party to be upright, accountable and transparent. The Opposition members seem to suggest that as people do bad things, they are being watched by others and therefore there is a need to uphold integrity. The theme of discursive polarization is being reiterated by the phrases, *it sounds alright for them today and their moment of truth will come very soon* as supported by Andreassen (2007).

The opposition members maintain that members of the ruling PF were not doing things right at that time. Besides, it is clear that members of the Opposition used this time as an opportunity to air out what they had been observing going on with the ruling party members. This perspective acted as a counter persuasive strategy and as a platform for reprimanding those who were indulging in corrupt activities including abuse of human rights, that one day the law would catch up with them and that, that time was almost at hand. The implication of this is that whatever is hidden would come out into the open with time as expressed in the phrase, *the die is cast and the time is ticking and their moment of truth will come very soon*. The Opposition seem to be saying that integrity should be upheld by all the members of the House if they were to be taken seriously. This is in line with Dunmire (2005) who contends that representations of the future are embedded in and projected through political discourse (see section 3.3.1). The Opposition members were telling the members of the ruling party to behave uprightly at that time or they would also suffer in the future revealed through the discourse that was used during the debate session (Rashidi and Souzandehfar 2010, Andreassen 2007). The Opposition were also asserting that leaders are also supposed to be accountable and transparent while in office for the good of all citizens of the nation and of themselves. The excerpt brings out further discursive polarization in that the this member 'others' the members of the ruling party by referring to them as being involved in corrupt practices just like the former president and that they would also face prosecution in future.

Furthermore, in the study the discursive event and discursive structure interrelatedness idea proposed by Fairclough (1995) was confirmed, which is supported by the findings of Horvath (2008) after examining Obama's persuasive strategies (see section 3.3.1). The immunity lifting, which is the discursive event shaped the debate session, which is the discursive structure.

5.3.4 Patriotism and Good Governance

This section discusses the importance of the members of parliament to be patriotic by doing what is right while in office. The members that presented arguments in this line were from the ruling party and they gave persuasive arguments as to why the immunity of the former Head of State was to be lifted. They drew the members of the House to be mindful of the innocent Zambians who were suffering as a result of the plundering of the national resources by those in power. The members in their arguments maintained that the plunderers deserved to be punished and needed to repay back the resources for the benefit of the citizens. The arguments reminded the members of what true leadership entails.

Excerpt 28

Sir, the hallmark of leadership is to have empathy, love and humility. . . Mr Speaker, I have been to places in this country where, in a family of ten or fifteen, a few of them eat on Monday, others eat on Tuesday and the rest on Wednesday. Then those who ate on Monday restart the cycle on Thursday, yet we have a President who does not care; a President who takes away money that should be given to the people of Zambia in the rural areas so that they are able to eat three meals a day and we sit in this Parliament, those of us who eat three meals a day, and say this Motion is not good. What are we talking about? Are we not supposed to represent the people of Zambia? People are walking out of this Parliament to protect an individual and not protect the 13 million people of Zambia. I find it absurd.

The members of the House are being reminded of the importance of the issue at hand of plundering of national resources and that it should be handled with the seriousness it deserves. It is a call that members should be objective by focusing on the real issue of the resources of the nation that had been plundered at the expense of the average Zambian people. The Member of Parliament reiterates *...we sit in this Parliament, those of us who eat*

three meals a day, and say this Motion is not good. Instead of politicking by bringing out the ideological differences between the ruling party and the Opposition, this member focuses her attention on the plight of all the citizens, who should have benefited from the plundered resources, who were now suffering as a result of the plunder. She calls on the members of the House to know why they were elected and to serve the people who ushered them into office accordingly. She interrogates the members of the House, *what are we talking about? Are we not supposed to represent the people of Zambia? People are walking out of this Parliament to protect an individual and not protect the 13 million people of Zambia.*

The excerpt brings out the importance of being a patriotic Zambian and the theme of patriotism. It is a reminder to members that despite the double standards, abuse of office and of human rights by the ruling party, there is the innocent citizens, the ordinary Zambians who suffer as a result of the plundering of the nation's resources. It is therefore these people that mattered the most and that the members of parliament were in the National Assembly because of these people, and therefore needed to protect them. This view tends to agree with Heatherington (1980) who asserts that politicians use good feelings, thus evocating feelings of patriotism. The members of parliament are admonished to protect the citizens and that when they do this, the citizens will respect them and may be assure them of voting for them again during the next elections thereby invoking good feelings and patriotism in the members of the House.

The strategy used here is example/illustration from van Djik's (2004) framework as the Member of Parliament gives examples of how innocent citizens suffer as a result of plunder of resources, to illustrate the importance of immunity lifting (Edelman, 1977; Jason & Peccei, 2003). This view is a persuasive strategy, which brings out the importance and true meaning of leadership and what it means to be a member of parliament and what is supposed to be done when one is such.

Excerpt 29

Mr Speaker, I support the Motion and I would like us to remind ourselves that we are here to offer a service. If the former President will be found guilty of these allegations, he must face the wrath. If he will not be found guilty, he then will be free on the streets of Zambia and the world. That is what it means, but it will also be

reminding those of us in public office that we are not omnipotent and not above the law. Therefore, we should deliver what is in our offices in a transparent manner; truthfully and without thinking that that expiry date will not come.

The theme of self reflection and true leadership is being reiterated. Members should serve the people by taking development to where people are, which can only be done by safeguarding the resources of the nation. The Member of Parliament reveals, *Mr Speaker, I support the Motion and I would like us to remind ourselves that we are here to offer a service.* She also calls for the respect to the rule of law for those in public offices by ensuring that justice be upheld through accountability, revealed by the words, *if the former President will be found guilty of these allegations, he must face the wrath.* Leaders are supposed to serve the people by being transparent and accountable to their actions so that they continue commanding respect from the public after leaving office expressed by the expression, *therefore, we should deliver what is in our offices in a transparent manner; truthfully and without thinking that that expiry date will not come.*

The view expressed above shows how political language validates established beliefs and how it strengthens the authority structures in which it is used as postulated by Bernstein (1975). The Member of Parliament admonishes fellow members to deliver in their positions. She continues using example/illustration from van Dijk's (2004) framework as indicated above. The pragmatic implicature of this excerpt is that the general public or the ordinary citizens of the nation are more important than the President, whether in office or former, and let alone the members of parliament. Therefore justice should be done by punishing those who are found guilty regardless of their status, and vindicating those who are found clean.

5.3.4.1 Patriotism and Service to the People

In this section, the themes of the fight against corruption, good governance and accountability, and the respect for rule law are being underscored in the excerpts below. All these themes are presented in the light of the ordinary citizens as these themes champion the plight of the Zambian citizens.

Excerpt 30

This Motion shows the Government's will to fight corruption. Therefore, this is an opportunity for my friend, Honourable Mweetwa, and other colleagues in the Opposition and African Parliamentarians Network against Corruption (APNAC) to bring even more efficacious laws in the next session of Parliament, to make sure we bring the fight against corruption to higher heights in Zambia. As a matter of fact, as Honourable Mweetwa has come to realise, Zambia is quite well respected in so far as the fight against corruption is concerned on the continent and globally.

The excerpt reveals that at the centre of the fight against corruption is the individual or the ordinary citizen and without the ordinary Zambian, the fight against corruption is rendered void. The Member of Parliament in the excerpt justifies ... *as a matter of fact, as Honourable Mweetwa has come to realise, Zambia is quite well respected in so far as the fight against corruption is concerned on the continent and globally.* The fight against corruption is being underscored as being the motivation for the lifting of the immunity of the Former President. This shows the unwavering efforts of the country's fight against corruption.

The view above is supported by Huckin and Clary-Lemon (2012) who posit that the defining feature of critical discourse analysis is its concern with issues of social justice and the abuse of power through the fight against corruption. Even this excerpt focuses on the ordinary citizen as the most important and almost the only reason why governments, presidents and members of parliament exist as shown by the use of lexicalisation in the phrase, ...*to make sure we bring the fight against corruption to higher heights in Zambia.* It is therefore more important to respect and protect the thirteen million Zambians than one individual – the former President, and to make things right in the country. These views bring out the ideologies of the ruling party and these ideologies are present in the discourse used by the members. This is in line with Andreassen (2007) and ascertains that political ideologies of the ruling government or political parties are present in the language or discourse they use.

Excerpt 31

I am cognisant of the fact that there are a few people who might have decided to oppose this Motion because they might have been beneficiaries, . . . directly or indirectly, but we have a moral duty, my dear colleagues, to the Zambian people to stand above board and

tall and demand that those who meddle with public resources are brought to account. This is not only being done for purposes of history, but also for the future. On that score, I would like to agree with the professor . . . Professor Luo . . . that we are setting this precedent for ourselves and it is up to us to make sure that, as we raise this bar, we also raise our moral uprightness.

The Member of Parliament who spoke the words in the excerpt ‘negatively others’ the members of the Opposition who during the debate were opposed to the motion in the pretext that they were sympathising with the former president. This is a reminder to those who might have taken part in some corrupt activities in the past or at that time, to do a self reflection and repent of their actions and support the Motion so that corruption activities could come to a halt. The members were urged to realise that they were in government because of the people and therefore should serve them accordingly revealed by the phrase, *we are setting this precedent for ourselves and it is up to us to make sure that, as we raise this bar, we also raise our moral uprightness*. It is also a reminder to those who were close to the former Head of State to pluck up their courage and face the issue of lifting the immunity of the former President objectively for the sake of transparency and for the plight of the Zambian people. The Member of Parliament reasons, *but we have a moral duty, my dear colleagues, to the Zambian people to stand above board and tall and demand that those who meddle with public resources are brought to account*. The excerpt underscores good governance and accountability for the good of all, in order to enhance positive national development and is in line with the views of Bernstein (1975) and Eldem (1977) in validating established beliefs and exhortation to patriotism respectively (see section 3.3.2).

Excerpt 32

I would like to appeal to all of us in the House that this matter is not just a matter for here in the House. This is a matter of great public interest and there shall be lots of debate out there. I would like to appeal to Honourable members of Parliament not to shy away from defending this position that we have taken because we have done so conscious of the fact that it is in the best interest of society and we are not in any way being personal or persecuting anybody.

The excerpt shows that whatever is done in the House concerns all the citizens of the country revealed by the phrase, *this is a matter of great public interest and there shall be lots of debate out there*. The members of the House are being reminded that the immunity lifting of the Former President was done for the good of all citizens of the nation and that the position taken by the members of the House should be clearly explained to the general public. He advises, *I would like to appeal to Honourable members of Parliament not to shy away from defending this position that we have taken because we have done so conscious of the fact that it is in the best interest of society and we are not in any way being personal or persecuting anybody*. The move was not personal, but rather to benefit all Zambians. Further it brings out the fact that Parliament exists because of the people of Zambia and therefore stresses the need to do what was right while people are in office which is supported by Heatherington (1980) in evocating good feelings and those of patriotism. The ruling party members use a strategy that the lifting of the immunity of the former president had to be done in respect to the rule of law. The example/illustration strategy from van Dijk's (2004) framework is further exploited here. The example is given by indicating that the matter was of great public concern and that there would be great deal of debate by the public. The members of the House are therefore admonished to defend the position of government to the public for the good of the citizens of the country. This Member of Parliament illustrates clearly that the move of immunity lifting concerned the whole society since the ordinary citizens would benefit in two ways. Firstly, when the plundered resources would be paid back, the money would be ploughed back by improving roads, housing, health institutions and other developmental projects. Secondly, corruption would be eradicated bringing about equal share of resources among the citizens. All these improvements will contribute positively to national development.

The three excerpts above focus on the ordinary citizen as the most important person. The members of the House were urged to realise that they were in government because of the people and therefore should serve them accordingly.

The excerpts underscore good governance and accountability for the good of all, in order to enhance positive national development. The members were further reminded that it is for the good of all citizens of the nation that the lifting of the immunity had to be done and that the position taken by the members of the House should be clearly explained to the general public. Furthermore, it was made clear that the National Assembly exists because of the people of

Zambia and therefore the need to do what is right while people are in office was stressed. This confirms the views of Jason and Peccei (2003) that presupposition implicature and persuasive language are strategies used by politicians to influence people's political and ideological views to their own advantage. This member persuades the other Members of Parliament that the lifting of the immunity of the former president would be for the good of Zambian citizens as well as for creating a good name for the ruling party. This member is persuading other members to be patriotic for the good of all the members and for the party. The lifting of the immunity of the Former President had to be done in respect to the rule of law, as the Member of Parliament warns, *we are setting this precedent for ourselves and it is up to us to make sure that, as we raise this bar, we also raise our moral uprightness*. The analysis applied in these excerpts is example/illustration strategy from van Dijk's (2004) framework. The Member of Parliament indicates and illustrates how the immunity lifting was meant for the good of all citizens as well as for the ruling party as indicated above.

5.3.5. Anti-corruption and True Meaning of the Law

This section discusses anticorruption and true meaning of the law. This is brought out by the members of the ruling PF, the movers of the motion, who towards the end of the session, give a summary of their party manifesto anchored on the fight against corruption. They also justify the motion by indicating that the move of immunity lifting is aimed at fighting corruption and not targeted at an individual. At the same time, the meaning and intention of article 43 (3) is clarified.

Excerpt 33

Therefore, we bring this Motion without any aorta of bad faith against any individual and in particular, the former President, Mr Banda. We bring this Motion in the interest of the country and not as an afterthought.

The excerpt champions the importance of citizenship over individualism or the society over the individual. It shows that the members of the House had no ill-feelings towards Rupiah Banda, but rather everything was being done in the best interest of the rule of law revealed by the phrase, *we bring this Motion without any aorta of bad faith*. Thus the move was taken in order to uphold the interest of the nation as a whole as opposed to an individual and that it was done in good faith expressed by the statement *...we bring this Motion in the interest of*

the country and not as an afterthought. This argument is in line with Huckin and Clary-Lemon (2012) who argue that the defining feature of CDA is its concern with issues of social justice and the abuse of power.

Excerpt 34

The people of Zambia believed us in that undertaking and voted us into office and we owe them a duty to ensure that we follow up on our undertaking to them to make sure that this culture of impunity for those of us that are in public office does not repeat itself. As the motto says, “Never, again, shall the people of Zambia fold their arms as they see their Treasury being abused and ransacked by those that are in public offices.

As indicated in this excerpt, the ruling PF now boasts of being a better party compared to the former ruling party, the MMD, to where the fourth President belonged, and that, that is why the Zambian people entrusted them (PF) with power in 2011. He justifies, *the people of Zambia believed us in that undertaking and voted us into office and we owe them a duty to ensure that we follow up on our undertaking...* This view ‘negatively others’ the Opposition MMD and positively presents the ruling PF. The PF are implying that theirs is a perfect Government in which the corrupt activities and plunder of national resources (done by the former ruling party, MMD) have come to an end. The Member of Parliament recites the motto, *Never, again, shall the people of Zambia fold their arms as they see their Treasury being abused and ransacked by those that are in public offices.* The members of the ruling PF are asserting that the resources of the nation should be used for the benefit of the citizens, and that the citizens are the most important beings, thereby professing patriotism through respect of rule of law, as the name of the party suggests, Patriotic Front. This tends to agree with Heatherington (1980) who posits one of the language sort indulged by politicians as good feelings thereby evocating feelings of patriotism.

Excerpt 35

The reason Article 43 of the Constitution exists, Mr Speaker, to delve into the question of whether or not the proceedings will be against the interest of the State, is to, simply, secure the State and ensure that nothing would jeopardise the security of the State would be a subject of legal proceedings. Certainly, it was never intended to

cover up for the theft of public funds, abuse of public office and I think that was not the intention of the framers of the Constitution and that particular article.

The excerpt brings out the fact that the article 43 (3) or the law is innocent in that it was not put to target any individual or to cover up for abuse of the nation's resources. Rather, it was put in order that the citizens of the nation are secure and protected. The Member of Parliament justifies, *certainly, it was never intended to cover up for the theft of public funds, abuse of public office and I think that was not the intention of the framers of the Constitution and that particular article.* In simpler terms, the law (see Appendix 2) is a mirror of society in which all citizens look through to see whether they fall short of its required standard or not. It is a warning that this article should not be used as a shield or as a passport to stealing or plundering the resources of the nation by those in power as this was not the intention of the framers of the act. Above all, the idea is that the law must be respected by all citizens cutting across individual status and that those who fall short of its required standard should be brought to book regardless of their social or political standing in society. These views are supported by Huckin and Clary-Lemon (2012) by focusing on the defining feature of CDA as its concern with issues of social justice and the abuse of power as explained above.

Again the theme of discursive polarization comes out, now with the ruling party members assuming the positive 'Us' presentation, as they claim to be offering better leadership and referring to the Opposition, the former ruling party MMD, with the negative 'Them' presentation, as having offered bad leadership (Rashidi & Souzandehfar, 2010; Andreassen, 2007) thus being better than the other party. Earlier on, the Opposition members (UPND and MMD) were presenting themselves as clean and perfect and were cautioning the ruling PF to be perfect and now we see the PF glorifying their activities and condemning those of the former ruling party, the MMD. However, the idea being brought out by the ruling PF is that the resources of the nation should be used for the benefit of the citizens and that the citizens are the most important beings, thereby professing patriotism. The member speaking also applies the example/illustration strategy from van Dijk's (2004) framework by illustrating how the ruling PF was fighting against corruption by establishing the GJIT to help in prosecuting those that would be found guilty.

5.4 Conclusion

The overall theme of the debate session is summarised as “respect for the rule of law and good governance as well as service to the people”, which is manifested by examples from the moral and religious perspectives and urges people to go back to these good old values. These are honesty, integrity, anticorruption, service, accountability, level headedness, transparency, true citizenry and patriotism.

The whole of section 5.3 above presents how members endeavoured to justify their positions of either being for the motion or being against it using different strategies. The strategies members use in order to convince others include reference to past events or history to strengthen their arguments, and activities outside the House. They also justify their stance by citing various provisions of the law or respect to the rule of law. Yet others accuse other members of being corrupt and therefore not fit to move the motion of immunity lifting of the former president, opposing to the motion. Further, others focus on the plight of the Zambian citizens as a justification of the motion.

It is important to note that even though the strategies cited above were persuasive and reasonable, persuasion on either side was not achieved, as pointed out in section 5.2 above. The proposing side of the motion managed to win during voting due to number game since they were the majority in the House, and because some of the Opposition members walked out of the House at some stage, out of frustration.

5.5 Summary of Chapter

The chapter has presented the findings and the discussion of the study on the basis of research objectives and questions raised in chapter one. The findings are presented by analysing excerpts of the arguments by members of parliament during the debate session by relating the linguistic form to communicative function in themes. The chapter has also presented the discussion of the findings by explaining and making inferences from the analysis of the excerpts in the presentation of findings thereby establishing the ideological implications of the parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President. The conclusions and recommendations of the study are presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0 Introduction

The previous chapter has presented the findings and the discussion of the study on the basis of research objectives and questions raised in chapter one. The present chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations that derive from the study. The conclusions are presented first and then followed by the recommendations.

6.1 Conclusion

This section concludes the Critical Discourse Analysis of the parliamentary debate session of 15th March 2013, in which the immunity of the Fourth Republican President was lifted. The analysis was done on the basis of the objectives of the study presented in chapter one. The main objective of the study was to establish the ideological implications of discursal features of the parliamentary debate on the lifting of the immunity of the Fourth Republican President. The study also attempted to analyse the rhetorical structure of the discourse used by members of parliament as they presented their arguments during the debate. The other objectives included examining the discourse of individual members of parliament when they were presenting their arguments during the debate and establishing the relationship between discursive practices and their social function in the arguments of the debate.

6.1.1 The Rhetorical Structure of Parliamentary Debate Argument

The findings of the study reveal that the rhetorical structure of the arguments of parliamentary debates follow the following sequence. When a Member of Parliament is given chance by the Speaker of the National Assembly to speak, they begin by indicating the stance or position they are taking, that is, whether they are supporting the motion or opposing to it. After that they go on to justifying their position by giving reasons why they are supporting the Motion or not supporting it. Finally as they end their argument, they would give a conclusion or a summary of their argument stating their point clearly. Therefore the rhetorical structure of the argument of parliamentary debates follows the pattern of: firstly, stating the position the member is taking, that is, whether they support the motion or against the motion. Secondly, justifying that position by giving reasons why they are supporting the motion or why they are against it. When justifying their arguments members bring out a lot of detail in

order to convince other members of their stand point. Lastly they give a summary of their argument, which is a combination of the stance and the reasons for or against the motion, stated clearly and briefly or precisely.

6.1.1.1 The Discourse of Individual Members of Parliament

The results also indicate that the discourse of the arguments of individual members of parliament is persuasive and reasonable at the same time. The persuasion comes out when members are justifying their positions and giving reasons for either supporting the motion or for opposing to the motion. The members make sure that they give persuasive arguments to convince the other members to accept why they are for or against the Motion, and if possible that the other members side with them. At the same time, members make sure that their arguments are reasonable by making sure that the standards with which the discourse complies are sound (Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004).

Members try to persuade the other members into believing what they are saying by being as reasonable as they can in their arguments. This persuasion is done by bringing out a lot of detail either in support or against the motion. For example, during the debate session one member spoke persuasively to other members by stating that she supported the motion because the ordinary Zambians who should have benefited from the resources that were plundered by the Former Republican President were now suffering and that it was the duty of the Members of Parliament to protect the interests of the people of Zambia by bringing the plunderers to book so that the resources of the nation could be used for the benefit of the citizens to alleviate their suffering. This was with a view that when those in public offices are brought to account for their actions while in office, such occurrences would not repeat themselves in future. This stance further reminded the members of the House of their role as members of parliament and that they owed their respect to the people who voted them into office. The argument given by this member is reasonable and she tried to persuade the other members to realise what true leadership entails.

However, as pointed out in the previous chapter persuasion in this debate session was not achieved (see section 5.2). The proposing side only won due to the advantage of numbers since they were the majority in the House.

It is during the time of justifying their positions that the discourse in the House is really interesting as members really try to give convincing arguments. The study further revealed

that during the detailed explanation, some members go out of their way or astray to talking about other details outside the Motion, some of which could be related to the topic and in some cases rather irrelevant. It seems that some members take advantage of debate sessions to air out their views or to inform other members of certain activities, or better still to bring out certain issues which they may have been observing going on, and of which they have not been accorded a chance to tackle them. Therefore they feel that this is the right forum to present them so that they are dealt with accordingly. This idea was brought out very clearly during the debate by the Opposition Members who maintained that the members of the ruling party were not fit to move the motion about the immunity lifting of the Former President as their hands were also contaminated since some of them were involved in corrupt activities.

The Opposition further brought out the fact that members of the ruling party had abused human rights and even the Public Order Act and that they therefore were not in order to talk about lifting the immunity of the Former President because they were also guilty. This was a way of telling the members of the ruling party that they were not acting according to expectation. The Opposition members were not against the motion per se; rather they wanted the correct procedure to be followed and to make sure that their friends in the ruling party respect the rule of law. In some cases the going out of topic during the debate session is done in order to ridicule the members of the other political parties. For example, one member, a former MMD, then PF refers to the former ruling party, the MMD, as having been hit by a political tsunami and therefore having no ideas of winning by-elections. He illustrated this idea by asserting that the tsunami started from Mpongwe, then went to Livingstone, proceeded to Kapiri Mposhi, then to Lukulu and ended up in the Zambezi river, after which they would be forgotten. This view had nothing to do with the motion of the immunity lifting of the Former President; rather it was just meant to make the members of the MMD, to which the Former President belonged, feel bad. The members of the ruling party therefore feel that they are better and more important than the Opposition to the extent of ridiculing the other party members. The member who spoke these words was showing that the MMD had expired, and therefore did not matter anymore.

6.1.2 The Role of Discourse in the Reproduction of Dominance and Inequality

The information aimed at convincing other members in turn brought out certain ideologies about Zambian politics. The following ideological implications have emerged from the study. As stated in the Literature review, Critical discourse analysis in political discourses provides

a great opportunity to discover the realities which have been naturalised as ‘non-ideological common sense’ (see section 2.2). The crucial role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance and inequality was established in the study. This perspective was seen in the way members of the ruling Patriotic Front tried to cement their legacies through the language they used, by access to influential discourse, and through power of definition (see section 5.3.3). For example, one of the members from the ruling PF when moving the motion gave out the grounds of allegations for Mr Rupiah Banda’s alleged plunder of national resources and justified that the Former President deserved to be prosecuted on those grounds (see section 5.3.2). The other member justified the immunity lifting by referring back to the MMD reign when the clause for abuse of office was amended by the Banda administration and that now the law was catching up with former Head of State. Further, yet another member referred to the time when they were campaigning (the PF), while still in Opposition, that they made pronouncements time and again that there was rampant corruption in the MMD (then ruling party) and that they told the people of Zambia that if and when the PF got into power they would investigate these rampant cases of corruption because they were against the interest of the people. He went on to saying that the people of Zambia believed them in that undertaking and voted them into office and that they (the PF) owed the people of Zambia a duty to ensure that they follow up on that undertaking to them to make sure that the culture of impunity for those that were in public offices does not repeat itself (see section 5.3.3).

The above argument clearly shows how the ruling PF tried to cement their legacies by access to influential discourse, and through power of definition. Another member of the PF further indicates that the immunity lifting of the former president was a matter of reflection for those that were in the House. He maintained that they needed to remind themselves that if the immunity of the president can be lifted by the members of the House, nothing could exclude them, as members of parliament from public scrutiny (see section 5.3.4). This discourse therefore, in the parliament that day, was meant to encourage the members of the House and the other Zambian citizens to also invoke the other provisions of the statutes to ensure that they too, live above board. The discourse used by this particular member is so influential that it appeals to the mind of the other members into supporting the motion and brings out the power of definition of the ruling PF.

6.1.2 Unequal Power Relations

The role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance and inequality in manipulating others further brought out unequal power relations in the House. This perspective was clearly brought out by the Speaker of the National Assembly himself. As the one controlling and regulating the arguments as he presided over the debate session, the Speaker of the National Assembly seemed to have exhibited partiality by being very strict to the Opposition members and very lenient to the members of the ruling party. For example, he reprimanded the members of the Opposition for going out of the motion when presenting their arguments while the members of the ruling PF were left free to talk about whatever they wanted. Even though the members of the Opposition were given chance to give out their arguments, the members of the ruling party seemed to have dominated during the session, showing the inequality that exists between the Opposition and the ruling party. One Opposition member even indicated during the debate session that he felt victimised because the Opposition members were not given enough time to defend themselves concerning the motion (see section 5.3.3).

The situation illustrated above affected the way the Opposition debated the motion during the session. They instead, out of frustration, focused their debate on the members of the ruling party bringing out their weaknesses and shortcomings, for instance, that it was immoral for them (PF members) to have been the ones presenting the motion of immunity lifting because they were not upright. The perspective therefore demonstrates that the debate session under investigation was characterised by unequal power relations with the members of the ruling party enjoying more freedom than those of the Opposition.

6.1.4 Respect for the Rule of law and Good Governance

Furthermore, the study demonstrates that the overall, underlying theme of the debate session was inspired and empowered by the ‘strength from the new PF ruling party’, which claimed that it had seen a lot of things going wrong from the previous ruling party, the MMD, especially in the previous reign by Rupiah Banda. It was alleged that during the period 2008 to 2011, there was public concern about allegations of prevalent acts of abuse of office and corruption by serving public officers and honourable Ministers in the Banda Administration. These allegations also extended to Mr Rupiah Bwezani Banda, as president, and some members of his family. For example, the members of the ruling PF attribute the problems that

were in the country at that time such as poor road network, lack of certain equipment and poor infrastructure to the mismanagement of national resources by the MMD.

After the PF took over the reins of power in 2011, there was mounting public demand to investigate the alleged acts of corruption and misappropriation of public funds and to bring those involved to account for such offences. The PF therefore resorted to rebuilding the nation in their time by fighting all forms of corruption in the country. In response to the public demand, the Government in 2011, established the Government Joint Investigation Team (GJIT) to probe and prosecute cases of corruption, fraud and money laundering through the established criminal system. It is this GJIT that secured convictions against Rupiah Banda and other individuals. It is from this perspective that the whole impetus of the debate session is coming (see section 5.3.4).

The theme of the debate session which is ‘respect for the rule of law and good governance as well as service to the people’, calls for those serving in public offices to possess and uphold certain values and virtues which include honesty, integrity, anticorruption, service, accountability, level headedness, transparency, and patriotism. When public officers uphold these values they would serve the citizens of the nation diligently and the resources of the nation would be used for the benefit of all the citizens thereby achieving positive national development. This view was illustrated by expressions such as *Mr Speaker, I support the Motion and I would like us to remind ourselves that we are here to offer a service. Also Are we not supposed to represent the people of Zambia? People are walking out of this Parliament to protect an individual and not protect the 13 million people of Zambia.*

6.1.5 Discursive Polarization

The cognizance by the PF of the corrupt activities by the former ruling party, the MMD, as well as the realisation by the Opposition UPND that some ruling PF members were involved in corrupt activities, led to polarized views throughout the debate session, in which we see the arguments of the ruling party on one hand and those of the Opposition on the other. The Opposition which comprised of the MMD and the UPND in the House, tended to speak the same language by insisting on the right procedure of handling the motion and alleging that the PF was not supposed to propose to the motion of immunity lifting of the Former Republican President because they were not upright themselves. For instance, the Opposition used expressions like *...Sir, I want to state that even as they remove the immunity of the*

Former President, not everyone is clean, to 'negatively other' the members of the ruling party. Furthermore, ...it is also immoral for the PF Government, proposing the removal of the immunity of Former President, Mr Rupiah Banda. because their hands are contaminated. The Opposition saw everything wrong with the ruling party, whereas the ruling PF also saw everything wrong with the Opposition especially the former ruling party, the MMD. The ruling party glorified or praised their activities, for example, of fighting corruption in forming the GJIT to probe and prosecute corrupt activities in the nation for the good of all citizens and positive national development. At the same time, they condemned the activities of the Opposition (MMD) for indulging in corrupt activities and money laundering which amounted to plundering of huge resources of the nation which led to negative development of the nation and suffering of the citizens. For example, poor road network, poor infrastructure, poverty, inadequate healthy facilities and other vices, were as a result of the plundering of resources which was done during the MMD reign (1991 to 2011).

The ruling party omitted their dubious activities and focused on the good ones. In this case, they praised themselves for fighting corruption by probing and prosecuting the Former President and ignored the fact that some of their members could have been involved in corrupt activities and the fact that they were abusing human rights and had abused the Public Order act and the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). The ruling party used language to influence and persuade the other members of the House that they had done what was right for the country and that they were still doing what they could to make Zambia a better place to live in than it had been during the MMD reign (see section 5.3.5).

The members of the ruling PF bring out a discursive reproduction of their account of the world by means of access to different discourses and through the power of definition inherent in their positions as Members of Parliament and of the ruling party. At the same time the Opposition also glorified their activities such as living clean lives and watching the activities of the ruling party and condemned the ruling party for indulging in corrupt activities such as disregarding the law and abuse of human rights. Therefore throughout the session this polarized view of positive 'Us' versus negative 'Them' representation is present in which the positive 'Us' presentation of one group is juxtaposed with the negative 'Them' presentation of the other group. As the argument is building up during the debate session, the Opposition members distance themselves from the ruling PF by using pronouns such as *their motion*,

their hands are contaminated, ...even as they remove the immunity of the Former President ... , they will also dance to this same music, and we cannot trust them, indicating that they were not part and parcel of those activities (see section 5.3.3).

Furthermore, in the study the discursive event and discursive structure interrelatedness idea proposed by Fairclough (1995) was confirmed. The immunity lifting, which is the discursive event shaped the debate session, which is the discursive structure, and, the discourse became subject of interpretation by the audience, which in turn would shape the activities of the country during the PF reign or even beyond.

6.1.6 True Leadership and Patriotism

The study further established how politicians, in this case Members of Parliament, conscript others into accepting their views on controversial issues such as that of immunity lifting of a Former President. The members of the House tried to convince others of their stand point by coming up with different strategies. The strategies included reference to past events, the plight of the citizens, proper procedures, and various provisions within the law or the rule of law. This was demonstrated by members drawing the attention of others on their role as members of parliament by focusing on the ordinary citizens who are supposed to benefit from the resources of the nation which had been plundered by those in power as already pointed out above. This perspective was illustrated by such expressions, *Sir, the hallmark of leadership is to have empathy, love and humility. . . and, Therefore, we should deliver what is in our offices in a transparent manner; truthfully.....* Therefore, the meaning of true leadership and patriotism was underscored during the debate session in that members were urged to uphold integrity in their work as members of parliament and that the only reason they are in parliament is to serve the people of Zambia faithfully.

6.2 Recommendations

From the overall study and conclusions drawn, the following are some of the recommendations that emerged:

- (i) There is need to extend the study to include the debate sessions that were done during the other Republics of Zambia to see if similar trends exist.

- (ii) There is also need to do a comparative study of parliamentary debates of different Republics to establish whether the construction of ideologies is similar or different.
- (iii) The general public, that is, senior government officials, the ordinary Zambians and the media to be included in the study to see how they collectively or individually contribute to ideological differences in politics.
- (iv) There is need to approach this study from a gender perspective, that is, how women fair in politics both in terms of numbers and whether they are affected by dominance and inequality of the patriarchal society existing in the country.
- (v) A comparative study of how members of the ruling party and members of the Opposition fair in parliamentary debates should be conducted to see whether these hold different political ideologies.
- (vi) Future research should focus on the role of the Speaker of the National Assembly in enhancing objectivity in the deliberations of the House.
- (vii) The debate in the House should be regulated in such a way that there are equal chances for the Opposition members and those of the ruling party when making contributions in order that both sides exhaust their ideas without interference from the opposing side.

REFERENCES

- Adetunji, A. (2006). Inclusion and Exclusion in Political Discourse: Deixis in Oluseguni Obasanjo's Speeches. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*. 5(2), 177-191.
- American Heritage (2013). *Dictionary of the English Language*, (5 ed). Harcourt: Houghton Mifflin.
- Andreassen, V. (2007). *Bowing out in style: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Margaret Thatcher's and Tony Blair's farewell addresses*. Universitetet i Tromsø
- Auberbach, C. F. And Silverstein, L.B. (2003). *Qualitative Data: An Introduction to Coding and Analysis*. New York: New York University Press.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Batstone, R. (1995). *Grammar in Discourse: Attitude and Deniability*. In G. Cook and B Seidlhofer, (eds.) *Principle & Practice in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 197-213.
- Baugh, J. and J. Sherzer (eds). *Language in Use: Readings in Sociolinguistics*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, Codes and Control, Volume 2*. London: Routledge.
- Bhatia, A. (2006) Critical Discourse Analysis of Political press Conferences. *Discourse & Society*. Vol 17(2): 173–203, <http://das.sagepub.com>.
- Bourdieu (P.) and Wacquant (L.). 1992 *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brewer, M. (2000). Research Design and Issues of Validity. In Reis, H. & Judd, C. (eds) *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1989). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Butler (J.), Laclau (E.) & Žižek (S). 2000 *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality*. London: Verso.

- Caroselli, M. (2000). *Leadership Skills for Managers*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Chilton, P. & Ilyn, M. (1993). Metaphor in political discourse: The case of the 'Common European House'. *Discourse & Society*, 4(1), 7-31.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice*. Routledge: London.
- Chilton, P. (2005). 'Missing links in mainstream CDA: Modules, blends and the critical instinct'. In Wodak, Ruth (ed.) *New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cohen, L. And Manion, L. (1989). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Cook, G. (1989). DISCOURSE. CUP.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Traditions*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. University of Netvaska: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Cumming, A. (1989). 'Writing Expertise and Second Language Proficiency'. *Language Learning*. Vol 39 (1), pp 81-41.
- Dakowiska, M. (2001). *Psycholingwistyczen podstawy dydaktyki jeezyoow obcych*. Warszawa: PWN
- Danes F. (1974). 'Functional Sentence Perspective and the Organisation of the Text'. In De Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. UK: Longman Group Limited.
- Downing A. (2001) *Thematic Progression as a Functional Resource in Analysing text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunmire, P.L. (2005). Pre-empting the Future: Rhetoric and Ideology of the future in Political Discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 16(4), 481-513.

Edelman, M. (1977). *Political Language: Words that succeed and Policies that fail*. New York: Academic Press.

Eemeren, F.H. van & Grootendorst (1995). The pragma-dialectical Approach to Fallacies. In: H.V. Hansen, R.C. Pinto (eds.), *Fallacies: Classical and Contemporary Readings*, University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 123-196.

Eemeren, F.H. van, & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation: The pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Eemeren, F.H. van, Garssen, B., Meuffels, B. (2009) Fallacies and Judgments of Reasonableness. Empirical Research Concerning the Pragma-Dialectical Discussion Rules. *Argumentation on Library*, 16.

Eemeren, F.H., van en P. Houtlosser. (2002). Strategic Manoeuvring: Maintaining a Delicate Balance. In F.H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *Dialectic and Rhetoric: The Warp and Woof of Argumentation Analysis*. Dordrecht etc.: Kluwer Academic, pp. 131-159.

Eemeren, F.H. van, & Houtlosser, P. (2005). Theoretical construction and argumentative reality: An analytic model of critical discussion and conventionalized types of argumentative activity. In D. Hitchcock (E.), *The Uses of Argument. Proceedings of a Conference at McMaster University, 18-21 may 2005, Hamilton* (pp. 75-84). St. Catharines, ON: OSSA.

Everts, E. (2003) 'Identifying a particular family humor style: A sociolinguistic discourse analysis'. *Humor*. 16-4, pp 369-412

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1998) 'Political Discourse in the Media: An Analytical Framework', in A. Bell and P. Garrett (eds) *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Longman.

Fairclough N. (2000). Discourse, social theory and social research: the discourse of welfare reform. In: *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4.2.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse and Text: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. London: Polity Press. Hall, Stuart. 2001. Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In: Wetherell, Taylor & Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications.

Fairclough, Norman (2000). *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman (2001). 'Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research'. In Wodak, Ruth & Michael Meyer (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Feteris, E.T. (2002). A Pragma-Dialectical Approach of the Analysis and Evaluation of Pragmatic Argumentation in a Legal Context. *Argumentation* 16, 349-367.

Fishman, J. A. (1971). *Contribution to the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton & Co. N.V

Foucault (M.). 1984. The order of discourse. In: Shapiro (M.) (ed). *The Politics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fowler, R. (1996) 'On critical linguistics in Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis', in Coulthard, C. and Coulthard, M. (eds). London: Routledge.

Francis, G. (1994). "Labelling Discourse: an aspect of nominal-group lexical. In Fries, P. (2001). More Thematic Structure and Revision. Lecture Plan.

Friedrich, P. (1989). Language, Ideology and Political Economy. *American Anthropologist* 91:295-312.

Gal, S. (1989). Language, Ideology and Political Economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18: 345-367.

GRZ (1996) *Constitution of the Republic of Zambia 1996*

GRZ (2005) *Standing Orders 2005*. Lusaka: National Assembly of Zambia.

Hailiang Ning, Xue Dai and Fachun Zhang (2010). "On Gender Difference in English Language and its Causes." *Asian Social Science*. Feb 2010, Vol. 6 Issue 2, p126-130, 5p.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, text and context*. Geelong, Vic.: Deakin University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Heatherington, M.E. (1980). *How Language Works*. Massachusetts: Winthrop.

Huckin, T., Andrus, J. And Clary-Lemon, J. (2012). Critical Discourse Analysis and Rhetoric and Composition CCC 64:1 / september 2012

Hunter, J. D. 1991. *Culture Wars - The Struggle to Define America*. New York: BasicBooks.

Horváth, J. (2008). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Obama's Political Discourse*. Slovakia: University of Prešov

Irvine J. T. (2012 November 1st, Last modified) Language Ideology. Available at: <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0012.xml> (Retrieved 2014 September 23rd).

Irvine J. T. (1989). When talk isn't cheap: Language and Political Economy. *American Anthropologist* 16:248-267.

James, P. and S. Manfred (2010). *Globalization and Culture, Vol. 4: Ideologies of Globalism*. London: Sage Publications.

Jing-fei, Z. (2009). China is not a threat: A critical discourse analysis of an editorial. Aug. 2009, Volume 6, No.8 (Serial No.68)

Jones, J. and J. S. Pecci. (2003). "Language and Politics". In Linda Thomas, Joanna Thornborrow et al (eds.) *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Joseph, J. and Taylor, (eds) (1990) *Ideologies of Language*. New York: Routledge.

Kane, E. (1995). *Seeing for Yourself: Research Handbook for Girls' Education in Africa*. Washington: The World Bank.

Karlberg, M. (2005). The Power of Discourse and the Discourse of Power: Pursuing Peace through Discourse Intervention. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, Volume 10, Number 1, Spring/Summer 2005.

Kommaluri and L. Ramamoorthy (eds) (2011). 'Critical Discourse Analysis: Politics and Verbal Coding'. *Problems of Parsing in Indian Languages*. 11 : 5 May 2011 Special Volume pp 20-29.

Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George (1991). 'Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf'. Paper presented at the *University of California*, Berkeley, January 30th 1991. Available at:
http://www3.iath.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Texts/Scholarly/Lakoff_Gulf_Metaphor_1.html

- LAKOFF, G. 2002. *Moral Politics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Locke, T. (2004). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Moody, J. (2001) *Zambians Talking: Twenty-five English Conversations*. *Zambian Papers* No.20, University of Zambia Press.
- Musakabantu, R. M. (1984). *Some Linguistic and Discoursal Features of Law Reports and their Pedagogical Implication in Preparing Reading Courses for Students of Law at NIPA, Zambia*. Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of Zambia.
- Nherera, C.M. (1999). *Capacity Building in Educational Research in Southern Africa: Empirical Insights into Qualitative Research*. Harare: Mazongororo Paper Converters.
- O'Halloran, K.A. (2005). Mystification and social agent absences: A critical discourse analysis using evolutionary psychology. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1945–1964.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd Edition). Newsbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Picciano, A. G. (2004) *Educational Research Primer*. London: Continuum.
- Pretorius, E. (1990). “The Discourse Dynamics of Male-to-Female Street Remarks: Insulting Compliments or Complimentary Insults?” *English Usage in Southern Africa*. Vol 21, Nos 1 & 2, pp 1-17. 1990. Pretoria: UNISA.
- Rashid, N. and Souzandehfar, M. (2010). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Debates Between Republicans and Democrats over the Continuation of War in Iraq*. Iran: Shiraz University.
- Robson, C. (1993). *Real World Research. A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner Researchers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rudestam and Newton (1992). *Surviving Your Dissertation: A Comprehensive Guide to Content and Process*. California: Sage.

Rudvin, M. (2005) Power Behind Discourse And Power In *Discourse In Community Interpreting: The Effect Of Institutional Power Asymmetry On Interpreter Strategies*. Revista Canaria De Estudios Ingleses, 51; November, 2005, pp. 159-179.

Silverstein, M. (1979). Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In *The elements: A parasection on Linguistic units and levels*. Chicago: Linguistic Society.

Simwinga, J. (1993). The Relationship between cohesion and coherence in English: An Investigation based on some University of Zambia Students' Written Discourse. Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of Zambia.

Simwinga, J. (2006). The Impact of Language Policy on the use of Minority Languages in Zambia with Special Reference to Tumbuka and Nkoya. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Zambia.

Straus, A. and Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Blackwell.

Švárová, J. (2008). Politeness Markers in Spoken Language. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Masaryk University Brno.

Tambulukani, G.K. (1985). An Analysis of the Structure of Zambia Civil Letters. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation, University of Birmingham.

Titscher, S.; Meyer, M.; Wodak, R.; & Vetter, E. (2000) *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Teittinen, M. (2000). *Power and persuasion in the Finnish presidential rhetoric in the early 1990's*. Retrieved September, 2014 from [http://www/natcom.org/conferences/Finland/MariTeittinen](http://www.natcom.org/conferences/Finland/MariTeittinen).

Toulmin, S. E. et al. (1979). *An Introduction to Reasoning*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Van Dijk, T. (1977). *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1985). *Prejudice in Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993) 'Principles in Critical Discourse Analysis', *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 249–83. 202 *Discourse & Society* 17(2)

Van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: An interdisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2004). Politics, Ideology and Discourse. Retrieved September, 2014 from <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html>.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2005). Contextual knowledge management in discourse production: A CDA perspective. In R. Wodak, & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 71-100). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Viñales, M. P. (2009). Life is a Heavenly Script: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Information Policy Texts and Interactions in Cuba. PhD Transfer Report in Information Science. London: City University.

Walsch, C. (1998). Gender and Mediatized Political Discourse: A case study press coverage of Margret Beckett's campaign for the Labour leadership in 1994. *Language and Literature*, 7(3), 199-214.

Wassiniewk, K. (2006). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: The MIT Press

Webster's New College Dictionary. (2010). Cleveland Ohio: Wiley Publishing Company, Inc.

Wodak, R. (1996) *Disorders of Discourse*. New York: Longman.

Wodak, R. & M. Meyer (eds) (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R. (2001). 'What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments'. In Wodak, R. & M. Meyer (eds). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R. (2006). 'Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis'. In Östman, Jan-Ola & Jef Verschueren (eds). *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wouwer, S. (2005). "Gender Stereotypes in HIV/AIDS Discourse". *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa*. Vol 36, No. 2, 2005, pp 148-161.

Xiao Zhuge (2005). "The Application of Schema Theory within Discourse Analysis" *US-China Foreign Language*. Jul. 2005, Volume 3, No.7, No.22.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

THE DEBATE SESSION

15th March 2013

REMOVAL OF LEGAL IMMUNITY IN RESPECT OF THE FORMER PRESIDENT,

MR RUPIAH BWENZANI BANDA

The Minister of Justice (Mr Kabimba, SC.): Mr Speaker, I thank you very much[.....

Interruptions ()

Mr. Mwiimbu: On a point of order, Sir.

Noise / interruptions ()

Mr. Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Mr. Mwiimbu: Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise out of the (.) provisions of article 86 and 87 of the >Constitution of Zambia<, as read with cap. 12 of the laws of Zambia, ↑and the Standing Orders of this House, and the various pronouncements that have been made by your Office ↑and the existing precedent in the Commonwealth, (.) ↓pertaining to (.) the Motion <under consideration>.

Hon. Government Members: [What is your point of order?"]”

Mr Mwiimbu: [Mr Speaker, we are all aware, we are that at various fora as well as this house, you have advised (.) that a matter that is in court cannot be discussed >on the floor of this House<, and on several occasions (.) your Office, through the clerk`s office, has written letters to various political parties (.) pertaining to expulsions of hon. Members or taken the matter to court.

Your Office has always said that once a matter is in court (.) your hands are tied ↓and that there is nothing you can do until the matter is resolved in the court of law (.) You have always guided very diligently and prudently that when a matter is before the High Court or

any other court in Zambia, [=this august house should not discuss that matter because it is *sub judice*.

The Motion that is (.) being raised Mr Speaker, is a subject of litigation in the high Court of Zambia. <As a result of the same being in the court Mr Speaker, we feel, arising from the guidance you have always given, (.) will not be in a` position to debate the matter because it will be> >*sub judice*< (.) [In that light Mr Speaker, we need to have your guided (.) direction on this matter, considering that the issues that are going to be debated are the ones that are being going to be discussed in (.) in court.

We are aware that >the court documents were served on the Clerk's Office< (.) yesterday afternoon (.1) For ease of reference and to ensure that there is orderliness, Mr Speaker. I am going to lay the documents that were served on the Clerk's Office (.) We do not intend to raise the merits and demerits of the Motion itself, but we think that the sanctity of this House must not only be seen to be protected, but must be protected.

We need your guidance, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mwiimbu: I lay the documents on the table.

Hon. Opposition Members: [HEAR, HEAR= ()

Mr. Speaker: Order!

My ruling, my ruling. I have also <in another ruling before the: House, I indicated that under the doctrine of the Separation of Powers, the House has a very unique freedom to determine> and deal with its internal >proceedings<. I think this must have been in a matter involving, if my memory serves me right, the hon. Minister of home affairs. I did issue a very elaborate ruling indicating that in so far as the internal proceedings and procedures of the House are concerned, they are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the court.

We have the freedom= [

Hon. Opposition Member: =Aah () ∫∫∫

Mr. Speaker: I made that ruling. It is there in the records.

Under the separation of powers, the House is given the freedom to determine its internal proceedings and procedures. That is the position, that is the position and that is my ruling =

Hon. Government Members: [Hear, hear! [=

Hon. Opposition Members: =No!= ()

=Rule of law!

Rule of law!

No, no, no!

Rule of law!=

Mr. Speaker: =Order!

I am at a loss. Is this a division or what? >There is no division here. This is a ruling< (.) It is a ruling.

The hon. Minister of Justice may proceed =

Interruptions () (2.6)

Mr. Kabimba: =Mr. Speaker (.) thank you [for giving me an opportunity-

Interruptions ()

Hon. Opposition Members rose.

Mr. Kabimba: Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me an opportunity-

Interruptions ()

Hon. Opposition Members rose

Interruptions ()

Mr. Kabimba: ... =to move a motion that, IN TERMS OF ARTICLE 43(3) OF THE CONSTITUTION OF ZAMBIA-

∫∫∫

Interruptions ()

Mr. Speaker: =Order! ORDER!

<Anyway, let me indicate this, because the majority were not present in those consultations. The point and the position of the Hon. Mr Speaker is that there are certain procedures which are a preserve of the House>. Amongst those procedures include business which is regulated by the Standing Orders. In this particular case, we do have a Motion before us (.) and this Motion whose genesis is from Article 43 of the constitution of Zambia.(.) This provision endorses parliament with discretion to decide (.) whether to remove the immunity of a President. In order to do so, you need to file a Motion.

And for those of you who were present when the immunity of the Second Republican President was removed, you will recall that there was a very extensive discussion surrounding the procedure. Eventually, a Motion had to be framed and presented to parliament. Business was accordingly transacted.

The position (.) The position of the Hon. Mr Speaker is that whatever decision emerges from this internal process is amenable to a court process. This is how that decision, in the Chiluba case, was decided. An action was taken to the High Court, eventually, it culminated in a judgment in the Supreme Court. In that judgement, the Supreme Court is very clear. This is a case of Chiluba versus the Attorney-General 2003, Zambia law Report, page 153. And they have said, just to sum it up, I cannot go into the detailed judgment but the conclusion is that, in terms of Articles 43 (3) (.) there is no need for any person who has his immunity removed to be heard. That is the ultimate conclusion. That is one of the issues in this action. The second issue is about two-thirds requirement and that is even an easier one. If you look at article 43 (3), it does not require a two-thirds majority.

The question we have, here, is that Hon. Mwiimbu made a very elaborate submission, and I credit him for it, that we need to preserve the sanctity or the strength of this House. That strength he referred to lies in the very issue that I am trying to do this afternoon, namely not to open the internal proceedings of this House to court. =However, if the ultimate decision violates any provisions of the law, any person is free to proceed to the court. However, once an action is taken to court and we are shown papers, and in that action even the Hon. Mr. speaker, who could, otherwise, have been party to, is not even party, as this is an action between the Attorney-General and the Fourth President. They have issues relating to Article 43 (3), in spite of the court or what the Supreme Court had said, that is for the courts to finally decide.

S:o, when we were at our last round, and after these extensive consultations, quite frankly, >I got the impression that after this, we would ring the bells after which everybody would be [seated-< ∫∫∫

Hon. Opposition members *interjected* (.)

Mr. Speaker: Let me finish. I am in charge.

I want to be very clear about this. There are a number of options. My decisions are also open to review. If whatever will transpire this afternoon violates any law (.) any law, constitutional or otherwise, it will be impeached. Quite frankly, I would be the last person to preside over proceedings which are underpinned with illegalities. However, you are all free to (.) to decide, at the end of the day, whether that is the route to go. In the meantime, we need to proceed an orderly fashion (.) ∫∫∫

[Proceeding in an orderly fashion does not mean my insisting on you being present. I cannot do that. Nonetheless, what is not permissible is to obstruct the proceedings.

Hon. Government members: Hear, hear ()

Mr. Speaker: That, equally, is against the rule of law. I think we must be clear about this (.)

I mentioned to your colleagues who come to see me that the incident that you have already shown to the nation, so far, in my opinion, is most regrettable. Those actions present a very ugly scene. [If you want to vindicate those rights, there are institutions outside parliament and there is timing for it]. In my earlier ruling, I did indicate that I made a ruling in relation to a point of order by Hon. Muntanga. I made the same point and those who came to the chambers were shown those (.) proceedings. S:o, I am quite surprised that after talking and discussing for two hours, we are coming to this. But, I must state that ↑proceeding we are and obstruction there will not be. I want to treat everybody with the dignity that they deserve. I think, let us proceed on that basis, but obstruction there will not be.

Mr. Kabimba: Mr. Speaker, [thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to proceed with the Motion that I moved this afternoon-

Interruptions ()

Hon. Opposition Members *rose*.

Mr. Muntanga: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Hon. Opposition Members *remained standing.*

=Mr. Speaker: the hon. Member has raised a point of order, respect him and sit down.

Hon. Opposition Members *resumed their seats.*

Mr. Muntanga: Thank you Mr Speaker (.) Mr. Speaker, earlier on <we were talking about how my friend was detained by the police in Livingstone for three weeks ↓and I was detained for five days. This makes Zambia look like a police State>. Is it in order that this Assembly, in particular, the grounds of parliament, should have paramilitary police in riot ↑gear to intimidate hon. Members of parliament and to give threat to them to only do what they are required?

Sir, at once, Hon. Dipak Patel asked a question in this House and when he left parliament, he was followed by the Police. He only escaped that police trail when he entered the Parliament Motel grounds and security personnel at the stopped the police by telling them that they could not pursue Hon. Patel inside the parliament premises unless they got permission from the Hon. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, is it, therefore, in order that we should now have police in riot gear on parliament grounds, whose intention is to intimidate hon. Members of parliament?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member, if your colleagues, whom we had discussions with, had briefed you fully, they would have informed you of the explanation given when that issue was raised in the meeting. These measures were put in place because we got information that >cadres from both sides were bound to come through and were likely to create disorder<.

Interruptions ()

Mr. Speaker: ↑Hold on. You wanted a ruling and I am ruling. ↑This particular event was not anticipated. I did not anticipate that it would come to this. S:o, the presence of those police Officers is not as a result of the incident that started at 14:30 hours, certainly not. Again I want to reiterate that there are avenues for lodging protest and actions in a democracy. We all believe in the rule of law. If the hon. Mr. Speaker has erred, ultimately, like any other public

official, <my actions and decisions are subject to judicial review>. That judicial review cannot be resorted to at this juncture and it is within my jurisdiction to ensure that once I decide that business is to be transacted, †it must be transacted orderly. If you still feel and are still convinced that I am wrong, ultimately, the courts are out of there. They will review all these proceedings and the final decision. However, and quite frankly, >it will not do to go in front of the cameras and obstruct or stop the Business of the House because that takes a different character all together. That takes a different character< (.)

In terms of the rule of law, [you can still sue the hon. Mr. Speaker(h) who is ready to go to court and explain.

Hon. Opposition Members: NO! ()

Mr. Speaker: I am telling you because I am in charge of these proceedings. I am telling you the position and I am not mincing anything. However, obstruction is the last thing we should do. The law is very clear, both on what I have said and the larger issues, but certainly obstruction cannot be a solution here. I think I am being very diplomatic and I am belabouring this point (.)

The bottom line is that we need to maintain the dignity of this august House and it is my responsibility to ensure that this is done. I spent almost two hours reasoning and appealing, but if that has been without avail (h), that is something else. I insist that we shall not have any obstruction although challenge the Hon. Mr. Speaker you can. You can take any other civil measures against the Hon. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, there are limits which are prescribed by the constitution itself=

Hon. Opposition Members: Aah!

Mr. Kabimba: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. In support of the notice of Motion that has been laid before this august House=, ...

Mr. Mbulakulima: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Mr. Mbulakulima: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to raise a point of order. We are at pains in trying to understand what has transpired. >You agree that the issue of lifting the former Head of State's immunity is a very grave matter<. In terms of

procedure, you did call the two whips to your chambers. However, contrary to what you have said, you were advised by the whips, but did not agree with them. <After giving your overview (.) how do we proceed because we have not been accorded a chance to air our views on this matter since we are all affected? I thank you Mr Speaker>.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, can I get your question again. Is your point whether you can debate?

Mr. Mbulakulima: ↑Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of procedure and said that the lifting of the immunity for the former President is a very grave matter and you have seen the concern arising from this side. You went to resolve this matter with our two whips who have informed us that you did not agree with them, which is contrary to what you have said. So, in terms of procedure, how do we proceed?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I think the point you have raised is very important. Like I said, I would not have called for the bells to be rung in that fashion if I had not thought that we had not come to an agreement. However, we had a very lengthy discussion. Tacitly, I gathered that we had reached an accord and had my support staff with me. We would not have triggered this. This is not subterfuge because that is beneath me. However, I still want to make the point that, as the hon. Mr. Speaker, I have made certain decisions already. I have also made a ruling and so I am simply belabouring the point. ↑The ruling I have made, to clear any doubt, is that ↑the Motion and internal proceedings cannot, at this stage, be questioned, especially by that particular action. There is nothing that has persuaded me to allow this Motion to be deferred. Now (.) If I have committed an error, and I am capable of committing one, there is also another process which can be ignited and you can resort to it to challenge whatever outcomes will emerge from this.

My only appeal is that since we believe in the rule of law(h); let us ensure that we conduct ourselves orderly. That is all. If you believe that what we are going to engage in is a total nullity, you can demonstrate elsewhere that this was just a sham and you will be vindicated. However, in the meantime, I stress, I will not allow a situation where the proceedings are obstructed because my function is to ensure that they are not obstructed.

Mr. Kabimba: Thank you Mr Speaker (.) Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion that is before us

Professor Lungwangwa: On a point of order, sir.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Professor Lungwangwa: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for granting me this point of. Is the hon. Minister of Justice (.) in order to present this house ↑a very serious matter of national concern, the removal or the proposal of removal of the immunity of the former President, when he is not a president of this country and does not even know what is in that office?[

Interruptions ()

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Professor Lungwangwa: Mr. Speaker, [a precedent has been set in this country where the removal of the immunity of a former Head of State was presented to this House by the occupant of the office, the Head of State himself. In that case, this was the late Levy Patrick Mwanawasa, SC, may his soul rest in peace-

Interruptions ()

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Members continue.

Professor Lungwangwa: Mr. Speaker, I repeat: Is the hon. Minister of Justice in order to present a matter of very serious national concern to this House when he is not the President of this country? ↑Mr Speaker, I need your very serious ruling on this matter.

Hon. Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Interruption ()

Mr. Speaker: Oder!

If you care to look at the Hansard on past proceedings that I had the privilege of reading them myself, you will find that a great deal of time was spent on determining whether that address by the late President Mwanawasa, SC., in itself, constituted a Motion. After very extensive discussions and debate, ↑very extensive my predecessor guided the House that it did not and a Motion was quickly drafted and moved, and the House proceeded on that basis.

I am glad you have raised this point, hon. Member for Nalikwanda. ↑What we have done in this case is that we have relied on standing order 37 (.) The point I was making earlier on is that these standing orders represent an internal constitution and by standing order 37, the hon.

Minister of Justice or any other hon. Minister is entitled to present a Motion. So in short, in short, if you visit the Constitution, National Assembly Privileges Act and Standing Orders, you will discover that there is nothing that prescribes (.) that such a Motion ought to be presented by his Excellency the President. When the late president came to present that address, he used another article in the constitution, which generally allows the president, at any time, if he so wishes, to address this august Assembly. =↑He is an hon. Member of Parliament, in that sense, though a special one. So, >in conclusion,< the Motion is being properly presented by the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. Kabimba: Mr. Speaker, thank you, again-

Mr. L.J. Ngoma: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Mr. L.J. Ngoma: Mr. Speaker. We are dealing with a very serious national matter here=

Interruptions () ∫∫∫

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Let the hon. Member speak.

Mr. L.J. Ngoma: On several occasions Mr. Speaker, the genesis of this problem emanates from the fact that the opposition has been abused by the office of the speaker=

The MMD, the UPND, let just say the Opposition have been abused in this country=

Hon. PF Members: Aah! ()

Hon. Opposition Members: YES!

Mr. L.J. Ngoma: ... on account that matters that are before a courts of law cannot be discussed in this house. Not only that, on certain occasions, the opposition in this country has been abused on account of just a letter from an hon. Members of parliament to the Clerk's office whose matter is before the court. This hon. Members are still seated on your right side today-

Hon. PF Members: =What is the point of order?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Just wait (.)

Mr. L.J. Ngoma: Mr. Speaker, we feel aggrieved and I want to put it on record that there are many ways in which a person can express his grievance and one way of doing so is that which you are seeing happening right now. We are tired, and for you, Mr. Speaker, to turn around ↑when, a few days ago, you indicated, through your office, that issues that are before the court cannot be discussed, we feel very much aggrieved. No wonder we are ready to use any ↑means possible to make sure that THIS MOTION [does not proceed today until the courts of the Republic of Zambia decide upon this matter and the procedures of this House]. So, it is in the interest in Zambia-

Mr. Speaker: =What is the point of order?

Mr. L.J. Ngoma: ↑ARE YOU IN ORDER,

Interruptions ()

Mr. Speaker: Let me answer=

Interruptions ()

Mr. Speaker: I think you have your point.

Mr. L.J. Ngoma: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you have my point. ↑Is this House IN ORDER to proceed in a double-standard manner on matters that are before the courts?

Mr. Speaker: You have made your point.

Mr. L.J. Ngoma: Mr. Speaker, that is my point of order and I ↑seek your serious RULING.

Interruptions ()

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, this is one of the issues we discussed for most of the two hours that we met your leadership. For the benefit of the rest, I will reiterate what we discussed in that meeting and what we were trying to explain to your leadership. You see, for those actions which we have deferred to the courts, and these are very fine points, the first and final arbiters are the courts themselves. If you are challenging your colleague (.) that the election was not duly done (.) it has nothing to do with the National Assembly in that sense as

regards the case's determination. We defer to the courts of law (.) >and in order to enable the courts to determine those issues< (.) there is a very well- established convention that we should wait for that outcome. ↑This is different and this is what we are trying to =distinguish

Mr. Kakoma: =Interjected (())

Mr. Speaker: ORDER! (.)

Just wait. >You cannot speak from the floor, hon. Member for Zambezi west<. In this case, in this case, the issue is whether or not there is anything inherent in that action to prevent the hon. Minister of Justice from invoking this Standing Order No. 2 and article 43 (3). My answer to those questions (.) is in the negative. Nothing and that is my ruling. As I have said earlier, whether we have made a mistake or not (.) as long as a ruling has been made (.) <it has to be respected>.

And two, if there will be illegal consequences (.) flowing from my decision (.) they will be open, eventually, to judicial review and that ultimate decision will be open to interpretation and so forth and if there are any injuries, legal injuries suffered, they will be subject to compensation. If there is any restraining to be done, in the interim, interim orders can be made. So, the point I am trying to belabour, is that >as far as I am concerned<, I am acting within the perimeters of the law (.) and in my best Judgment, not only as a Speaker, but as a lawyer <and also a High Court [Judge]>. By the way (.) ↓these issues I said were canvassed. They were discussed at length and certain impressions were created and the bell has rung <and I will end there>.

Hon. Minister of Justice, Continue.

Mr. Kabimba, SC.: Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker, [for your indulgence. =Let me start by ...

Mr. Mufalali: On a point of order, sir.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order is raised. (.)

Mr. Mufalali: Thank you Mr Speaker (.) Mr. Speaker, are we in order to (.) go forward with this Motion ↑when a precedent, even as you have ruled that (.) there was never before in this country where Parliament removed the immunity of the President (.) and a precedent was set when the removal of the immunity on the late Former Second President, Mr. F.T.J. Chiluba,

was done by this House. (.) The president appeared before parliament to indicate that there was a *prima facie* case that needed parliament to remove the immunity of the late former Second President.

Mr. Speaker: =Order!

Mr. Mufalali: =[Are we in order (.) to move the way we are doing by letting the hon. Minister of Justice come to the House to present a Motion ↑before the President >comes before this House to present a *prima facie* case so that the Motion could be prepared thereafter?< I need your serious ruling, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I had ruled on this, but being a former academic, <I had to learn to cultivate: ↓patience>. When the late former Third President, Mr. L.P. Mwanawasa, SC. Came, as I mentioned earlier, he invoked, I think Article 88 whi:ch allowed him to prorogue or convene Parliament at any time and the I have mentioned that even any president, any sitting president has that power, and that is what the late Third President, Mr. Mwanawasa, SC, did. He came and addressed the nation and made or ↑disclosed those issues as he did. As I explained earlier, after the address (.) the hon. Members of Parliament were left with the Problem. Was that address(h) a Motion? Eventually, the answer >was that it was not a Motion, but just an address. So they had to craft a Motion<. In this case, our Standing Order 37 permits any hon. Minister to present this motion and it is in this context and regard that the hon. Minister of Justice is presenting this Motion. S:o yes, a speech was made, other than being an address, >there was nothing beyond it<(h). It was just an address, but what we have here (.) we have just gone straight into Business of Motion as required by our own constitution. I would like to call this internal constitution, the standing Orders. So, >we complied with Standing Order 57<.

The hon. Minister of Justice continue.

Mr. Kabimba: SC.: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. [Let me start ...

Mr. Belemu: [On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Mr. Belemu: Thank you Mr Speaker, Mr. Speaker I seek your ruling, is this House in order to allow the hon. Minister of Justice to move this motion, in fact, making him a judge in his

cause >since he is the one who is going to defend the position of government<, and it is a notorious fact that the same hon. Minister of Justice has been in the public threatening (.) to deal with hon. members of the Opposition and the former President, Mr. R.B. Banda, to be specific, >thereby making it in the eyes of the ordinary citizens political prosecution <? Are we in order to allow him, >when he has been quoted so many times, to become a judge in his own cause?<

>Mr. Speaker, I need your ruling.<

Mr. Speaker: He is perfectly in order. >You have asked for a ruling<. The judges in this cause will be the National Assembly. They are the ones who will decide ultimately.

The Minister of Justice can continue.

Hon. Opposition Members *left the Assembly Chamber singing.*

()

Mr. Speaker: Order!

(.5) (())

Hon. Minister of Justice Continue.

Hon. Government Members: ((Hear, hear!)) (.)

Mr. Kabimba, SC.: Thank you very much Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker, in support of the Motion that I have moved before this House, >let me start by giving the House the background to this Motion<.

Mr. Speaker, in October, 2006, the late The President, Mr. Mwanawasa, SC., was elected for his second term of office in the Presidential and Parliamentary election of that year (.) ↑After the dismissal of Pastor Nevers Mumba (.) as His Vice-President, the late third President Mwanawasa, SC., appointed Mr. Lupando Mwape as Republican Vice-President. After Mr. Mwape ↑lost parliamentary election in 2006, the late third President Mwanawasa, SC. Appointed Mr. R.B. Banda as Vice-President.

In May, 2008, >while attending an African Union Summit of Heads of State and government in Egypt.< (.) Mr. Mwanawasa, SC., suffered a stroke which saw him being evacuated to

Paris, =France, for medical treatment. The President died in Paris on the 19th August, 2008. ↑The death of the President necessitated a Presidential by-election under our Republican Constitution within ninety days. The Presidential by-election was held on 30th October, 2008, with Mr. R.B. Banda as Presidential candidate for the movement for the Multi-Party Democracy. He went on to win the election by 40.09 per cent, ↑against the closest candidate, Mr. Michael Chilufya Sata, of the PF, who polled 38.13 per cent of the total votes cast. Consequently Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda was sworn in as Zambia's <Fourth Republican President to finish the residual term of office of five years which expired in 2011>. Mr Rupiah Bwezani Banda ↑also became president of the political party, the MMD.

Mr. Speaker Sir, ↑one of the major stapes taken by the Banda administration was =the amendment to the Anti-Corruption Act which saw the removal of the clause with the provision for abuse of authority of office of public office. ↑This clause was later reinstated by the PF Government in 2012 >after winning the September, 2011 Presidential and General Elections<.

(.) The restoration of the clause was intended, Mr Speaker I repeat, was intended to send a clear message to the public and the international community that the PF Government was serious and uncompromising about the fight against corruption. (.)

Hon. Government Members: Hear, hear! =

Mr. Kabimba, SC.: =Mr. Speaker, we have maintained this stance through several public pronouncements by His Excellency the President, Mr. Michael Sata. (.)

Mr. Speaker, during the period 2008 to 2011, there was public concern about allegations of prevalent acts of abuse of office and corruption by serving public officers and hon. Ministers in the Banda administration. These allegations ↑also extended to Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda, as President, and some members of his family (.)

After the PF took over reins of power, following the 20th September, Presidential and general Elections,↑ there was mounting public demand to investigate the alleged acts of corruption and misappropriation of public funds and bring those involved to account for such offences (.) ↓including former President Rupiah Bwezani Banda.

In response to this public demand, the Government, in 2011, established the government joint investigation Team (GJIT) ↑to >probe and prosecute cases of corruption<, fraud and money

laundering (.) our established criminal justice system which presumes an accused person innocent until proven guilty by an impartial tribunal after a fair trial. (.)↑The GJIT has since secured convictions against some individuals ↓while the prosecution of others is still ongoing.

Mr. Speaker, ↓on 4th February, 2013 the Director-General of the Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC), who is Chairperson of the GJIT, wrote to Mr. Banda. (.) In that letter she invited him to appear before the GJIT in order to answer questions on allegations of corruption and abuse of office (.) during his term of office >as President<.

Mr. Banda declined the invitation by the GJIT, through his lawyers, Messrs Central Chambers, whose Managing partner is Mr. Sakwiba Sikota. (.) In the letter to the Director-General of the ACC, dated 5th February, 2013, the lawyers responded as follows:

(.)

“The Director-General

Anti-corruption Commission

P.O Box 50486

LUSAKA

ZAMBIA

“Dear Madam,

“Subject: *Invitation for Interview for His Excellency Mr. Rupiah B. Banda over Allegations of Corruption and Criminal Activities*

“We refer to the above matter and your letter of the 4th February, 2013 ↑which, has been handed over to us with instructions to re:reply.

“As rightly stated in your letter, our client, His Excellency the former president of the Republic of Zambia, Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda, ↑enjoys immunity under Article 43 of the Constitution. The framers of the Constitution were minded ↑to put in this Article for good reasons. It would be wrong for us to agree to a scheme that circumve:nts the constitution of this land.

“If we are prepared to circumvent ↑even the Constitution of the land, which guarantees, what guarantees do we have that the other laws under which the proposed investigation and prosecution will be herd are going to be <followed>?”

“We have read in the newspapers that the press is already aware of the steps you are taking and looking at the editorial headlines the papers have and the time when the letter was (.) was delivered to our client`s residence, it is clear that the press had the letter ↓even before it was delivered to our client.

“Our client has seen that you wish to have conviction through the press before you even go to court. This is born out of the fact that ↑you saw it fit to leak your letter to all the press media and the press you consider favourable to the State. Our client is not prepared (.) our client is not prepared ↓to be subjected to a media trial.

“Kindly be advised that we are acting as co-counsel in this matter with Professor Patrick Mvunga and Associates and all further communications in this matter should be directed through us and Messrs Mvunga and Associates.

“Yours Faithfully,

CENTRAL CHAMBERS

“Sawiba Sikota

STATE COUNSEL

“Cc: Messrs Mvunga and Associates

Cc: His Excellency the President Rupiah B. Banda.’

Mr. Speaker, ↑in view of the letter above, the House is hereby moved, article 43 (3) of the Republican constitution to resolve that any criminal proceedings instituted against Former President Rupiah Bwezani Banda ↓should not be contrary to the interest of the state. (.)

Grounds of Allegations

(a) ↑*Abuse of Authority of Office, corrupt acquisition of public property* ↓*and misappropriation and/or revenue of moneys and revenue in respect of Crude Oil contracts with the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation.* (.)

Mr. Speaker, on 21st December, 2011, the GJIT ↑conducted a search on the property of Hon. Kenneth Konga, former Minister of Energy and Water Development then, in Kabulonga, Lusaka (.). During the search, the GJIT came into possession of a letter dated 25th November, 2008, which later was personally signed by the Former President, Mr Rupiah Bwezani Banda, ↑requesting the supply of 25,000 barrels per da:y (.). of tame Crude Oil from the Nigerian Petroleum Corporation in Nigeria.

The GJIT, (.). ↑through its investigations, has established that the Zambian Government ↑paid the Sum of USS 2.5 million to Nigerian National Oil company for the said crude oil facility through the Zambian Government’s Nigerian Procurement and (.). facility agency called Sub-Energy Limited.

The GJIT has further established that Mr. Henry Banda, the Son of former President Rupiah Bwezani Banda, ↑was involved in the oil deal with the sole responsibility of deciding where the Nigerian Company, Sub-Energy Limited, ↑which was assigned the responsibility to uplift the Crude Oil, would remit the proceeds of this transaction.

The GJIT has further established that Mr. Henry Banda opened an offshore bank account (.). with Barclays Bank in Singapore into which the proceeds of the crude oil were remitted on behalf of his father, Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda, ↑instead of the National Treasury of the Government of the Republic Zambia.

Hon. Government Members: ((Shame)).

This diversion of the crude oil proceeds revenue ↑constitutes an abuse of authority of office fraud ↓and misappropriation of public funds on Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda’s part for whi:ch he must be prosecuted by the GJIT. (.).

(b) ↑Importation and Customs Clearance of Movement for Multi-Party Democracy Campaign Material.

Mr. speaker, investigations conducted by the GJIT have, so far, established that Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda and his family, in 2011, ↑spent a sum of more than ↑K20 billion on the purchase of election campaign material. (.). ↓This sum of money was personally handled and disbursed ↑in cash by former President Rupiah Bwezani Banda and his sons. Mr. Banda disbursed the funds through his Senior Private Secretary and the MMD Campaign Centre Manager.

In addition to the above, ↑Former President Rupiah Banda also disbursed K60 million, paid in three instalments of K20 million, to each parliamentary candidate on the MMD (.) during the 2011 elections. He also disbursed K2 million to each local Government candidate or Councillor (.) for the 1,400 wards in the country. The GJIT ↑has now established that the Sum of K21,907,847,170 cash in total was personally disbursed by former President Rupiah Bwezani Banda and his family. ↓It has also been established that the MMD did not have any such amounts of monies in its bank accounts ↑at any one time. (.)

Mr. Speaker, although the senior Private Secretary (.) of Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda was responsible for the sourcing, consigning to his name and receipting of all campaign materials and payments, ↑he told the GJIT, during the course of investigations, that he did not know the source of the funds or the actual sum thereof as this information was only known by the Former (.) President, Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda.

During the period in question, the Former President, Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda, purchased the items and materials listed hereunder: (.) From India, from a company called Atlas Cycles, and another one called Metro (.) he purchased bicycle spares and accessories and printed fabrics valued at K371,908,000. ((mmm)) From the united Arab Emirates, from a company called Western Emirates, Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda purchased forty-two Toyota Hilux vehicles 2010 model (.) valued at k1,869,840,000. (.) He also purchased branded hand sweet candy lollypops.=

Interruptions (=)

Mr Kabimba: Mr. Speaker, from the United Kingdom, from a company called Witham Specialist Vehicles; Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda >purchased forty used Bedford Trucks< valued at ↑K686, 501,629. From China, Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda bought branded T-shirts valued at ↑K411,917,893, branded caps valued at ↑K21,884,175, branded badges valued at ↑K131,823,695, branded hats valued at ↑K14,500,380, branded balloons valued at ↑K9,227,385, and branded ha-nd flags valued at↑ K12,727,088.

Mr. Speaker, from JAPAN, from a company called Trust Company, Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda bought seventy-seven used light trucks valued at K1,246,166,872. ↓From Malawi, from a company called Goodson Ginford Bonongwe, (h) ↑he Purchased 2,407 bales of Printed fabric valued at K68,770,938. From South Africa, from a Company called Tokyo car Choudhry and Amalgamated, he ↑Purchased T-shirts valued at K29,403,197. He also

purchased badges valued at ↑ K25, 347,556 and hats valued at ↑K2 788 209. He also purchased balloons valued at ↑K1,774,263 and various types of Vehicles ↑valued at K1,066,879,353.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Banda's personal handling of such large sums of money and his activities ↑constitute arts of money laundering and/ or the presumption that the funds in question came from the Zambian Treasury as public funds for which he is liable for prosecution (.) by the GJIT.

(c) ↑Acts of Corruption in Respect of the Mpundu Property Development Trust.

Mr Speaker Sir, Mpundu Trust limited (.) was incorporated and re-gistered on 16th march, 2009. >Its main objective was to develop real estate<. The directors of the trust were Thandiwe Chilongo Banda, spouse of former President Rupiah Bwezani Banda, a Miss Miriam Chilongo and one Robert Penney. In February, 2012, the former President Mr Rupiah Bwezani Banda ↑became a director in Mpundu Trust Limited after the resignation of Mr. Robert Penny and ↓Miriam Chilongo. The GJIT has established that Nyiombo Investments ↑procured an unsecured loan in Dubai for Mpundu Trust Limited in the Sum of ↑US\$1 million from a company known as Hands industries. [This company is listed in Dubai as a dealer in clothing merchandise and not a financing house. It is significant to note that Mr. Banda and his family prepared their own loan agreement in respect of this loan of US\$1 million. <This was (.) ↓a very strange act by a customer of a bank>. In the absence of any reasonable explanation from Mr. Banda, the presumption that the loan constitutes gratification under the provision of the Anti-Corruption Act of 2012 is ↑inevitable, and hence, an offence for prosecution by the GJIT.

(d) ↑Money laundering activities by former President Banda and members of his family in the acquisition of assets.

Mr. Speaker Sir, investigations by the GJIT have, so far, established that Mr Banda and his family have been using Mauritius-registered off-shore companies to finance opaque transactions that are indicative of money laundering activities as follows:

- (i) Acquisition of a bus worth US\$200, 000. ↑Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda and his family acquired a ↑Higer bus worth US\$200, 000 with funds from an entity called ↓Charisma investments in Mauritius.

- (ii) Branded bulbs: worth US\$60,000. ↓They had even stopped using ordinary bulbs, they were using braded bulbs. ↑Mr. Banda and his family acquired braded bulbs from China worth US\$600, 000paid for by Charisma investments: of Mauritius. ()
- (iii) Importation of Shoes worth US\$300, 000. [() Mr. Banda and his family imported Shoes into Zambia worth US\$300, 000 also ↑financed by Charisma Investments Mauritius.
- (iv) Importation of trucks from the United Kingdom worth UK£100, 000. Mr. Banda and his family imported in Zambia thirty-eight Bedford Trucks ↓acquired from the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the GJIT wants to prosecute ↑Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda for the above offences >of money laundering<. ↓In view of the foregoing, ↑I hereby submit before this August House that the ↑House should resolve that criminal proceedings against Mr. Banda ↓would not be contrary to the interest of the State whatsoever, and that the GJIT must proceed to prosecute him on the evidence, so far, established against ↑him.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move.

I thank you, sir.

Hon. Government Members: Hear, hear! ()

Mr Speaker: The question is that in terms of Article 43(3) of the <Constitution of Zambia this House do resolve that Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda (.) Who has held, but no longer holds >the office of President<, may be charged ↑with any criminal offence or be amenable to the criminal jurisdiction of any court, in respect of any act done or omitted to be done by him in his personal capacity ↑while he held the office of President and that such proceedings ↓would not be contrary to the interests of the State.

>Any further debate<?

Mr Speaker: Honourable of Lupososhi

Mr. Bwalya (Lupososhi): ↓Mr. Speaker I thank you for giving me an opportunity add a word to the debate on the Motion on the floor, which I support for and on behalf of the people of

Lupososhi Constituency <this is a Motion which touches a lot of (.) lives. And indeed it has different emotions attached to it<.

Mr. Speaker, the genesis and indeed the history that has been given by the mover of the motion must be appreciated by everyone. I also want to add a bit more to what he said we have seen the ↓removal of immunity from a former President of this country. Former President Kenneth Kaunda was arrested, detained and put under house arrest (.) ↓over alleged missing of a book from State House.

Hon. Government Members: Shame!

Mr. Bwalya: ↓Painful and humiliating as it was, it was done in the best interest of the rule of law. (.) ↑This was followed by the removal of immunity of former President, Dr Chiluba, may his soul rest in peace. ↓<Unfortunately or fortunately, that Precedent was set by the MMD and they did it to their party president<. Again, that was very painful. Those of us who were on the terraces watched and lamented. It was unfortunate that somebody who was well supported could turn around and stab (.) the guy who put him onto the podium, in this back but it was done. (.) However, we have to bear in mind the fact that it was done in the best interest of the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, the rule of law cannot be se separated from good governance. Therefore, for good governance to be upheld, we need to do things according to the rule of law. <This is what we are seeing today>.

Sir, we are mindful that we are not operating ↓in a vacuum. Therefore >we are not an island. ↓We appreciate the concerns of the international community and we like and value their contribution<. ↓This issue requires level headedness so that we allow our beloved former President, Mr. Rupiah Banda, >to exculpate himself<.

Mr. Speaker, >it is our responsibility to ensure that the competent authorities that are charged with the responsibility of investigating and determining and whether one is guilty or not are given the platform on which to operate properly<. ↑It is in this light (.) that this motion has been moved. (.) It is in that spirit that we are asking our beloved Former President need (.) to answer to all these allegations. They are allegation as at now and it is up to him to clear the air.

Mr Speaker, the figures that have been alluded to are quite enormous. (.) I am beginning to think that (.) the people of Lupososhi are right (.) that the:ir poverty levels are as a result of the misapplication of funds. ↑I think, as a people, we need to ask ourselves >why certain areas of our country cannot access radio reception<. We need to ask ourselves why the Zambia National Broadcasting Corporation has few cameras. In fact, in Luwingu, Mr Speaker, >there is not even a camera<. The one which is at the Provincial headquarters in Kasama is faulty.

We now know that ↑some of these issues and the poverty that we have been experiencing is as a result of this colossal sums of money that have been mentioned in this Motion being misapplied. I now understand why (.) the Musele/Katuta/Sobini Road cannot be graded. Even just to put gravel has been a problem. For the past twenty years the people have had problems because ↑K21 billion, as we have heard, was spent on buying campaign materials.

This is what we are trying to find out whether this money was, indeed, personal or public funds. ↑I think that this is the point which this Motion seeks to address.

Sir, I have problems (.) to believe that (.) a <Sum US\$300, 000 could be used to buy shoes>, yet (.) the children of Luspososhi do not even have a decent classroom where to learn from. How could people use US\$600, 000 to buy branded bulbs? ↑I think, as Zambians, ↓we need to reflect (.)

Mr. Speaker, authority requires that you need to be accountable. (.) Accountability is a prerequisite of good governance. Accountability, Mr Speaker, requires that the rule of law is respected. It is very painful that we have to unveil our own beloved former president. ↑But, must we keep quiet and allow the misapplication of funds to an extent that the people (.) of Ikeleng'i (.) and Lunte cannot even access medical health care?

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Chadiza [=...

Mr. Mbewe: [On a point of order, sir.

Hon. Government Members: =Hmm!

Laughter (h) (h)

Mr. Bwalya: ... require better than this. (.) =The Zambian people are questioning especially, my people in Lupososhi Constituency, why, since independence, the Luwingu/Nsombo/Chaba/Chilubi road has been tarred. (.)

Hon. Government Members: [Hear, hear!]

Mr. Bwalya: Mr. Speaker, <it is because we have heard now that forty vehicles ↓were bought to ensure that the MMD won the election at all costs. I do not think that this is development>.”]”

Mr. Speaker, it is also important that we find out ↑why Charisma was so generous to our former president to the ↑extent that they were able to do all these favours for him.

Sir, >leadership demands transparency and accountability<. ↑Who else can answer for this apart from Mr Rupiah Banda?

Mr. Speaker, with these few concerns (.) I thank you.

Hon. Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr Speaker: The Deputy Ministry of Works, Supply, Transport and Communication

The Deputy Ministry of Works, Supply, Transport and Communication (Col Kaunda):

Mr Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity. In the midst of the confusion of this afternoon, we forgot to thank you for the lunch that we had today, thank you for the lunch.

Laughter (h) (h)

Col Kaunda: Mr Speaker, I think we need to understand what this immunity we are trying to remove from the Former President is all about. During the rule of Dr Kenneth Kaunda, he ruled under the state of emergency whenever he was faced with problem such as the one we have. During his reign, people could be detained for some time without trial and a person’s passport would be grabbed without him or her having any resource. ↑That was what the law stated. You cannot remove his immunity and prosecute him for what he did because the law allowed him to do so. However, you could remove his immunity if he had stolen money or misused his office. That is the point we are trying to get across. We are not stripping Mr Rupiah Banda of his immunity because he ruled badly, but because there are allegations that he stole public funds.

↑Mr Speaker, it is important that we understand where we are coming from. Our forefathers had a law or regulations which governed their conduct in office. They had what they called the leadership code. It was put in place exact to stop the conduct we are debating today. As a leader, you were not allowed to do business >if you were in the government<. This was meant to stop leaders from abusing their offices. Even us, the children of the president then, were not allowed to engage in business with the government in order to avoid what Mr Rupiah Banda is suspected of having done. However, they did not stop you from doing any other business.

Mr Speaker, the Zambian people must understand that there are no intentions of vengeance or revenge in what we are doing today. Apart from Hon. Chikwanda and Hon. Wina, <I might be the only one close enough to the Former President to stand here and support this Bill>. I do it with a heavy heart, but it must be done. It is like a boil in an embarrassing place, which really hurts, but must be removed. It is important >not only for Rupiah Banda, not anybody else but for the future<.

Sir, those of us who are aspiring to be president of this country must understand that we must behave ourselves. (.) We thank his Excellency the president, Mr Michael Sata, for not shielding his son when was accused of corruption. The first thing he did was send him to the ACC, but he was cleared.

Mr speaker, Kenneth Kaunda, as President, I am his son, I was accused of smuggling by the late former Prime Minister, may his soul rest in peace, Kebby Musokotwane, who said I was smuggling fish from Malawi in my trucks. My father did not shield me. I was investigated and cleared.

Mr Speaker, my brother accident (.) he shot a young girl (.) he also was not shielded. He was tried, convicted and condemned to death. It was only the Supreme Court, on appeal, that freed him. That is how a president must behave. >The president and his or her children are not supposed to be above the law<.

Sir, when the ACC called ↑Mr Banda, they did not say he was guilty. They come and help us with the investigation with his immunity still being kept intact. He refused to co-operate with the ACC. ↑The only way that we can establish the truth is by removing his immunity so that the authorities can interrogate him as an ordinary citizen.

Mr Speaker, when Dr Kenneth Kaunda left office, our friends who are now absent said he had stolen some books. For four hours they searched him even when his immunity was still intact. The government then even involved Scotland Yard to investigate his family all over the world while his immunity was still intact. He did not refuse to co-operate with the investigative wings. Had he refused, that case would have been brought to parliament and I would have removed his immunity. He is here today with his dignity intact because he was proved innocent. There is nothing wrong with the government, through the ACC and other organizations, asking the former President to go and report to the authorities to be probed.

Mr Speaker, we must all insist that all forms of corruption are prosecuted. Corruption is a cancer in this country which should be dealt with. <If we let go of this case, then nobody will learn a lesson. Immunity is not a right, but a privilege given to those in authority by the people of Zambia. ↑It can be removed at any time<.

Mr Speaker, with these few words, I thank you.

Hon. Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr Speaker: honourable member for Chadiza

Mr Mbewe (Chadiza): Mr Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to contribute towards the Motion on the floor of the House.

Mr Speaker, ↑I do not support the Motion before the House because what the hon. Minister of Justice has brought before this House are allegations. ↑Since they are allegations, I feel the method which has been used to lift the immunity has not been fully followed. In my opinion, justice should prevail, but the right procedures should be followed.

Sir, ↑I feel VICTIMIZED because there was not enough time given to the Opposition to try to defend this matter before the =House.

Interruptions=

Mr Mbewe: Mr Speaker, I would want to put it on record that we are setting a very bad precedent for our children, who are future leaders.

Hon. Opposition Member: Hear, hear!

Mr Mbewe: If it was wrong for the MMD (.) to pursue Dr Kaunda and at the same time, Dr Chiluba, then, the PF should not go the same way. What is happening today is what will take place tomorrow.

Hon. Government Members: =Yes, that is what we want.

Interruptions ()

Mr Speaker: Order!

Mr Mbewe: =You want to swallow me live? Let me talk.

Laughter (h) (h)

Mr Speaker: No, No, You are protected(h).

Mr Mbewe: Mr Speaker, I thank you for your protection.

↑Mr Speaker, to avoid this occurrence from being repeated, I have a suggestion for the Zambian people and the hon. Members on your right. (.) <There is a need to remove the clause of immunity in the constitution> so that the president can be questioned while he is in office [...

Hon. Opposition Member: [Hear, hear!

Mr Mbewe: ... because this occurrence will continue into future generations. (.)

Mr Speaker, lastly, I would like to put it on record that ↓I do not support this Motion.

I thank you, Sir.

The Deputy Minister of Foreign Affair (Mr Namulambe): Mr Speaker, <I have been prompted to debate by the debate by the hon. Member of Parliament for Nalikwanda who insinuated that some people had (.) become intellectually bankrupt instead of being morally bankrupt< by some people. (.)

Mr Speaker, I thi:nk that my former party has been affected by a political tsunami. Due to the intellectual bankruptcy in the leadership, my former party does not have new ideas of how to win elections. It started in Mpongwe the tsunami, it has gone to Livingstone, to proceed to

Kapiri Mposhi, to go Lukulu west and eventually in the Zambezi River, then we forget about them.

<Mr Speaker, the hon. Minister of Justice (.) ably moved the Motion on the floor and he is not (.) saying the Former President is guilty. According to Article 18 of our Republican constitution, ↓a person is not guilty until it is so proven by the courts of law>. What has been raised in the House, today, are mere allegations from which a person can exonerate himself (.) <For instance, we heard from the letter that was read, here, which states that when former president was called by the investigative wings to exculpate himself, his lawyers told him not to go there because he had the immunity (.) fine, it was obeyed. Today, the Motion to remove the former president's immunity (.) has been brought before this House, but the end result is the hon. Opposition Members walking away>. These are issues that I raised in my maiden speech that [when people do not have issues, they resort to walking away.

Mr L.J. Ngoma: [On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Mr. L.J. Ngoma: Mr Speaker is the hon. Member for Mpongwe in order to indicate that the Opposition Members have walked out when we are here? IS HE IN ORDER SIR?

Laughter (h) (h)

Mr Speaker: Well,(h) >indeed, there are some hon. Members of the Opposition <and I think the hon. Deputy Minister (.) for Foreign Affairs should take note of that. You need to make your statement ↑in a very qualified manner(h).

Mr Namulambe: Mr Speaker, I will quote from the parliamentary debate (.) by Brig-Gen Dr Chituwo, during the lifting of the immunity of the late president, Dr Chiluba. He said, on page 25 of the parliamentary debate of 16th July, 20[02, he said:

“Mr Speaker, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to share this debate. >In the first instance, I am happy to be part of the history that this country, through this National Assembly, is making<.

Mr Speaker, the Motion was very clear and it is also clear that parliament is not a court of law. What we have done this afternoon is to share in the responsibility of managing and administering the country. (.) The National Assembly has played its

role and, now, it remains with the judiciary. It has been made very clear that these remain allegations until the Former President, Dr Chiluba, appears before the courts of law. This is how it should be. We have done our job and we will have to be judged, whether it continues.”

Mr Speaker, (.) the allegations that have been outlined by the hon. Minister of Justice still remain allegations when goes to explain himself and he proves his point, the he will be set free. When he has been proven not guilty, he will be set free. This is just to remove the perception by many people that is there, that there was abuse of office and misappropriation of funds. For instance, there was an issue about oil funds being put into some account of Barclays Bank in Singapore. It is also public knowledge that ↓my young brother, I don't know if he is my elder brother, Henry, will have to answer to such allegations. I do not know if he is in the country or not. It is to answer such allegations.

Mr Speaker, what I am saying is that this is an opportunity for someone to go and clear himself. Parliament is simply saying that since there have been requests by the lawyers, the state has moved in to help our Former Head Of State clear the allegation that have been labelled against him. Therefore, even as you try to obstruct the debates or raise points of order in parliament, you should not show the Zambians that there is something you are trying to hide. You can only do that if, somehow, ↓you have been asked round the [corner to come and oppose even when things are straightforward. I was chairperson of elections and, now, I am a former member of that party”]”. Unfortunately, I am hearing what has been said on the floor of this House for the first time (h).

Mr Namulambe: Mr Speaker, these are issues which can be cleared and the people of Zambia ought to know about these things. It is more or less like in a village. For example, if you are accused of practicing witchcraft and then your nephews want to take you to the witch finder, immediately you start getting upset before you even go, people will conclude that you know something. What is important is to co-operate and move (.) Issues of procedure are important. In this House, >we have the standing Orders and laws<. No one is saying that our former Head State is guilty. I have not heard so, not even in the Motion <that has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice>.

Sir, what has been said is that the joint investigating team would like to probe into this issue further. It cannot proceed with anything unless the person that is mentioned goes to exonerate

himself. >Those are rules of natural Justice<. If we can deny the rules of natural justice, how are we going to exonerate ourselves? Due to removal of immunity, I do not envy to become a Head of State. At the moment, I am a free person. Even if I am taken to court today, I know that the Constitution is there and it is very clear. The Constitution states that, until I am proved: guilty, I am innocent. As such, <every person is innocent until proven guilty>. Therefore, >let us understand the fact that< there is no vengeance here. It is just a question of trying to clear the allegations. I am sure that some of my friends that have left this house are listening to the radio. Therefore, let us clear the perception by answering to these allegations. I am sure that if some of the allegations that have been laid against the former head of state are not proved, he will, be set free. That will be an occasion that will clear him for the rest of his life. It is important that, as Zambians, we try to face facts the way they are than to point fingers.

Mr Speaker, <with these few words, I thank you, Sir>.

Mr Speaker: Honourable Member for Kalomo

Mr Muntanga (Kalomo Central): Mr Speaker, I listened very carefully to the mover of this Motion (.) and I am trying hard to connect the money that has been mentioned to the State. ↑There are allegations and suspicions that money could have come from the State. ↓Those are suspicions. When the late President came to this House, he talked about the ZAMTROP Account and some mining enterprise. ↑There were people who even told us where the money could be.

Mr Speaker, our stand here was a question of procedure. We said it, even when we were removing the immunity of the late President, Dr Chiluba the then hon. Mr speaker said that we were bringing an issue that was unprecedented. That is the word that he used. I remember that there was, then, late Sikatana who even said he was moving the Motion because he knew there was money somewhere.

Sir, unfortunately, we have not recovered that money. ↑A task force was formed and it gobbled a lot of money. (.) Now that the issue is on the removal of the immunity, my appeal is that, somehow, this country must heal. This country must find a way to ↑heal. Someone must stop it. If we are going to work on precedents, ↓it will not end.

Mr Speaker, I have heard that the major issue is on the items bought for campaign. ↓I have not yet been in the government to know how money from the government to buy things. However, having heard the mover, I am suspicions. ↓Our friends did not have a lot of money, but, all of a sudden, the Government has a lot of money for buying vitenge for by-elections. <I am left with no doubt other than to suspect that even these friends are beginning to steal money from the State>.

Hon. Member: [Hear, hear!]

Mr Muntanga: [Because now this party has become rich overnight, after having gone into government. This party has now shown us that,↓ after all, the money that the former <President, Mr Banda, used did not come from donations, as we were made to understand, but the State>.

Mr Speaker, we are all concerned about the fact that we do not need money to go away. I think the first Republican President ensured that the money was used for development. There were accusations that were made about him being rich, but they came to nothing. On this particular one, ↓I even feel that the people that are investigating might spend more money than the money alleged to have been stolen.

Sir, we even know that with the current system, there are instances when people who are called to the ACC refuse (.) to be investigated. The President has said “if you want to investigate any hon. Minister, you should first get clearance from me. Without clearance, they will not be investigated.”

Mr Speaker, therefore, I want to appeal to the other hon. Members to realize that the precedent that we have been setting is that all of you will be searched when you are out from there. [I know that some of you may claim to be clean, but it is not all of you who are.]

Hon. Opposition Member: GBM.

Mr Muntanga: That is a fact. Do not think that when you are doing certain things, people do not know about them because they do. Nonetheless, nobody tells me that what you are doing is wrong. ↓In cases when you tell one another lies that hon. Given Lubinda gives me notes, those are CHEAP POLITICS. [Nobody gave me any notes.

Mr Speaker: [Hon. Member for Kalomo Central Constituency, I do not think it is appropriate to drag in the hon. Member for Kabwata Constituency in that fashion. Be fair to hon. Lubinda.

Mr Muntanga: Mr Speaker, I thank you.

Mr Speaker: Be fair to him.

Mr Muntanga: I am heavy of heart over him. I feel upset because I was dragged into his predicament. I withdraw that because it is above what parliament may know. >However, there is a lot of deceit, a lot of lying and cheating[<.

Mr. Speaker: [I have made a ruling, hon. Member for Kalomo Central Constituency.

Mr. Muntaga: All I am saying is that on the information given, I would have wished for the mover to tell us a little bit more on where the money could have come from. There are many who could have gone to Singapore. There was the ZAMTROP, in time of the late President, Dr Chiluba, and we were told on how money was deposited into it and later siphoned.

Sir, I have been listening (.) ↓I debate when I come here. (.) The others want to speak while seated. ↑This is a grave situation and we need the country to heal because I see a situation where there will be a demand for the [removal of immunity of another President. When is this going to end? ↓In any case, the word ‘stealing’ in our area and tribe is not there and it may happen to you. This is because for some of you, stealing is a way of life. It is not to me. ∫∫∫

Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal and insist that there should be a fast movement to the extent[...

Mr Kabimba: [On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Mr. Kabimba: Mr Speaker, I seek your guidance. I know that the vocabulary of some of us may be limited. Is the debater in order (.) to say that stealing is a way of life for some of us? Is that part of the language of civility in this House?

Mr. Speaker: My ruling, I think I have addressed this issue before. I have said that ↓let us not make these insinuations liberally and gratuitously. This is because power, being what it is, is a pendulum(h). It swings. I think, we are all honourable and let all of us in here not prove otherwise. I think we should approach each other ↓on that basis, on that basis,

especially in the context of debates (.) <if we make generalizations of that sort (.) I think it is not fair to say the least, to say the very least indeed>.

Please, hon. Member for Kalomo Central Constituency, continue.

Mr. Muntanga: Thank you Mr. Speaker (.) ↓I attended school as well (.) I am not a lawyer, but an [agriculturalist. So, to say that we are is limited is a bit out. <I was being advised not to steal and ↓I was responding<.(.) In that vein, we are here to talk about money being stolen from the State. We are talking about people who are in authority (.) to abuse that authority. It is that in mind that I am saying (.) ↓we should approach it carefully because the country needs healing. ↑If there was so much theft or some misdirection of funds, and ↑I believe there was, I feel that, in future, this country will need a reconciliation so that we are told by the people who were in the Government <where the money is>. The very many bicycles that people were riding or taking to the campaigns, there should be reconciliation. They should tell us. (.) It does not help (.) that, once one goes the other side, then, the people this side (.) are the ones who are guilty.

Sir, ↑I want to state that even as they going remove the <immunity of the former President>, not everyone is clean. However, I may not be the best person to defend the former president because I was not in the government. If anything, as a person in the Opposition, I would be more happy to hear what more was not given to us. ↑That is why I took the trouble to listen. I was very interested to hear the part on ↓the money that we are looking for. ↑That is why I said it fell short of telling me exactly where the money is coming from.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that more investigation might come. However, if that will not happen, we want to ensure that Zambian money will not be used on things that will not yield results. We have come from a time when we removed the immunity of our former late president and I do not think that, ↑at the end of it, there was anything that came out. Unfortunately, there was a demand of restoring immunity, <but it was said that there was no such allowance>. Perhaps, we should consider coming up with a process to give back a person's immunity after he or she has been cleared (.) so that they get on with their lives. We cannot remove immunity and not be able to give it back after a person has been cleared of all wrong.

Allegations are allegations Mr. Speaker, (.) Unfortunately, for a head of state (.) a precedent has been set. ↑Others may be there making noise, but if you are Head of State, you would be

wondering what you are doing. I would be very happy if we considered this motion very carefully. Our President, the President now, has been very tactful. He has not come to this House to lay out all the allegations. He has left it to the hon. [Minister of Justice so that if he fails, in future, <we only face the hon. Minister of Justice> ↓as one who may have told the House a <lot of lies>.

Mr. Chisala: On a point of order, sir.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Mr. Chisala: Mr. Speaker, I salute you for giving me the opportunity to raise a very important point of order.

Mr. Speaker, >the Motion on the floor this evening borders on corruption<. The African Parliamentarians' Network Against Corruption (APNAC), as an institution (.) under parliament (.) has the right to check on any citizen regardless of their status in society. (.) I have just observed that (.) the chairperson of APNAC, who is supposed to listen to and follow the debate, has stormed out of this debating chamber.

Are the chairperson of APNAC, Hon. Mweetwa, and his Vice (.) in order to ↑storm out of the chamber when they are supposed to be listening to and following the proceedings of the debate? Where is the dignity of APNAC if the chairperson can behave in such a manner?

Mr. Speaker, I need your serious ruling.

Hon. Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr Speaker: Order!

Quite candidly, >I do not know why they are not here<.

Laughter (h)

Mr. Speaker: <I simply do not know why they are not here and I cannot allow myself to speculate and rule on that basis>.

The hon. Member for Kalomo Central may continue.

Mr. Muntanga: Mr. Speaker, (.) I submit that what have been told to us are the allegations, we have heard this afternoon require more information so that we are convinced (.) that there

is, actually, need we are not using it as a mere speculation to remove the immunity of the former president. ↑I hope that this is not mere speculation. We are aware of many corruption charges that have been leveled against various hon. Members at the moment as alluded to by the hon. Member who raised a point of order.

However, we are not able to investigate such hon. Members. ↓Perhaps, when they leave office, we will follow them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

Mr. Belemu (Mbabala): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to debate this very important Motion that is before us today. (.) I have had to use the help of a television to see the face of the hon. Minister of Justice as he moved this Motion (.) [and I have arrived at a very safe, albeit unfortunately position. I do not trust him and I can't trust his word. ∫∫∫

Mr. Speaker, this is important because what is under discussion is a very serious matter. There are three reasons I do not agree with the Motion that is on the floor of the House today. Firstly, by now, we have a record of the PF, as party in Government. We cannot trust them (.) >because they have abused< a number of already existing laws and a number of innocent citizens. ∫∫∫

Mr. Speaker, allowing the immunity of Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda to be removed (.) under the executive of the PF government, would be (.) subjecting and allowing Mr. Banda >to be in the hands of (.) a Government that has got a record of abuse of human =rights<. ∫∫∫

Hon. Government Members: =Where?

Mr. Belemu: Mr. Speaker, this Government has blatantly abused the Public Order Act over the last few months that it has been in power. It has even abused the office of the Director of Public Prosecution (DPP), which is being directed to investigate people for being ... for owning cattle. ∫∫∫

Hon. Government Member: Question!

Mr. Sampa: ((*Interjected*)).

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Belemu: Mr. Speaker, it has even abused the powers of the President to appoint Ministers from among members of Parliament. As we heard, earlier in the day, >its members confessed and called it 'poaching'<. They are talking about abuse of human rights. It is the naked truth, as we heard and saw this morning. For instance, hon. Nkombo is nursing a fractured arm that he sustained in a police ... =() ∫∫∫

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Member for Mbabala, sit down for a moment, I need to provide some guidance.

You are free to debate how best you think you can represent the people of Mbabala. But, one of our fundamental rules is relevance. As much as you may want to buttress your submissions with examples, please I would urge you ↓to bear in mind the Motion before us. >I think that it is important< that you bear this particular Motion in mind and try to be as close to and focused to the Motion as possible.

>You may continue.<

Mr Belemu: Mr. Speaker, I was underling the fact that it cannot be trusted with the former president, =whose immunity ...

Mr Mwaliteta: =On a point order, sir.

Mr Speaker: A point of order is raised.

Mr Mwaliteta: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for according me this opportunity to raise a point of order.

Mr Speaker is the speaker in order ...

Mr Speaker: Order!

The Speaker?

Mr Mwaliteta: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Is the hon. Member debating in order (.) to say that appointing hon. Members from the opposition to the government is an abuse of office? >I need your serious ruling, sir<.

Hon. Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr Speaker: Order!

I think that we need to be very careful how we characterize some of these issues, and I mentioned earlier today that we have different perceptions and interpretations of these actions. ↓Others have argued very strongly about the latitude that is available under the Constitution, including some political arguments, <and there are also conflicting> positions on the subject. In fairness, in fairness, however, let us try to approach the subject, as much as it is emotive, in a very objective sense >so that we do not make it a source of controversy<. Once again, let us focus on the Motion before us.

The hon. Member may continue.

Mr Belemu: Mr. Speaker, I was underlining the fact that (.) handing a former President, without his immunity, to this Government would be as good as handing him (.) to a Government that has already decided his fate. We have seen various abuses of individuals in this country and I am sure that it has been looking for an opportunity to do the same to the former President. >This is one of our worries<. It admitted this and has been speaking about it. It appears, therefore, <that it wants to use us to remove his immunity so that it abuses him also, unless it can prove otherwise to us>. It is important that this provision (.) in the constitution is not abused (.) by those who are in the government today >whenever they have a vendetta to settle< or a personal score to settle.

Mr Speaker, I would have been happier (.) and actually supported this Motion on the floor, if it talked about removing the immunity of >all those have held the Office of President, including the current one,< in this country, so that this matter we settle it once and for all. Whether they like it or not, now, we have a pattern (.) and the movers of this Motion on the floor, will have themselves to blame if the current President's immunity is also brought before this House at some future date to be removed. It sounds very good (.) today that we can talk about immunity of the former president alone ↑but we do not want this pattern to continue. As for me, I would have wanted this country to have a fresh start. We are worried and concerned with the level of abuse of individuals, institutions, offices and, sadly, >even various provisions within the law by the current government<. So, if we allow them (.) to use this opportunity (.) to vent their anger or whatever they have to settle with Mr Rupiah Banda, it will be unfortunate. That is why (.) as a person <and as a representative of the people of Mbabala constituency> I am opposed (.) to their Motion. (.)

Secondly, sir, (.) whatever arguments they are advancing today, ↑I think that it is also immoral (.) for the PF Government, especially, to be the ones that bring the Motion proposing the removal of the immunity of former President, Mr. Rupiah Banda. (.) It IS IMMORAL BECAUSE THEIR HANDS ARE =CONTAMINATED THEMSELVES.

Hon. Government Members: =Aah!

Mr Belemu: Among themselves, [they have been accusing each other of corruption as to who is more corrupt than the other ...

Mr Speaker: [Hon. Member for Mbabala, may you sit down.

Interruptions ()

Mr M. H. Malama: He has nothing to say.

Mr Speaker: Sir, I have said before, and not long ago(h), that we should treat each other with respect and avoid these generalisations, generalitions. There is a specific Motion here, there is a specific motion, I think that I am saying this for the third or fourth time, addressing hon. Members over the same issue(h). There is a Motion. If you are for or against, state it in simple plain terms.

Give your reasons without these insinuations.

You may continue.

Mr Belemu: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your guidance. <In very simple and straightforward terms, this executive has, on a number of occasions, breached the constitution>. (.) And therefore giving them, that is why I am saying that it is immoral for it to be the one to talk about removing the immunity of other people >when its members also need their immunity to be removed.< (.)

Sir, I wish not to take too long on the floor. This is a serious matter on which we (.) need to reflect very seriously even as we (.) make a decision. ∫∫∫

The PF Government has demonstrated a total lack of fidelity, Mr Speaker in conclusion and >I am using the word 'fidelity' to mean loyalty to this country<. I think that the disregard of

various institutions or provisions in the law in the past is enough reason for us to question the motive behind what it is proposing to do today. ∫∫∫

I have made an undertaking to be =very short on the floor ...

Hon. Government Member: =((*Interjected*)).

Mr Speaker: Let the Hon. Member conclude, please.

Mr Belemu: Mr. Speaker, it sounds alright today to them (.) but let me summarise by saying that the [die is cast and the time is ticking and their moment of truth will come very soon. Their time is coming. They sound excited today, but some of them, soon and very soon, indeed, will face the music of this same law that they are trying to use today against others.”]”

I thank you, sir.

The Minister of Chiefs and Traditional Affairs (Professor LUO): I thank you Mr. Speaker, for giving me this opportunity to contribute on the Motion on the floor.

Sir, we have been told several times to reflect on this Motion. (.) For some of us, I did not need to come here to start reflecting. My life in Zambia (.) has taught me that Zambia has a lot of resources. There is no part of Zambia (.) I have not been. I have lived with villagers in the villages of Zambia, I have worked in the hospitals of Zambia, ↑I have implemented Human Immune-Deficiency Virus/ Acquired Immune-Deficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS) programmes and I have seen the suffering of the Zambia n people. Over Forty-Eight years of independence, for a country that has so much resource, ↓we should not be suffering.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who represent the people of Zambia ↑who gave us an opportunity to come here and speak on their behalf, can, actually, ask ↑why we should investigate an allegation of in-huge sums of money that have ended up in people’s pockets, buildings and banks outside this country.

Sir, the hallmark of leadership (.) is to have empathy, love and humility. If one can actually go into an oil deal and take money to Malaysia, Singapore and everywhere, ↑if one can go from nothing and build huge (.) investigations in this country (.) from a position where you had absolutely nothing (.) I think we should be serious as leaders of this country.

Let me remind the hon. Members of parliament that the day we were elected into office (.) we had a pre-stamped expiry date and none of us should think that, because we are in the opposition or executive, that date will not come, and what we are doing today is sending a warning to all of us, including those of us in the executive, that when we hold these offices (.) we hold it in trust for people of =Zambia.

Hon. Government Member: =Hear, hear!

Professor Luo: We do not hold them for ourselves. When you are elected as a member of parliament of President of this country, you are elected as an individual, therefore, cannot bring your children in the governance of this =country, ...

Hon. Government Members: =No!

Professor Luo: ... and start taking money, siphoning money that should help the people of Zambia and bank it in the children's (.) bank accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to places in this country where, in a family of ten or fourteen (.) a few of them eat on Monday, others eat on Tuesday and rest on Wednesday. Then, those who ate on Monday restart the cycle on Thursday, and then ypu have a president who does not care; a president who takes away money that should be given to the people of Zambia in the rural areas (.) so that they able to eat three meals a day and we sit in this parliament (.) those who eat three meals a day, and say this Motion is not good. What are we, what are we talking about? Are we not supposed to represent the people of Zambia? People are walking out of this parliament to protect an individual and not protect the 13 million people of Zambia. =I find it absurd.

Hon. Government Members: =Hear, hear! Shame!

Professor Luo: Mr. Speaker, unlike other presidents of this country, Mr. Rupiah Banda was elected President when there was a serious economic credit crunch in this country, in this world.

↑While other presidents were looking for ways of protecting their countries (.) so that they could even find policies that would make it better for their people (.) ↓our president found it fit to start siphoning money, taking up illegal deals (.) building the Mpundu trust.

↓>Mr Speaker, in my own constituency, I believe K3 billion was spent in order for me not to win Munali Constituency<. ↑I saw the mugs, I saw the underwears which were all pre-branded. Mr Speaker, ↓I think, as a country, we are sending the right signals that all of us get into offices (.) public offices <must serve the people of Zambia>. ↑I, for one, was elected by the people of Munali Constituency to serve them. They did not elect me to go to my ministerial office, take money, and get into deals and bank money all over. I think, that is not leadership (.) ↑and, I think this time, we should start galvanizing ourselves in understanding what leadership is and in trying to protect the people who have given us the privileges that we are enjoying.

<I want to state this afternoon Mr Speaker, or this evening that I support this Motion> and I would like us to remind ourselves that we are here to offer a service. <If the former President will be found guilty of these allegations, he must face the wrath>. ↓If he will not be found guilty, he then will be free on the streets of Zambia and the world. That is what it means, ↑but it will also be reminding those of us in public office that we are not omnipotent and not above the law. Therefore, we should deliver (.) what is <in our offices in a transparent manner; truthfully and without thinking that that expiry date will not come>. I, for one > I must state that the day the President of the Republic of Zambia appointed me Minister<, and the day the people of Munali Constituency elected me Member of Parliament, I take it with a pre-stamped expiry date. That date will come and I am reminded every morning, and I think all of us must be reminded every day. <I wished Mr. Rupiah Banda had been reminded then, but anyway it is too late now>. <He has allegations leveled against him and I think we should support the Motion and make sure (.) that we put these allegations to rest>.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Government Members: Hear, hear! ()

Mr Lubinda (Kabwata): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for allowing me to contribute to this Motion. ↓From the outset, let me take cognizance of the point of order raised by hon. Chisala, and I am glad to notice that the chairperson of the Zambian chapter of the African Parliamentarians' Network Against Corruption (APNAC) ↑has come back in the house.

Sir, as Vice-chairperson for the global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption (.) and President at the continental level, I support this Motion <wholeheartedly>. I also want

to say this is a big day for Zambia. ↑It is a big day for the champions in the fight ↓against corruption. It is a day when some of us have been vindicated. ↓I remember standing opposite (.) and debating these matters and being told, (.) “This hon. Member wants to share poverty. That is the reason he does not want the government not to remove abuse of office clause (.) from the anti-corruption act.” I do remember being hospitalized because of those laws (.) >after unfortunately, (.) suspected food poisoning<. This day is a big day and I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Chiefs and Traditional Affairs that my Dear Professor (.) >do not regret that former President, Mr. Banda, was not reminded. He was forewarned< (.) in this House. When he was Vice-president as well as when he was President, that these laws would follow him. He was also forewarned when he was President, when he called for the amendment of the Anti-Corruption Act. We said to him that the government that would come would perform one f.(.) major function, which was the re-introduction of the abuse of office clause, and that those who would be found complicit would be caught up (.) Indeed, the time has come. I have heard some colleagues say >that these are allegations<. Indeed, they are, and <that is why (.) the government has decided to do that which is required for those allegations to be proved, and to give the accused the opportunity to vindicate themselves>. That is what good governance is all about, to give people an opportunity to defend themselves from public ridicule. (.) I do recall my colleagues in the UPND and me, on that side, raising questions about the unexplained enrichment (.) of some people in the government, <particularly the former first family of Mr. Rupiah Banda>. I do recall engaging in <a lo:ng discussion with colleagues in the UPND over matters like this>. <I am glad that they are coming back to the house because they> [=realize that what we spoke about, then, is today being followed through. We are doing, exactly, what we said we would do.

Mr Speaker, it is also important for us to realize that by lifting the immunity of the president, the former president, we are also setting a precedent for ourselves (.) and that is what we want. This is in answer to the question raised by my good friends, Hon. Muntanga, who asked where it would stop. >It shall start stopping now< because the current President is aware of the fact that this law is in the status books. He has allowed his hon. Minister of Justice to come and remove the immunity of this predecessor. [Naturally, he knows (.) that↓ if he misconducts himself (.) he too, will have to face the same wrath. Is it not a mark of honesty for a person to say, I am clean (.) and I intend to remain clean? Judge me by this standard. This is the reason why all those who are committed in the fight against corruption must celebrate today. (.) ↓As for me, I shall break my alcohol fast tonight.

Laughter (h)

Mr Speaker: That is personal(h).

Laughter (h)

Hon. Government Member: Gin and Tonic.

Laughter (h)

Mr Lubinda: I shall go and enjoy my gin and tonic tonight

Hon. Government Members: Hear, hear! ”]”

Mr Lubinda: Mr Speaker, this is also a ↑matter of reflection for ourselves (.) We need to remind ourselves that if the immunity of the president can be lifted by us (.) what excludes us, as members of parliament from public scrutiny? I am hoping that this act, in this parliament today, shall encourage us, shall encourage the citizens to also >invoke the other provisions of our statutes to ensure that we< too, ↓live above aboard. I do recall, several years ago, the organization I am proud to lead, APNAC, coming to parliament and proposing amendments to ensure that even those declarations we make are verifiable because as far as I am concerned, to date, those declarations are just worth the paper on which they are written. >I said before, something that I would like to share today, that in many countries, those declarations (.)< ↓could as well be a love letter (.) sealed in an envelope and deposited with the Chief Justice and nobody gets to understand them unless there is a particular person who has a particular interest in that particular person who made declarations. >I am hoping that my friends in APNAC in Zambia< (.) shall go back to the anti-corruption act and look for amendments. >This brings me to the other issue that I listened to this morning<. I was rather frustrated to hear somebody say that there is intellectual bankruptcy because the Government has not brought Bills (.) I reminded myself of how many amendments [I made when I was in the Opposition. >That is a mark (.) of intellectualism as an hon. Opposition member. You do not just wait for the government to come with bills and you pass them without any amendment and call yourself an intellectual.< (.) You call yourself an intellectual, hon. Opposition member, if you are also able to propose amendments and move bills”]”.

This Motion shows the government’s will to fight corruption. Therefore, this is an opportunity for my friend, hon. Mweetwa, and other colleagues in the opposition and

APNAC to bring up even more efficacious laws in the next session of parliament (.) to make sure that we bring the fight against corruption to higher in Zambia. >As a matter of fact, as Hon. Mweetwa has come to realize, Zambia is quite well respected in so far as the fight against corruption is concerned< (.) on the continent and globally.

I heard one of my colleagues asking where the connection is between the money that was being spent and the >treasury<. (.) ↓The anti-corruption act has provisions for (.) fighting illicit enrichment. If a person has acquired wealth that they cannot explain its source, (.) >it is the duty of the government to go out and ask<. Therefore, the Government is asking very mildly, very honestly please explain to us where the more than US\$11 million came from because we do not think that this emoluments, as president, could give him that kind of money, ↑especially if the money is going to be spent [on buying shoes, bulbs and underwear, like we heard earlier this evening”]”.

Laughter (h)

Mr Lubinda: Surely, if you are going to spend US\$11 million on that, it means that you must have a limitless source of money. Therefore, is it not in the interest of society for him to be questioned? What about the Nigerian oil deal? >Have we not been told that, actually, it was the treasury that paid for oil transaction, and yet the proceeds of that deals did not come back to the treasury?< The proceeds of that transaction went to offshore accounts. ↑Is that not a good reason for us to demand answers? Those of us who are determined to fight corruption believe this (.) ↓is a very good starting point and ought to be supported by EVERYBODY.

Hon. PF Members: Hear, hear!

Mr Lubinda: I am fully alive to the fact that there are a few people who might have decided to oppose this motion >because they might have been =beneficiaries<, ...

Hon. PF Members: =Hear, hear!

Mr Lubinda: ... directly or indirectly, but we have a moral duty, my dear colleagues, to the Zambian people (.) to stand board and tall and demand (.) ↓that those who meddle with public resources are brought to account. >This is not only being done for purposes of history purposes< but also for the future. >On that score, I would like to agree entirely with the =Professor<, Professor I agree with you ...

Hon. Government Members: =Which Professor?

Mr Lubinda: Professor Luo.

Laughter (h)

Mr Lubinda: I entirely agree with Professor =LUO...

Mr Mulenga: =Not Lungwangwa.

Mr Lubinda: ... That we are setting this precedent for ourselves and it is up to us to make sure that, as we ↑raise this bar, we also raise our moral uprightness. (.) This does not mean that we shall not be suspected of being involved in corruption. We will, as leaders, we will be suspected. There are a lot of people who are going out there and saying that we are abusing the constituency development fund (CDF). Yes (.) but then we must show the people that we have put in place measures to make sure that we are given an opportunity (.) to vindicate ourselves and we must be willing to vindicate ourselves. We must not shy away from vindicating ourselves. When our reputation is dented, we must be able to stand tall and say, ↑“Try me. (.) I might be a broken mirror but, at least, you can see my image in that mirror.” That is a mark of leadership.

And I would like to appeal (.) to all of us in the House that ↓this matter is not just a matter here >in the House<. This is a matter of great public interest and there shall be lots of debate out there. I would like to appeal to hon. Members of parliament not to shy away from defending this position that we have taken because we have done so conscious of the fact that it is the best interest of society and >we are not in any way being (.) personal or persecuting anybody<. It is the prayer of a lot us that when the time comes (.) former President Rupiah Banda will be able to go and explain to the Zambian people (.) how the oil deal was entered into, concluded and how money went into offshore accounts. >It is our hope that will also go and explain how those charities came about<, enriched him and made it possible for him to have personalized bulbs when they light. >I wonder what was being written in the light bulbs<. Maybe, it was ‘vote RB’ bulbs. <This will enable others, too, to learn how to be so creative and innovation in attracting so much charity if, indeed, it was clean. If it was not clean then, of course, ↑the law ought to ↓take its course>.

Mr Speaker, let me end where I started and that is on APNAC. <I am hoping that my colleagues in APNAC will also take time (.) to convene a meeting where, as APNAC, ↑they

will look at this issue of immunity and sponsor a few radio and television programmes to go and explain to the masses (.) that APNAC stands tall on matters to do with abuse of office, irrespective of the political divide because this is not a matter of political divide. This is a matter (.) of prudent utilization of power, entrusted power. For a person to have been entrusted with power for three years and, in those three years, be able to accumulate more than US\$11 million (.) to spend in a campaign (.) ↓is miraculous, to say the least. ↓>I am sure that all of us would like to learn from that story<.

Sir, I support the Motion and I thank you.

Hon. PF Members: =Hear, hear!

Mr Kabimba, SC.: =Mr. Speaker, firstly, let me thank all the hon. Members of parliament who have rendered support to this Motion this afternoon. Let me also thank even those that (.) debated against the Motion (.) or veered off the compass of the Motion and decided to start debating individuals on your right.

In concluding, Mr Speaker let me just say that ↑the issue of removal of immunity of a former President is not peculiar to the Zambian jurisdiction. Those of us, who recall the case of the former president of Chile, President Pinochet, when he was arrested in London (.) will recall that <there was an extensive debate over the issue of how and when you remove (.) the immunity of a former president>. President Pinochet had arm-twisted the senate of Chile to confer upon himself (.) life immunity for the period that he was in office. When he was arrested in London, the issue of his immunity came up before the House of Lords. In summary, that precedent, which was within English law, would be of great interest to this jurisdiction. The arguments by former President Pinochet's lawyers were that (.) he enjoyed lifetime immunity >against prosecution<. The human rights lawyers that defended or represented the people that had claimed that their kith and kin had been kidnapped, abused and killed under the former president, Pinochet's regime advanced this argument. The argument, in summation, was as follows:

“They agreed that ye:s former President, Pinochet enjoyed immunity under (.) the Chilean law. That was not in dispute. However, the lawyers argued and said (.) no President, no president is ever elected by this people to kidnap and kill >citizens of his country< or to steal, in this particular case to steal from citizens of his country.”

If former President Banda had gone round the country campaigning for people to vote for him because he wanted to come and steal from them, they would have not voted for him (.) in 2008. (.) That just means that the people of Zambia (.) <voted for him in good faith, believing that he would be a good president and that he would look after the affairs and treasury of this country>.

Therefore, Mr Speaker we bring this Motion ↑without any aorta of bad faith against any individual and in particular, the former president, Mr Rupiah Bwezani Banda. We bring this Motion (.) in the interest of the country (.) we bring this motion not as an afterthought. Like my colleagues, the previous speaker, said, when we were in the opposition, we made pronouncements, from time to time, (.) that there was rampant corruption under the MMD. I was one of the people that wrote letters to the former president (.) Mr. Banda, about issues of corruption and we did tell the people of Zambia that if and when we got into power (.) we would investigate these rampant cases of corruption because they were against the interest of our people (.) The people of Zambia believed us in that undertaking (.) and voted us into office and we owe them a duty Mr Speaker, to ensure that we follow up on our undertaking to them to make sure that this culture of impunity for those of us that are in public office does not repeat itself. (.) Like the Israeli motto goes, “Never, again, shall the people of Zambia fold their arms (.) as they see their treasury being abused (.) and being ransacked by those that are in public offices.”

I want to state, Mr. Speaker, that the GJIT has concluding its investigations to prosecute former president (.) Banda. So, the Motion concerning the lifting of his immunity in respect of Former President Banda, which is before this august House, is not intended to investigate him as far as the investigating team is concerned. They have concluded the investigations (.) and wishes to prosecute him (.) on the ground that are before this House.

↑The reason article 43 of the Constitution exists, Mr Speaker, you know, to delve into the question of whether or not (.) the proceeding will be against the interest of the State, is to, simply, secure the state and ensure that nothing that would ↑jeopardize the security of the state would be a subject (.) of (.) legal proceedings. Certainly, it was never intended to cover up for theft of public funds, abuse of public office and ↓I think that was not the intention of the framers of the Constitution (.) and that particular article.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

Hon. Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr Speaker: I put up a question. The question is: (.) that in terms of Article 43(3) of the Constitution of Zambia >this House do resolve< that Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda (.) Who has held, but no longer holds the office of President, may be charged ↑with any criminal offence or be amenable to the criminal jurisdiction of any court, in respect of any act done or omitted to be done by him in his personal capacity ↑while he held the office of President and that such proceeding ↓would not be contrary to the interests of the State.

Mr. Speaker: As this a constitutional resolution, we have to record the number of Hon. Members agreeing or disagreeing with this Motion by voting. The vote will be done >electronically<. As many of that opinion say 'I'. =Of a contra-

Hon. Government Members (IN CHORUS): =A: Y:II

Question that the removal of legal immunity in respect of the former President, Mr. Rupiah Bwezani Banda, would not be against the interest of the State *put and the House voted.*

Yes-(80)

1. Mrs E. M. Banda
2. Mr N. Banda
3. Mr C. Banda
4. Mr Bwalya
5. Col Chanda
6. Mr Chansa
7. Mr Chenda
8. Dr Chikusu
9. Mr Chikwanda
10. Mr Chilangwa
11. Mr Chingimbu

12. Mr Chisala
13. Mr Chishimba
14. Mr Chitotela
15. Mr Chungu
16. Mr Evans
17. Mrs Kabanshi
18. Mr Kabimba, SC.
19. Mr Kamyongo
20. Brigadier-General Kapaya
21. Mr Kapeya
22. Mr Kapyanga
23. Dr Kasonde
24. Dr Katema
25. Col Kaunda
26. Mrs Kawandami
27. Mr Kazabu
28. Ms Kazunga
29. Mr Kosamu
30. Ms Limata
31. Mr Lubinda
32. Mr E.C. Lungu
33. Dr Lungu

34. Col Lungu
35. Professor LUO
36. Mr Mwimba H. Malama
37. Mrs Masebo
38. Mr Masumba
39. Mr Matafwali
40. Mr Mbulu
41. Mr Miyutu
42. Mr Monde
43. Mr Mpundu
44. Mr Mubukwanu
45. Mr Mukata
46. Mr Mulenga
47. Mr Mumba
48. Mr Mushanga
49. Mr Musukwa
50. Mr Mutale
51. Dr Mwali
52. Mr Mwaliteta
53. Mrs Mwamba
54. Mr Mwamba
55. Mr Mwango

56. Mr Mwenya
57. Mr Mwewa
58. Mr Mwila
59. Mr Namulambe
60. Mr Ngoma
61. Mr Njeulu
62. Mr Phiri
63. Dr Phiri
64. Mr Sakeni
65. Mr Sampa
66. Dr Scott
67. Mr Shamenda
68. Mr Siamunene
69. Mr Sichone
70. Mr Sichula
71. Mr Sikazwe
72. Dr Simbyakula
73. Mr Simuusa
74. Mr Taima
75. Mr Taundi
76. Mr Tembo
77. Professor Willombe

78. Mr Yaluma

79. Mr Zimba

80. Mr Zulu

Noes (3)

1. Mr Mbewe

2. Mr Ndalamei

3. Mr Ngoma

Abstentions – (4)

1. Mr Antonio

2. Mr Banda

3. Mr Mweetwa

4. Mr Sianga

Question accordingly agreed to.

APPENDIX 2

ARTICLES FROM THE 1996 ZAMBIAN CONSTITUTION QUOTED DURING THE DEBATE SESSION

Article 18

(1) If any person is charged with a criminal offence, then, unless the charge is withdrawn, the case shall be afforded a fair hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial court established by law.

(2) Every person who is charged with a criminal offence –

(a) shall be presumed to be innocent until he is proved or has pleaded guilty;

(b) shall be informed as soon as reasonably practicable, in a language that he understands and in detail, the nature of the offence charged;

(c) shall be given adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defence;

(d) shall unless legal aid is granted to him in accordance with the law enacted by Parliament for such purpose be permitted to defend himself before the court in person, or at his own expense, by legal representative of his own choice;

(e) shall be afforded facilities to examine in person or by his legal representative the witnesses called by the prosecution before the court, and to obtain the attendance and carry out the examination of witnesses to testify on his behalf before the court on the same conditions as those applying to witnesses called by the prosecution; and

(f) shall be permitted to have without payment the assistance of an interpreter if he cannot understand the language used at the trial of the charge;

and except with his own consent the trial shall not take place in his absence unless he so conducts himself as to render the continuance of the proceedings in his presence impracticable and the court has ordered him to be removed and the trial to proceed in his absence.

- (3) When a person is tried for any criminal offence, the accused person or any person authorised by him in that behalf shall, if he so requires and subject to payment of such reasonable fee as may be prescribed by law, be given within reasonable time after judgement a copy for the use of the accused person of any record of the proceedings made by or on behalf of the court.
- (4) A person shall not be held to be guilty of a criminal offence on account of any act or omission that did not, at the time it took place, constitute such an offence, and a penalty shall not be imposed for any criminal offence that severer in degree or description than the maximum penalty that might have been imposed for that offence at the same time it was committed.
- (5) A person who shows that he has been tried by a competent court for a criminal offence and either convicted or acquitted shall not again be tried for that offence or for any other criminal offence of which he could have been convicted at the trial for that offence, except upon the order of a superior court in the course of appeal or review proceedings relating to the conviction or acquittal.
- (6) A person shall not be tried for a criminal offence if he shows that he has been pardoned for that offence.
- (7) A person who is tried for a criminal offence shall not be compelled to give evidence at the trial.
- (8) A person shall not be convicted of a criminal offence unless that offence is defined and the penalty is prescribed in a written law:

Provided that nothing in this clause shall prevent a court of record from punishing any person for contempt of itself notwithstanding that the act or omission constituting the contempt is not defined in a written law and the penalty therefore is not so prescribed.
- (9) Any court or other adjudicating authority prescribed by law for determination of the existence or extent of any civil right or obligation shall be established by law and shall be independent and impartial: and where proceedings for such determination are instituted by any person before such a court or other adjudicating authority, the case shall be given a fair hearing within a reasonable time.

- (10) Except with the agreement of all the parties thereto, all proceedings of every court and proceedings for the determination of the existence or extent of any civil right or obligation before any other adjudicating authority, shall be held in public.
- (11) Nothing in clause (10) shall prevent the court or other adjudicating authority from excluding from the proceedings persons other than the parties thereto and their legal representatives to such extent as the court or other authority –
- (a) may consider necessary or expedient in circumstances where publicity would prejudice the interests of justice or in interlocutory proceedings; or
 - (b) may be empowered by law to do in the interest of defence, public safety, public order, public morality, the welfare of persons under the age of eighteen years or the protection of the private lives of persons concerned in the proceedings.
- (12) Nothing contained in or done under the authority of any law shall be held to be inconsistent with or in contravention of –
- (a) paragraph (a) of clause (2) to the extent that it is shown that the law in question imposes upon any person charged with a criminal offence the burden of proving particular fact;
 - (b) paragraph (d) of clause (2) to the extent that it is shown that the subordinate court in proceedings for an offence under *Zambian customary law*, being proceedings against any person who, under that law, is subject to that law;
 - (c) paragraph (e) of clause (2) to the extent that it is shown that the law in question impose reasonable conditions that must be satisfied if witnesses called to testify on behalf of an accused person are to be paid their expense out of public funds;
 - (d) clause (2) to the extent that it is shown that the law provides that –
 - (i) where the trial of any person for any offence prescribed by law has been adjourned and the accused, having pleaded to the charge, fails to appear at the time fixed by the court for the resumption of his trial after the adjournment, the proceedings may continue notwithstanding the absence of the accused if the court, being satisfied that, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, it is just and reasonable so to do, so orders; and

(ii) the court shall set aside any conviction or sentence pronounced in the absence of the accused in respect of that offence if the accused satisfies the court without undue delay that the cause of his absence was reasonable and that he had a valid defence to the charge;

(e) clause (2) to the extent that it is shown that the law provides that the trial of a body corporate may take place in the absence of any representative of the body corporate upon a charge in respect of which a plea of not guilty has been entered by the court;

(f) clause (5) to the extent that it is shown that the law authorises a court to try a member of a disciplined force for a criminal offence notwithstanding any trial and conviction or acquittal of that member under the disciplinary law of that force, so, however, that any court so trying such a member and convicting him shall in sentencing him to any punishment awarded him under that disciplinary law.

(13) In the case of any person who is held in lawful detention, clause (1), paragraphs (d) and (e) of clause (3) shall not apply in relation to his trial for a criminal offence under the law regulating the discipline of persons held in such detention.

(14) In its application to a body corporate clause (2) shall have effects as if words “in person or” were omitted from paragraph (d) and (e).

(15) In this Article “criminal offence” means a criminal offence under the law in force in Zambia.

Article 43 (3)

(3) A person who has held, but no longer holds, the office of President shall not be charged with a criminal offence or may be amenable to the jurisdiction of any court, in respect of any act done or omitted to be done by him in his personal capacity while he held office of President, unless the National Assembly has, by resolution, determined that such proceedings would not be contrary to the interests of the State.

Article 62

The legislative power of the Republic of Zambia shall vest in Parliament which shall consist of the President and the National Assembly.

Article 69 (1)

- (1) There shall be a Speaker of the National Assembly who shall be elected by the members of the Assembly from among persons who are qualified to be elected as members of the Assembly but are not members of the Assembly.
- (2) No business shall be transacted in the national Assembly, other an election to the office of Speaker, at any time when the office of Speaker is vacant.

Article 86

- (1) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the National Assembly may determine its own procedure.
- (2) The National Assembly may act notwithstanding any vacancy in its membership (including any vacancy not filled when the National Assembly first meets after any dissolution of Parliament) and the presence or participation of any person not entitled to be present or to participate in the proceedings of the National Assembly shall not invalidate those proceedings.
- (3) In the selection of members of committees, the National Assembly shall seek to ensure that there shall be equitable representation of the parties or groups that are represented in the National Assembly as well as of the members not belonging to any such parties or groups.

Article 87

- (1) The National Assembly and its members shall have such privileges, powers and immunities as may be prescribed by an act of Parliament.
- (2) Notwithstanding subclause (1) the law and custom of the Parliament of England shall apply to the National Assembly with such modifications as may be prescribed by or under an act of Parliament.

Article 88

- (1) Subject to the provisions of clause (4) each session of Parliament shall be held at such place within Zambia and shall commence at such time as the President may appoint.

- (2) There shall be a session of Parliament at least once every year so that a period of twelve months shall not intervene between the last sitting of the National Assembly in one session and the commencement of the next session.
- (3) The President may at any time summon a meeting of the National Assembly.
- (4) Subject to the provisions of clause (1) of article 37, the sittings of the National Assembly in any session of Parliament after the commencement of that session shall be held at such times and on such days as the National Assembly shall appoint.
- (5) The President may at any time prorogue parliament.
- (6) Subject to clause (9) the National Assembly –
 - (a) shall, unless sooner dissolved, continue for five years from the date of its first sitting after the commencement of this Constitution or after any dissolution and shall then stand dissolved;
 - (b) may, by a two thirds majority of the numbers thereof, dissolve itself; or
 - (c) may be dissolved by the President at any time.
- (7) Whenever the National Assembly is dissolved under this article, there shall be Presidential Elections and elections to the National Assembly and the first session of the new Parliament shall commence within three months from the date of the dissolution.
- (8) At any time when the Republic of Zambia is at war, Parliament may from time to time extend the period of five years specified in clause (6) for not more than twelve months at a time: Provided that the life of the National Assembly shall not be extended under this clause for more than five years.
- (9) If, after a dissolution of Parliament and before the holding of the general elections, the President considers that, owing to the existence of a state of war or of a state of emergency in Zambia or any part thereof, it is necessary to recall Parliament, the President may summon the Parliament that has been dissolved to meet and that Parliament shall be deemed to be Parliament for the time being, but the general election of members of the national Assembly shall proceed and the parliament that

has been recalled shall, if not sooner dissolved again, stand dissolved on the day appointed for the nomination of candidates in that general election.

APPENDIX 3

ARTICLES FROM THE 2005 STANDING ORDERS QUOTED DURING THE DEBATE SESSION

Standing Order No. 2

(1) Words and terms of in these Standing Orders which are in the constitution shall have the meaning assigned to the in the Constitution.

(2) In these Standing Orders, unless the context otherwise requires-

‘Assembly’ or ‘House’ means the National Assembly or House and shall be deemed to include any committee, sub-committee or other groups or bodies of members or officers of the National Assembly for purposes of carrying out any function or representing the Assembly;

‘ballot box’ means transparent ballot box;

‘Chairperson of Committees’ means the Chairperson of the Committees of the Whole House and includes a Deputy Chairperson of Committees of the House;

‘Chairperson of Committee’ means any Chairperson of a Standing, Sessional, select or Sub-Committee of the House;

‘Clerk’ means the Clerk of the National Assembly and includes the Deputy Clerk, Assistant Clerk, and any other officer of the National Assembly when the latter are at the Table;

‘Constitution’ means the Constitution of Zambia;

*‘Deputy Speaker’ means the person elected in terms of Article 70 of the Constitution;

‘dissolution’ means to bring to an end a term of Parliament followed by a general election;

‘Meeting’ means all sittings of an Assembly held during a period beginning when the Assembly first sits after being summoned at any time and terminating when the Assembly is adjourned *sine die* or at the conclusion of a session;

‘member’ means any member of the Assembly and includes the Speaker;

‘officer’ means the Clerk or any other employee of the Assembly or person acting within the precincts of the Assembly Chamber under the orders of the Speaker;

‘petition’ means a written plea presented to the Assembly; and includes all similar submissions whether relating to public or private matters of general policy, or to redress local or personal grievances;

‘precinct of the Assembly Chamber’ means the Chamber in which the Assembly sits in session for transaction of business together with the offices, rooms, lobbies, galleries, courtyards, gardens, Assembly Motel and other places provided for the use of connecting such places and other places hereto as may be designed by the Speaker;

‘prorogation’ means the end of a session of Parliament;

‘select committee’ means an *ad hoc* Committee appointed for a specific task and stands dissolved at the end of the task;

‘Sergeant-at-Arms’ means any person appointed to perform the duties and function of the Sergeant-at-Arms;

*‘session’ means a period commencing when the assembly first meets after a general election or prorogation and ending when the Assembly is next thereafter prorogued or dissolved without having been prorogued;

‘sessional committee’ means a committee appointed for a session of an Assembly;

‘sitting’ means the period between the time when the Speaker takes the Chair and the time when the assembly is adjourned;

‘summoning’ means the ordering of a session of Parliament;

‘standing committee’ means a Committee appointed for the life of an Assembly;

‘Standing Orders’ means Standing Rules and Orders of the Assembly as in force on the 24th October, 1964, and any orders or rules of procedure amending or replacing them made in pursuance of Article 86 of the Constitution;

‘Table’ means Table of the House;

‘Speaker’ includes the Deputy Speaker or any person presiding in terms of Article 83 (c) of the Constitution; and

‘visitor’ means any person other than a Member of or an officer.

** refers to provisions from the Constitution of Zambia*

Standing Order No. 37

Notwithstanding the provisions of standing order thirty-six, notices of motion may be handed in by Ministers at any time during any sitting of the House and the Minister shall specify any subsequent day as the day on which such motion shall be debated.

Standing Order No. 57

No amendment shall be moved to any part of a question after a latter part thereof has been amended, or after a question has been voted upon on an amendment thereto.