

## **THE 1967 UGANDA CONSTITUTION**

### **A compilation by Nelson Kafir; Source: The Transition 33**

The Government issued its Constitutional proposals on the 9th of June, 1967 and Parliamentary Debate began on the 22nd of June. The debate was adjourned on the 27th of July. On the 4th of August the Government announced that it would submit new amendments to its own Constitutional proposals when Parliament reconvened. These amendments were published on the 29th of August. Parliament reconvened on the 6th of September to consider the sections of the proposed Constitution one by one. All the Government proposals, as modified by its own amendments only, were accepted and the Constitution was adopted on the 8th of September, 1967.

The following quotations were taken from speeches made by Members of Parliament in the debate on the Constitutional proposals. In most cases they were made in the Constituent Assembly itself. No attempt has been made to reproduce comments on every section of the proposed Constitution, nor has there been an effort to quote each speaker. The comments do, however, indicate the range of thinking on major provisions, as well as the atmosphere in which the debate took place. Some of the comments, however, were outdated (or achieved their purpose), when the amendments to the proposals were introduced. All the quotations have been taken verbatim from the Uganda Argus, except two taken from the Daily Nation and one taken from the East African Standard. The Argus' reporting of the debate was commended on the floor of Parliament by a Government Minister.

### **ADOPTION OF A NEW CONSTITUTION**

The question they had to ask themselves was whether it was necessary to have a new Constitution. It was the third in five years. Were they setting a good precedent?

Apparently Uganda was making good progress and he had not heard any Minister say he was being held up because he was being hampered by the Constitution. If that was the case why was it necessary to have a new Constitution?

We should not change our Constitutions in the way some men change their shirts. The Constitution should be a document of great sanctity. We should respect it and we should abide by it.

**ABU MAYANJA (UPC, Kyagwe N.E.) Uganda Argus 6th July**

A constitution which would suit Uganda should be a flexible one, which would be easy to amend.

**ABBAS BALINDA (UPC Ankole S.E.) U.A. 13th July**

Mr. Luande said that the President had spoken about a revolution in the country that was still going on. Were they going to have a new Constitution every time there was a revolution?

**H. M. LUANDE (Ind. Kampala E) U.A. 29th July**

### **INCREASING PRESIDENTIAL POWERS**

We want to pin down the responsibility. Now the President is the final authority. If things are going to go wrong-we know him. If a minister forgets to do something, the President cannot turn round and say 'I was advised' or 'I was not advised.' Either the man resigns or he takes the rap for it.

**DR. J. LUYIMBAZI-ZAKE (Acting Attorney General) U.A. 24th June**

Turning to civil liberties, our rights could be suspended summarily under the proposals and there was no recourse to the courts to find out why they had been suspended.

This was the biggest indication of autocracy. The members were giving the President power to appoint everybody, dismiss everybody, nominate one third of the Parliament and detain them in the bargain....

Mr. Nekyon said the proposals provided for an autocracy or an African-type of democracy. Which prevailed would depend on the person who held the office of President.

The concentration of powers in one person was not completely justified. Some of the powers given to the President were excessive. There should be a balance between the office of President and the judiciary, and the system of Parliament.

**A.A. NEKYON (UPC, Lango S.E.) U.A. 30th June**

Mr. Mayanja said he was not suggesting that at present power would be used irresponsibly.

There was sustained laughter in the House when Mr. Mayanja pointed out that Muslims believe that on the day of judgement an angel read out an indictment-but that at least the person concerned had a chance to defend himself. Even God did not assume such powers as were envisaged under the Constitution.....

We are not here to govern this country like savages. We are not going to reject the standards which have been accepted by the rest of the civilised world. We are part and parcel of the civilised community. We are not going to justify autocracy and the granting of dangerous powers on the grounds that Uganda is backward and cannot have a civilised government.

**ABU MAYANJA (UPC, Kyagwe N.E.)**

**U.A., 6th & 7th July**

'I love the present President. He knows me thoroughly and I know him intimately.' He was not a machine, but even in machines there were limitations.

Mr. Obwangor said that in his opinion it would be unfair to impose all the powers of the State on him. The essential factor in a modern state was the balance of power. It would be ridiculous if the Constituent Assembly vested all the powers in one man.

He strongly felt that the office of Prime Minister should be created. He should be the head of government to assist the President. The creation of such an office would relieve the President and would leave him with the work pertaining to such an important office.

Mr. Obwangor suggested that the principle of collective responsibility between the Cabinet Ministers and the President should be held to.

**CUTHBERT OBWANGOR (Min. of Plan. and Econ. Dev.)**

**U.A. 11th July**

Mr. Obonyo referred to a remark made by the acting Attorney-General, Dr. Luyimbazi-Zake, in his speech that by giving powers to the President it would be possible to lay the

blame to the President if things went wrong.

Mr. Obonyo felt that it would be better for Parliament or the Cabinet to be blamed for any wrong decisions than to leave the President to shoulder the burden. Standing on a point of information, Dr. Zake said that what he had said was that if the proposals were passed, it would now be possible to trace the source of authority.

**J. H. OBONYO (D.P. Acholi S.E.) U.A. 20th July**

### **NOMINATED MPs**

The system of presidential elections could bring into that important office a person who is not a true representative of the people. As that same person is empowered to nominate up to 27 Members of Parliament, that meant that key Ministries could also go to some of those nominated persons who were not true representatives of the people. The country could then end up by being ruled by those people who were not representatives of the people.

**A. LATIM (Leader of Opposition) U.A. 27th June**

It was not democracy for the President to nominate 30 members of the House. It would be better for him to nominate all the Members of Parliament so that the country would clearly know that it was a dictatorship. If a man was nominated he was bound to be a 'yes man.' This was a clear step back to the dark days.

**H.M. LUANDE (Ind. Kampala E.) U.A. 29th June**

As far as the people nominated by the President were concerned, some people had said they would not be stooges, but what else could they be? They would be the remnants of the politicians who had failed at the polls.

If the purpose of bringing these 27 people was to bring stability to the country, then it was better to find some other way. There were only a limited number of people available who could maintain the dignity of the House.

**A.A. NEKYON (UPC, Lango S.E.) U.A. 30th June**

Mr. Obwangor disapproved of the section which provided for nominated members whom he described as political failures. If someone fails at the vote, let him not poke his nose in this noble House, Mr. Obwangor said amid cheers from both sides of the House.

**C. OBWANGOR (Min. of Planning and Econ. Dev.)**

**U.A. 8th July**

There were strong reasons why it was decided that the President should be given those powers. He was allowed to nominate up to 27 Members because of stability. They did not want a Government with a majority of, say, one as recently happened in one of the West African countries.

**P. MUNYAGWA-NSIBIRWA (Dep. Min. Info, Broad. & Tourism)**

**U.A. 27th July**

### **PREVENTIVE DETENTION**

When the detention act came into being, it was not pick and choose, one did not know who would come first. It is like death, and you don't want to play with death.

**E. M. MULIRA (UPC, Mengo North) U.A. 30th June**

Preventive detention was a double-edged sword. It prevented a crime that was feared it if were used properly, but it could also create the commission of that offence if it were wrongly used.

If a man were detained because he was trying to subvert the country, it was only proper that he should be brought to trial, but if he was going to be kept indefinitely, then Mr. Nekyon thought that what Uganda was trying to prevent would instead be caused by other people who may think they might be detained as well.

Preventive detention, unless used correctly, would spread discontent. To detain one man meant to detain six, because his friends and family would become discontented.

To go on detaining more and more people would mean a spread to the point where preventive detention could no longer be effective because one had detained three million out of seven and a half already.

At that point the Constitution would be changed by force. This was nature's provision for human rights-human nature. He believed that the President and police were being given power to eliminate serious political opponents systematically, and he did not think this was the answer, even when power is wanted.

**A.A. NEKYON (UPC, Lango S.E.) U.A. 30th June**

Turning to the section which deals with the protection of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms of the Individual, Mr. Mayanja said that as a veteran nationalist one of the most serious indictments against the colonialists was the deprivation of some of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual. But still there were some rights which the colonialists guaranteed, and added that it was disappointing that even those rights and freedoms which were enjoyed during colonial times were going to be taken away by the present proposals. He described the move as a shame.

**ABU MAYANJA (UPC, Kyagwe N.E.) U.A. 6th July**

What a shame that Members of Parliament should be asked by our President to give him powers to detain us and after he had done so to give him powers not to be taken to a court of law.

**J. W. KIWANUKA (UPC, Mubende N.) U.A. 14th July**

He had also suggested in 1963 that if people attempted to cause trouble in the country a detention act should be passed to deal with them. (He said) Today I am very happy that the Government has seen fit to bring about my dream. I am happy that it is now going to not be only my idea but the idea of the entire nation. Mr. Lakidi hoped all Members would support it. It had not been introduced lightly by the Government, but only after a lot of thought. The Government had been thinking about it since 1963. If we had in the 1962 Constitution a section about a detention act in it I am sure Sir Edward Mutesa would be still here today. I embrace this article (on detention) as mine, because I was the first person to come out with it.

**E. Y. LAKIDI (Min. of State, Public Serv. and Cab. Affairs)**  
**U.A. 15th July**

Detention is bad. It is very bad. There was nobody in the Government who did not think it was bad. But there was a significant responsibility to construct a platform or foundation for the millions of people in Uganda.

**DR. A. MILTON OBOTE (The President)**  
**U.A. 7th September**

## **ABOLITION OF KINGSHIP AND FEDERALISM**

This is the end of the road of the Federation, and the beginning of a unitary system of government.

**DR. A. MILTON OBOTE (The President) U.A. 23rd June**

Mr. Kalema called upon the people of Buganda to put their loyalty in Uganda and not their tribe. We are all the same people. In the new proposals there is no such thing as northern region or east or Buganda or western region. These proposals are trying to build a strong Uganda and a strong government so that progress can be made. He hoped the time would come when they would go back to the old African tradition of leadership, when the leaders sat together and discussed problems, and not across a room to oppose one another.

**W.W. KALEMA (Min. of Commerce and Industry)**  
**U.A. 29th June**

In the Kingdoms there had been a ready-made system for providing for peace, order and good government—the three things African governments found it most difficult to obtain. The chiefs were accepted by the people as the representatives of the king. What was needed was not to reject kings, but to rechannel the loyalty to them to wider issues of nation building.

**E.M. K. MULIRA (UPC, Mengo N.)**  
**U.A. 30th June**  
**U.A. 28th June**

There were those who thought that in order to achieve true national unity there should be only one loyalty to the State or the Republic of Uganda. There were others who conceived of loyalty in a series of spreading out circles. Mr. Mayanja believed that in achieving true national unity, loyalty should not be exclusive of all other loyalties. He pointed out that what the Government was trying to do was to unite different entities which existed before Uganda was invented. Therefore those who pretended that all Ugandans were the same and that the tribes did not exist were unrealistic. Therefore, the devised Constitution should take into account all the peculiar circumstances of the country's situation. He prayed that the Members in making the Constitution, should not do so at the expense of losing our peculiar geniuses.

I deny we have the mandate to abolish kings for the reason we pledged ourselves to safeguard kings and hereditary rulers. That is how we were elected.

**ABU MAYANJA (UPC. Kyagwe N.E.) U.A. 6th-7th July**

The proposal to rid the country of kingship and privileged classes seemed interesting and tempting. But how did they propose to do it without introducing a "super kingship" by creating a privileged class? If Members of Parliament had their homes guarded and were always accompanied by the army when on tour, was that not a privilege?

**M. A. OKELO (DP, West Nile and Madi) U.A. 1st July**

He would like to support the Constitution because there were so many things he agreed with. [He said:] I cannot however sign a death warrant for kingship, because it would be tantamount to writing one's own obituary.

**E.MULIRA (UPC, Mengo North) U.A. 1st July,**

In a small country like Uganda, with many tribes and dialects that had been retained through generations to preserve identities, a combination of Presidential and Cabinet Government from the centre overseeing strong local governments in four provinces would be more acceptable to the various components, temperaments and customs, Dr. Sembeguya suggested. A large measure of autonomy should be accorded to four provincial councils. The centre would be responsible for foreign affairs defence, finance and policy. Ministers would be concerned with supervising overall policies.

**DR. F.G. SEMBEGUYA (UPC, Special) Elected Daily Nation ,4th July,**

It was unfair to ask a person who comes from the part of the country where there were no kings whether kingships should be retained.

**B. BYANYIMA (DP, Ankole N.E) 3 U.A. 12th July,**

He disagreed with those who suggested that Members who come from areas where there were no kings should not discuss kingships. All members were entitled to discuss any national issues and to vote over them.

**ABBAS K. BALINDA (UPC, Ankole SE.) U.A. 14th July,**

To have a king as President had not proved satisfactory in the past. With kingships there are double loyalties. This is what we don't want. We don't want two masters when we have only one destiny.

**F.Y. LAKIDI (Min. of State, Public Serv. & Cabinet Affairs)**

**U.A. 15th July,**

## **PARTIAL ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONSITITUTION**

To say the Constitution must be the supreme law was good, but it was not sufficient. Nobody, apart from the President should be exempt from the provisions of the Constitution. Everybody, including Ministers and officials must obey it. Mr. Obwangor told the House: I want to be given the right as a citizen of Uganda to arrest a Minister who does not obey the law.

**C. OBWANGOR (Min. of Planning & Econ. Dev.) U.A. 8th July,**

## **OFFICIAL LANGUAGE**

According to the proposals, the country's official language would be English. He hoped that Members would not spend unnecessary time over that matter by asking when there should be a switch to Swahili. To those, I would say why not change over to Gujarati because Swahili was no nearer to us than Gujarati.

**DR. J. LUYIMBAZI-ZAKE (Acting Attorney-General ) U.A. 24th June,**

Dealing with the official language, he said it should remain English. There were enough problems without creating the difficulty of having a new language as the official one. Mr. Mulira interjected and said that he meant that Luganda should become the second language. [Mr. Odaka replied:] If there was ever to be a second language, it should be French.

**SAM ODAKA (Minister of Foreign Affairs) U.A. 6th July,**

## **DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY**

He did not mind people saying it was a good thing to have Parliamentary democracy, or even a great thing. But he stressed there was no point in pretending that Uganda was at a stage where

full Parliamentary democracy could obtain, because there were certain matters that came with it that were lacking in Uganda. These things had become effective in certain states in the world after many years of trial and error, and many upheavals. But they did not just come like that. Uganda must be prepared to go through years of trial and error in order to get them. Many countries of the world were in various transitional stages. It could not be achieved by wishful thinking.

**DR. A. MILTON OBOTE (The President) U.A. 23rd June,**

He was aware that no government could continue to rule indefinitely without the consent and support of the people. That was why they were also taking steps that would give material benefit to the people. There was no need to sing liberty and democracy when the people in the country were starving.....

A Parliamentary system of democracy must be a guided system. It was not true to say people in the House were not competent to choose, discuss and enact a Constitution.

The Cabinet had decided to reject a proposal that the President should be elected by the people of the country directly. The proposed method of electing the President, where members state their choice when they were nominated as a Parliamentary candidate, with the person who has the majority of votes being elected, was the best way. If the President were directly elected, the supremacy of Parliament would be challenged.....

On the basis of theory alone there was no reason why the President should not be directly elected. It was easy to say that political parties could put up presidential candidates and elections could be conducted on a party basis. But it was not difficult to conceive of a situation where there could be five different parties all derived from tribal considerations. Where there was a one party system, or where the tribal considerations were not strong, as in Kenya or Tanzania, then it was possible to have a directly elected President. The first thing

to do in Uganda was to try and create a situation which would enable the people to elect future presidents purely on national considerations.

**F.ONAMA (Minister of Defence) U.A. 27th-28th June,**

Mr. Oda said that he was not in the House as a representative of the people. He had been elected by the President on April 15 last year, as had every other member of the House. Since May 6 this year the mandate of every elected member of the House had expired.

**G.O. B. ODA (DP, W. Nile & Madi W.) U.A. 28th June**

Winding up, Mr. Mayanja underlined the fact that democratic government, of which he was unashamedly a supporter, could not be created by writing a Constitution. Ultimately, democracy did not reside in the Constitution, but in the hearts and minds of the people.

**ABU MAYANJA (UPC, Kyagwe N.E.) U.A. 8th July**

Democracy did not work anywhere. Some people confused democracy with general elections. He said that if Uganda decided not to have a general election for a generation it was up to it. He referred to the political situation in many European countries, where there had been no elections or real elections for years.

**VINCENT RWAMWARO (Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs)**

**U.A. 15th July**

Interjecting on a point of information, Mr. M. A. Okelo (DP West Nile and Madi Central) said that the people of Uganda were not asking anybody to give them liberties. The liberties were given to them by God and what was needed was to preserve them. Mr. Kisekka said that he did not want to suggest that liberties should be a licence for Uganda citizens to misbehave or indulge in subversive activities.

**ALI KISEKKA (UPC, Mengo S.) U.A. 18th July**

Mr. Obonyo said certain individuals could be called bad, but this did not mean that the institution of kingship as such was bad. When the DP wanted to revise anything regarding institutions, they would go back to the people who were wiser than they were and ask their views.

**J.H. OBONYO (DP, Acholi S.E.) U.A. 20th July**

It was not the masses who caused chaos. It was not the masses who had brought shame on Africa. It was those who sought in the Parliament of Africa and those who saw the inside of universities and those who had seen the light of modern society. These were the people who had given Africa her present shape. It was such people as these who would not hesitate to see that an African state was plunged into difficulties in the hope that these difficulties would provide them with personal advantages.

**DR. A. MILTON OBOTE (The President) U.A. 7th September**

**GOVERNMENT AMENDMENTS TO ITS CONSTITUTION PROPOSALS**

The President told reporters at a press conference that there were no fundamental changes to the original proposals put forward by the Government. We want one people in Uganda, one destiny, for the people, one country, one parliament, and one government. When the Constituent Assembly meets again next Tuesday, he would answer the general points made in the debate. But he explained that 53 amendments had been agreed by the Government- some of them structural, while others were completely new ideas.

**DR. A. MILTON OBOTE (The President) U.A. 30th August**

Although the Government amendments meet some of our wishes, they do not go far enough.

Referring to the President's recent speech stressing his belief in political parties, the publicity secretary said there was no reason why the present Government did not accept our proposal for the recognition of an official opposition so long as there is a party in Opposition to Government in Parliament.

The Democratic Party proposed that before the start of the proposed new Constitution there should be a general election because the term of office of the present Parliament has expired and to prolong the life of the present Parliament is tantamount to taking away the powers of the electors.

**PAUL SSEMWOGERERE (Publicity Secretary D.P.)**

**U.A. 4th September**

Members had not had sufficient time to consider the constitutional amendment proposals. Mr. Oda said that the House had risen last month so that the Government could prepare amendments to the existing proposals. Nearly all the members had already given their views, and it remained only for the mover of the motion to reply to them. It is very important that before we discuss the very important issues implied in the Constitution, we should have time to examine them.

He appealed to the Government to withdraw the motion. It had been said last month that not only members of the House, but also the public would be given time to study the amendments. These proposals were not in our hands until two days ago.

**G.B. ODA (D.P., West Nile & Madi West) U.A. 7th September**

## **ATMOSPHERE OF THE DEBATE**

We have been travelling along a narrow and twisty road. This road is the best road. Let every citizen support the building of it.

**DR. A. MILTON OBOTE (The President) U.A. 23rd June**

There were going to be many words spoken- 'zillions of words"- across the floor of the House about the proposals, and each member was going to try and persuade the others that his was the right way to do it. I want to ask members that we should not talk with malice but take things with an open mind, because we must feel humble in the face of the magnitude of the job that lies before us.

**DR. J. LUYIMBAZI-ZAKE (Acting Attorney-General)**  
**U.A. 24th June**

We on this side of the House are few, but in spite of that we shall do our best and we shall speak without fear....

They had said that the Buganda Emergency should be lifted. They had said that the representatives of the people should be free to talk to the masses of the people they represented. But all this had not been given to them. People were in fear. The people could not express their views freely. A Member of Parliament had been quoted as saying he feared giving an opinion about the new proposals. If he could say that, how many more people outside could say it? This house is fearing to tell the truth. If a Member of Parliament is frightened to comment, how many people in the country are afraid to express their views?

**A.A. LATIM (Opposition Leader) U.A. 24th June**

The mere fact that the Government had brought the Constitutional proposals in this way indicated that the Government also believed that some of the proposals could be rejected and the House should have freedom to say what it wanted about each and every one. Party considerations were one reason why the proposals were difficult to debate. The members should be speaking as representatives of their constituents.

If this were the case, they could see what was the right thing to include and what would please some people. If the proposals were being debated on a party basis, then there was only need for two members to speak: one from each party. There could not be 82 members speaking on party matters...

I think we should speak as if there were no government now, no parliament now, no president now, and no judiciary now, because the Constitution is meant not only for today's government but for tomorrow's government and the government after that.

Another reason why the proposals were difficult to debate was that it appeared that certain members of the House were now under the impression that they were in real danger of being attacked by the security forces at any time because of their views.

The sense of fear should be removed if the Constitution was going to be a good guide to the country for the future.

**A.A. NEKYON (UPC, Lango S.E.) U.A. 30th June**

Shortly after Mr. Mulira had begun resuming his speech, the Minister of Defence, Mr. Felix Onama entered the chamber together with Dr. P. Kigundu, Mr. Onama indicated to Dr. Kigundu the Government benches, and accompanied by cheers he took his seat on that side. Dr. Kigundu, a specially elected member, was a member of the now defunct Kabaka Yekka party until May last year. At one time he sat on the Government benches, but later crossed to the Opposition benches. After the new Constitution was introduced in May last year he was the only former KY to remain on the Opposition side calling himself an independent. His crossing follows that of another former KY member, Mrs. Florence Lubega.

**Uganda Argus 1st July**

Mr. Okelo said the opposition had not been afraid to speak their minds and would never be afraid to speak, even in the face of threats. They would sooner die. [He said] We will defend this principle against all comers. The ship of freedom is being torpedoed, and Ugandans are waiting to see what we, their elected representatives, are going to do to save the ship.

**M.A. OKELO (D.P., West Nile & Madi) U.A. 1st July**

He read in full a letter to members of the Government side signed by the Chief Whip. This stated that members absenting themselves from the House without permission would be causing subversion, and no member should oppose or vote against the proposals. The letter stated that as far as he (the Chief Whip) was concerned, opposition had been dealt with at a Parliamentary group meeting, and members who opposed the proposals would be liable to be dealt with severely. We can now see what sort of Parliament we have got.

**M.A. OKELO (D.P., West Nile and Madi) U.A. 1st July**

Dr. Sembeguya criticised Government MP's whose "insulting and threatening" interjections during the past week's debates in the Constituent Assembly suggested that, already having prior knowledge of the proposals, they were intent on seeing that they were bulldozed through the Assembly.

**DR. F. G. SEMBEGUYA (UPC, Specially Elected) Daily Nation  
4th July**

As a Constituent Assembly, they represented not political parties but the nation as a whole. When the Constitution is enacted, it would be enacted by the whole National Assembly collectively.

**CUTHBERT OBWANGOR (Min. of Planning & Econ. Dev.)  
U.A. 8th July**

I do not consider that the view that has been expressed in the Constituent Assembly that Members should consider the Constitutional proposals as individuals representing constituencies is valid or correct. The Constituent Assembly itself provides for a Minister responsible for the Government proposals. This in my view does not mean that the Government-having worked out proposals-one Minister should then be selected to be responsible while others take the position of tearing up what are supposed to be proposals worked out by the Government as a whole. I find that if that was to be the position, we should have provided in the Constituent Assembly Act that every Member had to speak as an individual and to bring such proposals as he thought fit on his own. In doing so we should have provided for the method of bringing together the different points of view. As matters stand, however, it is the Government that has made proposals before the Constituent Assembly and it is the Government that is responsible to consider each and every view expressed by non-Government Members. The Ministers' place in proposing which parts of the proposals should be amended is certainly-in my view-not the Constituent Assembly but the Cabinet Room.

**DR. A. MILTON OBOTE (The President) U.A. 12th July**  
**Letter to Obwangor after his dismissal from Cabinet.**

Discussing the Opposition's proposal that there should be recognition of the post of Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Katiti, asked where was the Opposition. They were not significantly represented in the House.

Mr. Okelo informed the House that an effective Opposition did not depend on numbers alone. Although they were few, they had saved the country from catastrophe on more than one occasion.

On another point of information, Mr. Shafiq Arain (UPC Specially Elected) said there was also the question of how seriously the Opposition took their responsibility. Instead of being in the House to discuss the proposals, the named Leader of the Opposition was away in America attending some "schoolboy seminar."

The Minister of Defence, Mr. Felix Onama, added that the Opposition had not contributed constructively to the affairs of the nation. They had merely opposed for the sake of opposing. Resuming, the Minister thanked Government speakers for their information.

**C. B. KATITI (Minister of Cult. & Comm. Dev.)**  
**U.A. 19th July**

Mr. Obonyo did not see why the Government should abolish the official Opposition. He recalled the days when the now Minister of Health, Mr. J. W. Lwamafa, was a member of the Opposition during the colonial government. Mr. Lwamafa, on a point of information, said in those days the Opposition was effective and dynamic. This was not the case today.

**J. H. OBONYO (D.P., Acholi S.E.) U.A. 20th July**

Dr. Obote said the Assembly was very representative and before there could be elections there had to be a Constitution that was well known by the people. Uganda was probably making history in Africa by having its proposals debated so openly.

**DR. A. MILTON OBOTE (The President) E.A. Standard**  
**5th August**