



REPUBLIC OF KENYA

ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT – FOURTH SESSION

THE SENATE

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 2016 AT 2.30 P.M.

1. The Senate assembled at thirty minutes past Two O'clock.
2. The Proceedings were opened with Prayer said by the Speaker.
3. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CHAIR**

The Speaker conveyed the following Communications from the Chair-

a) Processing of the Physical Planning Bill (National Assembly Bill No.46 of 2015) and other Bills from the National Assembly

"Honourable Senators, as you will recall, at the sitting of the Senate held on 16th February, 2016, I issued a Communication delivering a Message from the National Assembly regarding the passage of the Physical Planning Bill, National Assembly Bills No. 46 of 2015, by the National Assembly. In the Communication, I informed Honourable Senators that the Speaker of the National Assembly did not seek the concurrence of the Senate as contemplated under Article 110(3) of the Constitution on whether the Physical Planning Bill concerns counties and if it does, whether it is a special or ordinary Bill.

Honourable Senators, Article 110(3) of the Constitution provides that "*before either House considers a Bill, the Speakers of the National Assembly and the Senate shall jointly resolve any question as to whether it is a Bill concerning counties and, if it is, whether it is a special or an ordinary Bill*".

Upon delivering the Communication, the Senate Majority Leader, Senator Moses Wetang'ula, rose on a Point of Order and sought the guidance of the Chair on the effect of Article 110(3) of the Constitution and, in particular, whether this provision could apply retrospectively where a Bill, for which concurrence was not sought, is processed in one House and submitted to the other House for processing. Senator Wetang'ula argued that if this was allowed, and in particular, if the Physical Planning Bill was allowed to proceed

despite the violation of Article 110(3) of the Constitution, the Senate would undermine its own authority and that of the Speaker of the Senate. The Senator therefore took the view that the provision could not apply retrospectively.

A number of Honourable Senators rose on Points of Order to speak to this matter including Senator Ong'era, Senator (Prof.) Lonyangapuo, Senator Njoroge, Senator (Dr.) Machage, Senator Mong'are, Senator Khaniri, Senator (Dr.) Zani, Senator Mutula Kilonzo Jr., Senator Ongoro, Senator Abdirahman, Senator Orengo and Senator Elachi. In their submissions, all the Senators took the view that Article 110(3) of the Constitution ought to be adhered to and concluded before a Bill is proceeded with in either House. Consequently, in respect of the Physical Planning Bill, some Senators urged the Speaker to find that the Bill could not be proceeded with until corrective measures were taken.

Having heard the submissions of the Honourable Senators, on account of the gravity of the issues raised, I undertook to deliver a ruling on the matter before the Bill is scheduled for Second Reading.

Honourable Senators, the issues arising requiring the direction of the Chair are as follows –

- (a) whether or not Article 110(3) of the Constitution can be applied retrospectively; and
- (b) the manner in which a House should proceed with a Bill in respect of which Article 110(3) of the Constitution was not complied with.

Honourable Senators, these issues have continued to recur in respect of the processing of legislation as between the two Houses in our bicameral Parliament. These questions have however not been restricted to the Legislature. It is important that I state that the compliance or otherwise by Parliament, and in particular the National Assembly, with Article 110(3) of the Constitution has arisen in various cases before the Courts.

It has therefore become necessary that the Speaker of the Senate gives guidance on these matters for the general guidance of the Senate of the Eleventh Parliament and for posterity. Posterity will judge the Office of the Speaker of the Senate and the Senate as a whole harshly if these matters are not put on record at this early stage in the life of the Senate.

Honourable Senators, the first issue relates to "*whether or not Article 110(3) of the Constitution can be applied retrospectively*". This, Honourable Senators, is a straight forward matter. Article 110(3) of the Constitution is required to precede the introduction of a Bill in either House of Parliament. It must therefore, for all Bills, be complied with before a Bill is read a First Time in either House. It is not an optional or discretionary provision. The Supreme

Court in Supreme Court Advisory Opinion No. 2 of 2013 had opportunity to pronounce itself on this matter as follows –

the requirement for a joint resolution of the question whether a Bill is one concerning counties, is a mandatory one; and the legislative path is well laid out: it starts with a determination of the question by either Speaker – depending on the origin of the Bill; such a determination is communicated to the other Speaker, with a view to obtaining concurrence; failing a concurrence, the two Speakers are to jointly resolve the question...the legislative path thus laid out should apply to each and every Bill coming up before either Chamber of Parliament; and it is the constitutional task of the two Speakers to jointly determine the route to be followed by legislative proposals.

Honourable Senators, despite the express provisions of Article 110(3) of the Constitution and the pronouncement of the Supreme Court, the National Assembly has, on almost every occasion, failed to observe Article 110(3) of the Constitution.

The upshot of all this, Honourable Senators, is that Article 110(3) of the Constitution cannot be applied retrospectively, if it must be conclusively observed before a Bill is introduced in either House of Parliament

Honourable Senators, the second issue requiring my direction is "*the manner in which a House should proceed with a Bill in respect of which Article 110(3) of the Constitution was not complied with*". In order to comprehensively address this issue, it is important that I set out various scenarios that have confronted the Senate with respect to the processing of Bills and the manner in which the Senate has and should proceed in each of the scenarios.

The first scenario is where, in respect of a Bill originating in the Senate, the Speaker of the Senate, in terms of Article 110(3) of the Constitution seeks the concurrence of the Speaker of the National Assembly on the nature of the Bill and the Speaker of the National Assembly concurs with the Speaker of the Senate.

In this case, the legislative process would proceed as anticipated in Part 4 of Chapter Eight of the Constitution.

The second scenario which has also presented itself is where, in respect of a Bill originating in the Senate, the Speaker of the Senate, in terms of Article 110(3) of the Constitution seeks the concurrence of the Speaker of the National Assembly on the nature of the Bill and the Speaker of the National Assembly fails to respond within a period of seven days as contemplated under standing order 118(4) of the Senate Standing Orders.

Standing order 118(4) of the Senate Standing Orders provides that "*where, upon the expiry of seven days from the day of the communication under*

paragraph (1) or such further time as the Speaker of the Senate may in any particular case determine, no communication has been received from the Speaker of the National Assembly as to either concur or differ that the Bill is a Bill concerning counties and, if it is, whether it is a special or an ordinary Bill, the Speaker of the Senate shall direct that the Bill may be Read a First time in accordance with these Standing Orders”.

Consequently, in accordance with this standing order, the Senate would proceed to process the Bill in accordance with Part 4 of Chapter Eight of the Constitution, and the Speakers of the Houses and the Houses themselves would be estopped from subsequently raising any question regarding the nature of the Bill in terms of Article 110(3) of the Constitution.

The third scenario is where, in respect of a Bill originating in the Senate, the Speaker of the Senate, in terms of Article 110(3) of the Constitution seeks the concurrence of the Speaker of the National Assembly on the nature of the Bill and the Speaker of the National Assembly does not concur with the Speaker of the Senate on the nature of the Bill.

Although Article 110(3) of the Constitution requires the Speakers of the Houses of Parliament to jointly resolve any question on the nature of a Bill, standing order 126(1) of the Senate Standing Orders provides an additional mechanism by which *“for the purpose of making a determination whether or not a Bill concerns county government, the Speakers may appoint a joint committee to advise them in resolving any question on such a Bill”.*

The Supreme Court also further stated as follows, with respect to the formation of a joint committee –

“It is clear to us, from a broad purposive view of the Constitution, that the intent of the drafters, as regards the exercise of legislative powers, was that any disagreement as to the nature of a Bill should be harmoniously settled through mediation. An obligation is thus placed on the two Speakers, where they cannot agree between themselves, to engage the mediation mechanism. They would each be required to appoint an equal number of members, who would deliberate upon the question, and file their report within a specified period of time. It is also possible for the two Chambers to establish a standing mediation committee, to deliberate upon and to resolve any disputes regarding the path of legislation to be adopted for different subject-matter. Had such an approach to the dispute been adopted, it is our opinion, this Court would probably not have been asked to give an Advisory Opinion, as a fitting solution would most likely have been found.”

Where, as has been the case, all efforts are made by the Senate towards the establishment of the joint committee with no action or response from the National Assembly, standing order 118(4) of the Senate Standing Orders would then apply and the Senate would be entitled to proceed with the processing of

the Bill in accordance with Part 4 of Chapter Eight of the Constitution. Thereafter, neither the Houses nor the Speakers can raise an issue regarding the nature of the Bill.

The fourth scenario is where, in respect of a Bill originating in the National Assembly, the Speaker of the National Assembly, in terms of Article 110(3) of the Constitution, seeks the concurrence of the Speaker of the Senate on the nature of the Bill and the Speaker of the Senate concurs with the Speaker of the National Assembly on the nature of the Bill.

In this case, no further issue arises as to concurrence and the legislative process would proceed as anticipated in Part 4 of Chapter Eight of the Constitution.

The fifth scenario is where, in respect of a Bill originating in the National Assembly, the Speaker of the National Assembly, in terms of Article 110(3) of the Constitution, seeks the concurrence of the Speaker of the Senate on the nature of the Bill, the Speaker of the Senate does not concur with the Speaker of the National Assembly on the nature of the Bill but the National Assembly nonetheless, without further reference to the Senate, proceeds to consider the Bill only in the National Assembly and to process it for assent.

There is no doubt, Honourable Senators, that such process contravenes Article 110(3) of the Constitution. You will recall that the Senate was, in November, 2014, confronted with this issue with respect to forty-six Acts of Parliament that had been processed and assented to otherwise than in accordance with Article 110(3) of the Constitution. The Senators, by a resolution adopted by this House on 11th November, 2014, resolved to seek an advisory opinion from the Supreme Court on, among other matters, *"the constitutional status of Acts of Parliament which have been passed by one House of Parliament and assented to in contravention of Article 110(3) of the Constitution"*.

In accordance with that resolution, for every Bill processed by the National Assembly in violation of Article 110(3) of the Constitution, the Senate reserves the right to challenge the legislation on account of such violation.

The sixth scenario is where, in respect of a Bill originating in the National Assembly, the Speaker of the National Assembly does not seek the concurrence of the Speaker of the Senate in terms of Article 110(3) of the Constitution and the National Assembly proceeds to consider the Bill only in the National Assembly and subsequently processes it for assent.

This clearly violates Article 110(3) of the Constitution. As is the case in the fifth scenario, it would be open to the Senate to challenge the legislation on account of such violation.

The seventh scenario is where, in respect of a Bill originating in the National Assembly, the Speaker of the National Assembly, in terms of Article 110(3) of

the Constitution, seeks the concurrence of the Speaker of the Senate on the nature of the Bill, the Speaker of the Senate does not concur with the Speaker of the National Assembly on the nature of the Bill but, despite this, the National Assembly proceeds to consider the Bill and subsequently refers it to the Senate for consideration.

This, Honourable Senators, has happened in a number of instances and has presented challenges on the manner in which the Senate is to proceed. The first and perhaps more natural option would be to do nothing on the legislation, to take no action whatsoever, on account of the legislation having been processed in violation of Article 110(3) of the Constitution, thus leading to a deadlock. In the process, key legislation, including legislation required for the implementation and strengthening of devolution and for the implementation of the Constitution, which is time bound, would stall. Taking into account the Senate's role under Article 96 of the Constitution relating to the protection of the counties and their interests, this would not augur well.

The Senate has therefore, in light of the fact that the legislation forwarded by the National Assembly nonetheless concerned counties and required to be processed through the Senate, chosen the route of mitigation of the harm that would otherwise be caused if the legislative process were to stall on such crucial legislation.

As your Speaker, I have however, in all such instances, put on record, our reservations concerning the lack of compliance with Article 110(3) of the Constitution while noting that despite the mitigating actions taken by the Senate, the legislation may still be challenged on account of its constitutionality.

The eighth scenario is where, in respect of a Bill originating in the National Assembly, the Speaker of the National Assembly does not seek the concurrence of the Speaker of the Senate in terms of Article 110(3) of the Constitution and the National Assembly proceeds to consider the Bill and subsequently, despite the lack of observance of Article 110(3) of the Constitution, proceeds to refer the Bill to the Senate for consideration.

Honourable Senators, the action to be taken by the Senate would be the same as that in the previous scenario.

Honourable Senators, having set out the different scenarios, it is important that I give directions on the manner in which we shall proceed with the Physical Planning Bill, 2015.

As I indicated in the last communication on this matter, the National Assembly did not observe the concurrence process under Article 110(3) of the Constitution before the introduction of the Bill in the National Assembly. The National Assembly has, however, found it fit to forward the Bill to the Senate.

In light of the matters that I have set out in this Communication, the Senate shall proceed with the consideration of the Physical Planning Bill, 2015 at the Second Reading of the Bill at the appropriate time.

I thank you."

b) Visiting students and teachers from Mogotio Girls High School

"Honorable Senators,

I wish to recognize the presence of visiting students and teachers from Mogotio Girls High School in Baringo County. They are seated in the Public gallery.

In our usual tradition of receiving and welcoming visitors to Parliament, I extend a warm welcome to them and, on behalf of the Senate and on my own behalf, wish them a fruitful visit.

I thank you."

4. PAPER LAID

The following Paper was laid on the Table of the Senate-

Statement regarding the Business of the Senate for the week commencing Tuesday, 29th March, 2016.

(The Senate Deputy Majority Leader)

5. NOTICE OF MOTION – (The Senate Majority Leader)

THAT, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 28 (4), the Senate resolves to alter its Calendar in respect of the First Part of the Fourth Session for the recess to commence on Friday, 1st April and sittings to resume on Tuesday, 12th April, 2016.

6. STATEMENTS

Statements pursuant to Standing Order 45(2) (b)

- a) The Vice-Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries issued a statement on acute food shortage in West Pokot County. In the statement the Vice-Chairperson informed the House that on the basis of the assessment by the Kenya Food Security Steering Group (KFSSG), it was estimated that about 20,000 people required food assistance in West Pokot. This was as a result of a combination of factors such as poverty, high malnutrition in children due to poor care practices, and insecurity in some areas.

The Vice-Chairperson further informed the House that the strategic food reserve (SFR) maize had been pre-positioned strategically in the nearest NCPB depots, to enable relief distribution agencies and relief provision government depots to access the maize for distribution to the affected population.

- b) The Vice-Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries issued a statement on supply of fertilizer and other farm inputs by the National Cereals and Produce Board (NCPB) to farmers ahead of the planting season. In the statement, the Vice-Chairperson informed the House that the distribution of fertilizer was hampered by delays in exchequer funds, which had since been released in January, 2016.

The Vice-Chairperson further informed the House that as at 23rd March, 2016, 23,000 metric tons of fertilizer had been received in the country, and was under distribution to various NCPB depots countrywide. To avert delays in distribution of fertilizer in subsequent years, the Government was in the process of establishing fertilizer and seed development funds.

- c) The Senator for West Pokot County (Sen. (Prof.) John Lonyangapuo) requested a statement from the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Finance, Commerce and Budget concerning failure by County Governments to pay for goods and services supplied by suppliers.
- d) The Senator for Trans Nzoia County (Sen. Henry Ndiema) requested a statement from the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on National Security and Foreign Relations regarding vetting committees in the issuance of national identification cards in Trans Nzoia County.

Statement pursuant to Standing Order 45(2) (c)

The Senate Deputy Majority Leader issued a Statement of the business of the Senate for the week commencing 22nd March 2016.

7. MOTION- ALTERATION OF THE SENATE CALENDAR FOR THE FIRST PART OF THE FOURTH SESSION

Motion made and Question proposed

THAT, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 28 (4), the Senate resolves to alter its Calendar in respect of the First Part of the Fourth Session for the recess to commence on Friday, 1st April and sittings to resume on Tuesday, 12th April, 2016.

(The Deputy Senate Majority Leader)

Debate arising;

There being no any other Senator wishing to contribute;

Before the Question on the motion was put, and pursuant to Standing Order No. 72, the Temporary Speaker (Sen. Sang) informed the House that the Motion did not affect counties.

Question put and agreed to.

RESOLVED ACCORDINGLY-

THAT, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 28 (4), the Senate resolves to alter its Calendar in respect of the First Part of the Fourth Session for the recess to commence on Friday, 1st April and sittings to resume on Tuesday, 12th April, 2016.

8. **THE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BILL (NATIONAL ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 18 OF 2014)**

(The Senate Majority Leader

Order for Second Reading read;

(Resumption of Debate interrupted on Wednesday, 23rd March, 2016)
(Division)

Order deferred

9. **THE COUNTY GOVERNMENTS (AMENDMENT) (NO. 4) BILL (SENATE BILL NO. 18 OF 2014)**

(Sen. Kipchumba Murkomen)

Order for Second Reading read;

(Resumption of Debate interrupted on Wednesday, 23rd March, 2016)

Order deferred

10. **MOTION-APPROVAL OF APPOINTMENT OF SENATORS TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL REVIEW**

AWARE that pursuant to Article 124(1) of the Constitution and the Standing Orders of the Senate, at a Special Sitting of the Senate held on Monday, 15th June, 2015, the Senate resolved, to establish a Select Committee on Constitutional and Legal Review to inquire into legal issues arising following the re-allocation by the National Assembly of monies intended for key constitutional organs and institutions, including, the Judiciary, the Salaries and Remuneration Commission and the Senate;

FURTHER AWARE that on 23rd June, 2015, the Senate approved the names of Senators to serve in the said Select Committee whose terms of reference were as follows-

- (a) inquire into the design of the Legislature and in particular, the institutions set out in the Constitution with a view to protecting the interests of the counties and their governments and securing and safeguarding the system of devolved government established in the Constitution;*
- (b) inquire into the role of the Senate as set out under the Constitution and make recommendations on the appropriate role to be played by the Senate in-*
 - (i) the budget making process and revenue allocation;*
 - (ii) the legislative process;*
 - (iii) oversight over the National Government; and*
 - (iv) oversight over the County Governments;*
- (c) examine and make recommendations on the appropriate role to be played by the Senate in the approval of nominees for appointment to State office;*
- (d) examine and make recommendations on the appropriate inter linkage and interplay between-*
 - (i) the Senate and the National Government;*
 - (ii) the Senate and the National Assembly;*
 - (iii) the Senate and the County Governments; and*
 - (iv) the Senate and other constitutional offices and Commissions.*
- (e) recommend to the Senate such constitutional and legislative interventions as may be necessary to secure and safeguard the system of devolved government in the Constitution, including measures necessary to ensure the effective discharge by the Senate, of its legislative and oversight role under the Constitution; and*
- (f) examine and make recommendations on any other matter connected with or incidental to the foregoing;*

COGNIZANT OF THE FACT that the Committee tabled its report on 23rd September, 2015 which report was adopted by the Senate on 21st October, 2015;

NOTING that one of the recommendations in the report was that-

The Senate approves the appointment of a Select Committee to spearhead the processing of the General Suggestion for the Draft Constitution of Kenya (Amendment) Bill, 2015 through popular initiative in terms of Article 257 of the Constitution;

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to the resolution of the Senate during the Sitting held on 21st October, 2015, the Senate approves the appointment of the following Senators to the Select Committee to spearhead the processing of the General Suggestion for the Draft Constitution of Kenya (Amendment) Bill, 2015 through popular initiative in terms of Article 257 of the Constitution-

1. Sen. Murkomen Kipchumba
2. Sen. (Prof.) Lonyangapuo John
3. Sen. Chiaba Abu Mohamed

4. Sen. Wangari Martha
5. Sen. Kiraitu Murungi
6. Sen. James Orengo
7. Sen. (Dr.) Boni Khalwale
8. Sen. Hassan Omar
9. Sen. Halima Abdille

And that the committee reports back to the Senate within six months.

(Senate Majority Leader)

Order deferred.

11. **MOTION-ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN RELATIONS ON THE ASSESSMENT OF THE SECURITY SITUATION IN MANDERA COUNTY, LAIKIPIA COUNTY AND KAPEDO (BORDER TOWN OF TURKANA AND BARINGO COUNTIES)**

THAT, this House adopts the Report of the Standing Committee on National Security and Foreign Relations on the assessment of the security situation in Mandera County, Laikipia county and Kapedo (Border town of Turkana and Baringo Counties) conducted between 19th January and 5th February, 2015 and laid on the Table of the House on Wednesday, 29th July, 2015.

(Chairperson, Standing Committee on National Security and Foreign Relations)

Order deferred.

12. **MOTION-NOTING OF THE REPORT OF THE ACP PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY AND THE 29TH SESSION OF THE ACP-EU JOINT PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY**

THAT, the Senate notes the Report of the ACP Parliamentary Assembly and the 29th Session of the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly held at the Grand Pacific Hotel, Suva, Fiji from 10th to 17th June, 2015, laid on the Table of the House on Wednesday, 25th November, 2015.

(Sen. Kembi Gitura)

Order deferred.

13. **MOTION-IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY STATEMENTS AND STRATEGIES MADE IN THE NATIONAL SPECIAL NEEDS EDUCATION POLICY FRAMEWORK, 2009**

AWARE that Article 43 (1) (f) of the Constitution of Kenya provides that every person has the right to education and that Article 53 (1) (b) of the Constitution provides that every child has the right to free and compulsory basic education;

COGNIZANT that Article 54 (1) (b) of the Constitution provides that a person with any disability is entitled to access educational institutions and facilities for

persons with disabilities that are integrated into society to the extent compatible with the interests of the person;

RECOGNIZING that education in Kenya is a shared function of both the county and national governments;

CONCERNED that while significant gains have been made under the Free Education Programme introduced in the year 2003, access and participation of children with special needs is generally low across the country and their needs have not been specifically addressed;

NOW THEREFORE the Senate directs the Standing Committee on Education to inquire into the performance of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology in the implementation of the policy statements and strategies made in the National Special Needs Education Policy Framework, 2009 and report back to the Senate within three months.

(Sen. Peter Mositet)

Order deferred.

14. **MOTION-ADOPTION THE REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN RELATIONS ON THE STUDY VISIT TO RUSSIA**

THAT, this House adopts the Report of the Standing Committee on National Security and Foreign Relations on the study visit to Russia laid on the Table of the House on Tuesday, 15th March, 2016.

(Chairperson, Standing Committee on National Security and Foreign Relations)

Order deferred.

15. **MOTION-CREATION OF THE OFFICE OF AN AUDITOR TO SPECIFICALLY AUDIT THE BASIC EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS' FUNDS**

THAT, whereas Article 53 (1)(b) of the Constitution provides that every child in Kenya has the right to free and compulsory basic education;

Recognizing the importance of education in the alleviation of the main challenges facing Kenya's sovereignty identified at independence, namely; poverty, illiteracy and disease;

Appreciating the gains made following the implementation of the free primary education program in 2003 and cognizant of the principles set out in the Basic Education Act of 2013 whose objectives include promotion and regulation of free and compulsory basic education besides providing for accreditation, registration and management of basic education institutions;

Also noting the substantial resources invested by the national and county governments, parents, sponsors and development partners in the provision of basic education;

Further noting that pursuant to the Basic Education Act, the County Director of Education is vested with numerous responsibilities including facilitation of auditing of all basic educational institutions in the respective county thereby leaving fundamental gaps of governance especially in the management of the available resources;

NOW therefore, the House recommends to the Cabinet Secretary for Education to facilitate the creation of the office of an auditor to specifically audit the basic education institutions' funds to enhance transparency and accountability and improve governance in the management of these institutions.

(Sen. (Prof.) John Lonyangapuo)

Order deferred.

16. **MOTION-NOTING THE REPORT OF THE COMMONWEALTH WOMEN PARLIAMENTARIANS REGIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING WORKSHOP**

THAT, the Senate notes the Report of the Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians Regional Capacity Building Workshop held in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania on 20th – 23rd January, 2016 laid on the Table of the House on Thursday, March 17, 2016

(Chairperson, Standing Committee on National Security and Foreign Relations)

Order deferred.

There being no other business, the Temporary Speaker (Sen. Sang) adjourned the Senate at fifty seven minutes past Five O'clock, without question put pursuant to the Standing Orders.

17. **SENATE ROSE** - at fifty seven minutes past Five O'clock.

M E M O R A N D U M

*The Speaker will take the Chair on
Thursday, March 29, 2016 at 2.30 p.m.*

--X--