

**PARLIAMENT OF UGANDA**

**Thursday, 22 April 2021**

*Parliament met at 2.56 p.m. in Parliament House, Kampala*

PRAYERS

*(The Speaker, Ms Rebecca Kadaga, in the Chair.)*

*The House was called to order.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I welcome you to this afternoon meeting. I would like to give notice to the Members of the Committee on Appointments that we shall convene tomorrow at 9 o’clock in the morning in the Parliamentary Conference Hall A to consider nominees for the Commission on Equal Opportunities.

Secondly, as part of the Parliamentary Commission’s commitment to better the welfare of members, a seminar has been organised for all Members of Parliament on the theme, “Life after Parliament”. This seminar is intended to boost the awareness and preparedness of members in opportunities and realities that exist outside Parliament. The topics and facilitators for this seminar have been carefully thought out and selected for the optimum benefits of members.

The seminar is scheduled for Thursday 29 to Friday 30 April 2021 in the Parliament South Wing Car Park beginning at 8.30 a.m. I invite all members to attend it.

Honourable members, I will also adjust the Order Paper to permit the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development to lay a paper. Hon. Mawanda also wishes to present a Bill for first reading. We shall also make that adjustment on his behalf.

In the meantime, there are just a few matters of national concern.

2.59

**MS SYDA BBUMBA (NRM, Nakaseke North County, Nakaseke):** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for this opportunity to present a matter of national concern on the establishment of Qadhis courts.

During the 1995 Constitution making process, the Odoki Commission reported that it received several memoranda especially from the Muslim community suggesting that the new Constitution should recognise the Sharia Courts that administer Islamic law of the Koran and Hadith.

It was further suggested that the Sharia Courts would arbitrate and settle disputes among the Muslim factions and individuals according to Islamic law.

Indeed, the Constituency Assembly provided for a provision to establish Qadhis courts for this purpose. Article 129(1)(d) of the Constitution stipulates that Judicial power of Uganda shall be exercised by the courts of judicature which shall consist of, inter alia, *“such subordinate courts as Parliament may by law establish, including Qadhis courts for marriage, divorce, inheritance of property and guardianship, as may be prescribed by Parliament.”*

Whereas the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda recognised the need for the establishment of the Qadhis courts, the Government has not, since the promulgation of the 1995 Constitution, enacted a law that establishes the Qadhis courts.

Qadhis courts are a court system that would enforce limited rights of inheritance to family and succession for persons professing the Muslim faith. The problem is that Islamic law is applied in Uganda, at present, mainly in personal matters such as marriage, divorce and inheritance.

It is only formally recognised by law in some cases. For instance, under the Marriage and Divorce Act of the Mohammedan Act, Cap. 213. This is a 1906 Act, and it provides for only the recognition of marriages solemnised or divorced effected in accordance with the Islamic law.

The desire for persons who profess the Islamic faith to apply Sharia law, makes them go to Muslim leaders at the grass root level. The Muslim leaders who adjudicate over such matters are many, at times, not well knowledgeable in Islamic law. This usually results in miscarriage of justice.

The establishment of Qadhis courts will go a long way in ensuring that the persons who adjudicate over matters relating to personal status, marriage, divorce or any inheritance in proceedings in which all the parties profess Muslim religion are grounded in the Sharia.

The law will ensure that processes and procedures established are adhered to. This will enable the parties to get proper justice.

This is, therefore, to strongly urge Government to establish the Qadhis courts to enable the streamlining of administration of matters relating to marriage, divorce, inheritance of property and guardianship of persons who profess the Muslim faith.

Here, I would like to emphasise that this applies to only people of the Islamic faith, because some people are worried that when Qadhis courts come, that will be islamisation of the country. That is not the case. The Qadhis courts will be applied to only those of the Muslim faith.

Madam Speaker, I beg to present.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you, Hon. Bbumba. The Attorney-General is required to come and explain to the country when he intends to establish the Qadhis courts which are there in the Constitution. We will give him one week to respond.

3.04

**MR ABDULATIF SEBAGGALA (Independent, Kawempe Division North, Kampala):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. As you may recall, last week on Friday, you hosted the Muslim community for an annual Iftar dinner. Indeed, on behalf of the Muslim community, we express our innermost gratitude to you for such a gesture.

We invited at that occasion someone who is very knowledgeable in as far as Islamic banking is concerned and it was Dr Sulaiman Lujja. He took us through the importance of Islamic banking and why it should really take root in Uganda.

He even indicated that there are so many qualified Ugandans who can run the Bank of Uganda Sharia Advisory Board. You directed us to get Ugandans who are qualified to run the Islamic banking as the absence of qualified personnel has been the hindrance for Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development and Bank of Uganda to continue with that product, which is very much needed especially in this period when the economy is suffering.

Madam Speaker, the names that I am going to submit to you and lay on the Table include names of those even more qualified than those who are running Sharia banking in many countries like Indonesia, Malaysia and other countries that have adopted the Islamic banking.

Madam Speaker, allow me to lay on the Table a list of 11 Ugandans from PhD level down to many qualifications that can run the Bank of Uganda Shariah Advisory Council. With your permission, allow me to lay it on the Table for your action.

**THE SPEAKER:** Please lay them. Maybe in addition, honourable members, three other Muslim scholars have written to me sending me their names. Therefore, if they are more than 11, it will be because of the three I have also received. I undertake to pass them formally to the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development so that - But you could read them.

**MR SSEBAGGALA:** Madam Speaker, allow me to read the following names of Ugandans who are capable of manning the Bank of Uganda Sharia Advisory Council:

1. Dr Lujja Sulaiman, head of Islamic banking department, Tropical Bank Uganda. He has a PhD in Islamic banking.
2. Dr Walusimbi Abdul Hafiz, deputy dean and head of Sharia department at IUIU. He has a PhD in Islamic law from Pakistan and Masters in Islamic law in Uganda.
3. Dr Muhammad Hussein Bbowa; regional Khadhi, Busoga Muslim region. He has a PhD in Sharia, Saudi Arabia; Masters in Sharia Law, Saudi Arabia and BA Sharia, Saudi Arabia.
4. Sheikh Waiswa Muhammad Ali, Deputy Mufti, Uganda Muslim Supreme Council. He has Masters in Arts in Religious Studies, Bachelor of Arts in Islamic Law and Religious Studies.
5. Dr Sowedi Juma Mayanja, Imam and lecturer, Makerere University. He has a PhD in Sharia law, Saudi Arabia and Masters in Sharia law, Saudi Arabia.
6. Dr Muhammad Kisuule, Director, House of Zakat and Waqf. PhD in Sharia law.
7. Dr Ssemuddu Rashid, is a consultant with a PhD in Sharia law.
8. Dr Kasozi Edris, deputy dean and head of department, Islamic law, faculty of law. He has a PhD in Sharia Law from the Government of Sudan.
9. Mr Yahaya Kasujja; Senior Associate Accountant, Islamic Development Bank. He has a Masters in Islamic Finance, Malaysia and MBA Herriot, UK.
10. Sheikh Ismail Njuki, Director, Madina International Development Agency. He has a BA in Sharia law, Saudi Arabia and Masters in Islamic banking, Uganda.
11. Mr Katongole Imran Hussein, Assistant lecturer, Islamic University in Uganda, faculty of Islamic studies and Arabic Language. He holds a Masters in Islamic financing, Dar-es-Salaam, B.A Sharia Islamic Law, Dar-es-Salaam and Diploma from Law Development Centre.

Madam Speaker, I beg to lay this list on the Table.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, as I indicated, I have three other names, one of whom is a lady. I will be sending 14 names to the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development on that issue. Thank you very much.

3.09

**MS ROSE KABAGYENYI (NRM, Woman Representative, Kisoro):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise on a matter of national importance to prohibit the use of excess mercury in our environment. Mercury is one of the heavy chemicals that is being used in Uganda and it is largely used in mining, pharmaceuticals, hospitals, electricals and many other uses.

Madam Speaker, Uganda became a signatory to the Minamata Convention on Mercury Use on 10 October, 2013 and it was ratified on 1 October, 2019. The convention recognises that mercury is a heavy chemical and of global concern owing to its large long range atmospheric transportation in the atmosphere and the environment.

Madam Speaker, the objective of this convention was to protect human health and environmental atmosphere as mercury releases a lot of compounds in the atmosphere. Also in the same convention, Article 4 under annex (a) part 2, it spells out the measures to be taken to phase out mercury use in dental amalgam which is used to refill teeth and largely used in hospitals and clinics and yet it has alternatives that are effective, efficient and are friendly to our environment and health.

Bearing that in mind, our hospitals have continued to use mercury in various treatments even when we know the effects and Uganda being a signatory to the Minamata Convention.

My prayer is to call upon the responsible ministries; the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development, Ministry of Water and Environment- *Mama Mabira* you are here - Ministry of Health and other relevant Government departments to put a law governing the use of mercury and also to put measures to see how it can be retracted in the environment for better health.

Also to provide a law regulating the use of mercury in Uganda because it is largely used; 50 per cent of it is being used in Uganda other than other countries and to provide effective, efficient and environmentally friendly alternatives to our health systems. I beg to submit and thank you, Madam Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much. This matter has many ministries; I don’t know who will take the lead in answering. Can I ask the Minister of Health?

3.13

**THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR HEALTH (PRIMARY HEALTH CARE) (Dr Joyce Moriku):** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank my colleague for this very important matter that she has raised on the Floor of this Parliament, most especially on mercury that we use in the various settings and most importantly, she raised the regulation of mercury.

As far as health is concerned, indeed it is true that we have got mercury in the health sector. We use mercury in clinical thermometers; the thermometers that we use to test whether your temperature is raised or not.

We also have mercury in the blood pressure machines that we use to measure whether you have raised blood pressure or low blood pressure. Therefore, indeed it is true that those are a few examples of the mercury that we have in the health sector but also, other equipment we have use mercury.

As far as health use is concerned, it is under strict - I may call it - regulation because we are not subjecting this equipment to be used anyhow apart from the specific uses that we are subjected to. Nevertheless, we will take this up to ensure that the use and regulation are properly handled and do not have a lot of effect on human health.

Madam Speaker, what my colleague has said is true. Mercury per se has got a lot of health effects. When it is inhaled through your lungs, it can cause a lot of effects in the lungs including lung infection, cough and other infections. However, it also causes other health problems.

Excessive mercury in the body can cause tremors, emotional changes like irritability and other changes. Therefore, she is right that when we do not regulate the use of mercury, it can have lots of effects in our body as a matter of fact, as far as your health is concerned.

I would like to take this up with the other responsible ministries to ensure that we look into this together, and see how best we can give a feedback to you as much as the regulation is concerned. Thank you.

3.16

**The minister of state for water and environment (ENVIRONMENT) (Ms Beatrice Anywar):** Thank you, Madam Speaker and Hon. Rose for raising a pertinent issue. I always get comforted that all of us are getting aware of how to protect our environment and this is one of them.

It is true that our environment is being contaminated by various things including the way we are going to be disposing off our used up phones, old computers, refrigerators and the like.

Specifically to what the colleague has raised, a law is coming up through our colleague in the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development. I have read the Bill. Cabinet has already passed it. This is one of the highlighted minerals. There are clauses to protect such minerals from contaminating our environment.

I would like to give information to this House that in that Bill, mercury and such harmful minerals are being catered for as far as the environment is concerned. Thank you.

3.18

**The leader of the opposition (Ms Betty Aol):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am rising up on our usual issue, which we have raised here time and again; the power outage in Gulu City. We have people who process food using grinding machines. There is rice hulling, salons and small businesses that depend on electricity.

However, we do not have constant power supply. When our people, especially the business community see us, they think we are not doing anything. We hear about Karuma and Aswa but why is it that we cannot have constant power supply? What is the problem?

People task me to ask if it is intentional to keep them below the poverty line forever. If that is a city, then it has to have constant power supply. You do not have power today, tomorrow and the next two days – *(Interruption)* - I take the information.

**Mr kaberuka:** Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member for giving way. The information I would like to supply to my colleague is that the inconsistence in power supply is very immeasurable.

Last week, we were here talking about the inconsistence yet as a country, we brag about having Bujagali and other dams and we are proud of having much power that we are trying to evacuate.

However, in Kanungu, power outage is at 85 per cent. We have virtually no power yet we pay service fees. We pay money and it vanishes. People are crying. The Honourable member is right. There is virtually no power in Uganda.

In Kanungu where the industries are struggling to come up, they use diesel, which has high taxes. This means that the Ugandan Government, in this arrangement of power, is scaring away investors from the rural setting.

**Ms betty aol:** Thank you for the information. The Minister for Energy and Mineral Development should explain to us. Otherwise, some of us look so bad before our people worst of all, right now if we talk about alternative sources of energy. This power should be constant, easily available and accessible. Leave alone the tariffs.

Why is it that we do not have constant power supply in some of the cities and towns? Maybe, there are some without a problem like that but we have it. Our business community is worst affected. At least for domestic purposes, you can afford to stay without power but not the business community.

Can we help the business community of Uganda so that they are able to access power? Without it, we cannot talk of even development when we talk about small and medium scale enterprises. How can we move if we do not have power?

Honourable minister, please help us. Maybe the Rt Hon. Prime Minister will explain to us. Sometimes people tell me that Uganda produces electricity in excess. If that is so, then where is the problem? Why is it that our people are not getting enough? Don’t we love these people? Don’t we want to see them being empowered by the businesses that they do?

Even young people with salons and small eating places require power in order for them to progress.

Therefore, Rt Hon. Prime Minister explain to us. Do not let us to stand again before this House to ask for constant power supply to our people. Is it the distribution? What is the problem? Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Honourable members, the issue of power outage in Gulu is an old matter. There is also the issue of West Nile and other places. Let us ask the Minister for Energy and Mineral Development to give us a solution. What does she intend to do about this power outage? Does the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development have something to say?

3.24

**The Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (Mr Matia Kasaija):** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and my dear sister for raising this issue. The truth is that we now have more power than we are consuming not because there is demand for it - *(Interjections)* - that is the point I am coming to. Our problem is distribution. That is why you are having a problem in Gulu and I have a problem in Masaka.

However, we are tirelessly working on that issue. We got a loan for making sure that the transmission lines are taken and also the distribution is done.

Therefore, I will carry this message to my colleague, the minister, and ask her to come and explain to Parliament and the whole country how far we have gone in making sure that anybody who wants power will receive it at a particular time. Thank you.

3.26

**MR BENARD ATIKU (Independent, Ayivu County, Arua):** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for giving me this opportunity. I think, by coincidence, the microphone wants me to stand on the Government side to be able to raise this matter.

I stand to raise a matter of national importance regarding the presidential pledge that was made to our daughter, Dorcus Inzikuru, after she won a gold medal for this country in Helsinki in 2005.

If you remember very well, after Dorcus Inzikuru returned, Parliament presented a motion to pay tribute to her. In that motion, one of the presents that were given was a house, for which Arua Municipal Council allocated land, and the UPDF Engineering Brigade constructed it. This house has been in existence and it is part of the assets that have given our daughter a source of income.

However, of recent, the property came under attack by the municipal council. They are not only interested in it but also want to demolish it and take part of the land, to establish an access road for a plot they created much later than the time this building was given to her.

As I talk, our daughter is in tears. She is threatening to go to court, as the only remedy yet we are here, as Members of Parliament. The President is in State House and the Rt Hon. Prime Minister is seated here with the Minister of Finance. We are the ones who benefited from her raising our country’s flag at that time and thereafter.

My prayer is:

1. To ask this Parliament to prevail over Arua Municipal Council, which is now the acting Arua City Council Authority to halt any damages they want to cause to this property. I believe it is a national treasure that was given to our daughter to honour her for the prestigious medal she won.
2. To request the Rt Hon. Prime Minister to take this message to the President; that a pledge of a car, just like other athletes who have won gold medals, should be delivered - Dorcus Inzikuru has never received hers.

I have raised this matter on the Floor of Parliament before but it has never come to see the light of day.

Madam Speaker, these are my prayers and if that is fulfilled or done, particularly halting any move to tamper with the property in Arua, I will be more than grateful to give comfort to our daughter. I thank you.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much, Hon. Atiku. Of course, we are very proud of the *gazelle* but I would like to know whether the building was built in a road reserve.

I would also like to call on the Minister of Lands, who is in charge of the physical planning in this country, to examine that situation and see how our daughter’s house can be salvaged.

**MR ATIKU:** Madam Speaker, thank you for asking that question. It is important for the ministers of Lands, Presidency and Finance to pick interest in this matter. The land was allocated in 2006 by Arua Municipal Council. Therefore, it cannot be the same municipal council that wants to *–(Interruption)*

**MR SSEWUNGU:** Thank you, honourable member, for giving way. Madam Speaker, I watched Inzikuru being interviewed on one of the television; she said the land has no land title. That alone is very funny. How did Government give our athlete a property with no exclusive possession of a land title? It was painful to listen to her say that.

While the house is there, Arua Municipal Council can demolish it any time because there is no legal entity attached to our athlete. That is the information I would like to give you.

**THE SPEAKER:** We instruct the Minister of Lands to urgently examine the situation in Arua City to identify the problem and ensure that Dorcus Inzikuru’s house is not destroyed and report back to this House. It is very urgent and we cannot afford to have our young children threatened. Minister of Lands, can we have a report in one week?

3.33

**MS PAULINE KEMIREMBE (NRM, Woman Representative, Lyantonde):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise on a matter of national concern about a company called Alliance in Motion Global Limited, whose office is at Mabirizi Plaza Complex. It also has its regional office at City Mall in Mbarara.

This company is fleecing lots of money from the young generation yearning for employment. Each person who goes there is supposed to buy a share at Shs 900,000 yet when they go to the places they have told them to go to, they have no money for rent or feeding. In order to gain from your money, you have to bring two other people, who will also bring other people. They are conning children as young as 15 years of age.

I came to know about this when I found more than 400 youth from different districts of Kabale, Isingiro, Rwampara, Masindi, Hoima, Ibanda, Rubanda and Kiruhura in my district of Lyantonde because they had been told that there is employment there. They were all over the place and some had already paid that Shs 900,000.

I involved the police in this matter and arrested some of the up liners, who told us that their regional office is in Mbarara. Yesterday, I travelled to Mbarara with the permission of the RCC of Mbarara, the DISO and DPC to this office, where we found – what beats my understanding is that in Lyantonde, you would find 15 children sleeping in one room; five boys and 10 girls or eight boys and seven girls*.* When we arrested them - the leaders called themselves the “up liners”. They told us that the office is in Mbarara. However, reaching there, where the manager is a Ghanaian - I asked for his work permit but he did not have it.

I found very many youths in their office some were from northern and eastern Uganda. I managed to get some of their names but some refused to give me their identity cards. Those who gave their names included:

1. Ocan Peter from Agago District
2. Kako Gordon from Vurra, Arua
3. Aguta Kennedy from Vurra, Arua.
4. There was one who had just paid money. He is Oriokot Emmanuel from Kachelakweny Village, Ongiino Subcounty, Kumi District. This one had deposited Shs 1.8 million.
5. There was a young girl in the names of Isupa Gladys from Okulukulun Village, Kateta subcounty in Serere District. This one had just paid membership and she had paid Shs 100,000. I do not know whether it was membership fee *(Interruption)*

**MS AMULE:** Thank you, honourable for giving way. The information I want to add here is that the similar company that my sister is talking about is bringing us issues all over the country. Back in Amolotar District, two youths are calling me on the same thing.

A one hon. Ochen Richard, whose niece was conned - the mother had to sell land and the girl travelled to Mbarara, paid the Shs 900,000 and right now she is bedridden.

What they are asking of me is to establish where this company is and find how we can get the girl. This happened three days back, when I was trying to find out the condition of the girl and see how we can repatriate her.

There are also other boys who are stranded, having paid Shs 100,000. They are asking for Shs 900,000 for them to buy shares.

However, when they are giving you a call, they call at night. They ask you to first come and then the money will follow. When you reach there you get into captivity, you are forced to pay the money, rent on your own and yet nothing exists.

This is becoming a menace to the whole country, aware of the fact that youths and young people are jobless and hopeless, they will want to pick any opportunity. We have to pronounce ourselves so that these fake companies are established and punished according to the laws of the country. Thank you.

**THE SPEAKER:** Is the Minister of Internal Affairs here?

**MS ANYWAR:** Madam Speaker, I thank the colleague for giving way. We need to look into the issue, which has been raised in more depth.

In my constituency, it is now coming two and a half weeks- for security reasons, I am not going to expose it all. Ayoung man rang and told me that some people came to Kitgum and were picking them to go for jobs and they paid a little bit of money so that they can be given jobs. In his recollection, they were six and were taken by these people to some border and from there, he found some 300 youths. They were not there for jobs but they were being trained for something else.

This one has a security connectional. The security is handling it. However, I would like to say that this issue must be handled in totality because it has a security threat. We went through preliminary investigations but the person says there is recruitment going on, not only for jobs but they pick them and say, “We are going to give you some jobs”. When they reach there, they are at some border training.

**MS KEMIREMBE:** Thank you, for the information. When I went to this office, I found that they deal in food supplements. It is a big office in Mbarara. They pretend and I think these guys deal in food supplements and these boys and young girls supply the food supplements.

I wonder how you bring people from Arua, Kumi and Serere to come and sell food supplements in Mbarara. I think there is a big threat to our Government. As the honourable minister has said, it is a security threat.

In Mbarara, in the divisions of Kakoba, Nyamityobola, Kiswahili, they say they have children from eastern and northern Uganda but they do not know how they reached Mbarara.

My prayer is that the ministries of Internal Affairs and that of Security investigates the works of this company in our country, and then find out more about these poor youth who have been conned so that they can be given back their money.

Then the Ministry of Trade - I got a copy of their trade license, which I lay on the Table. This license was obtained in 2014 but I do not know what they were going to trade in. For the items they are selling, they have documents from the National Drug Authority.

My prayer is also that the Ministry of Health talks to the National Drug Authority to inform people to stop hawking food supplements or medicines for human consumption. Otherwise, these people pretend that they are taking these food supplements from their office to the consumers, which is dangerous to human life. Thank you. I beg to lay on the Table these documents that I got from Mbarara.

I request that, that Ghanaian’s work permit be looked at. They should also stop pretending that they deal in food supplements, when it is a different business.

In Lyantonde, we already have nine in cells and the investigations are going on. Thank you.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you, Hon. Kemirembe, for bringing out that very serious issue; it is very multidimensional. I see elements of trafficking, abuse and so on. I want to ask the Minister responsible for Youth to take interest in these children and see how they can be taken back to their homes.

The Minister for Internal Affairs should swing into action to identify the veracity of this company, who are behind it and are they legally here?

The Minister for Security should take an interest in the cross-border movement of the number of children, who are being moved back and forth. We will need an answer within a week.

3.44

**MR LYANDRO KOMAKECH (DP, Gulu Municipality, Gulu):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a matter of national urgent concern pertaining to the situation of St Mary’s Hospital Lacor and the surrounding communities up to the border with South Sudan.

When COVID-19 broke out, this health facility stood firm to work and contained the pandemic. However, to date, this hospital that serves even South Sudan has been brought into a very terrible situation, where there is a cluster outbreak of COVID-19, which arose from one student who reported to the training school on 8 March, 2021. She was tested and found positive. We have over 416 students in the training school, and to date, 30 per cent of these students have tested positive for COVID-19. They are bedridden; there are more tests going on and also the patients from outside the training school are being tested.

This morning, there has been a big alarm from management of St Mary’s Hospital Lacor, that they need an urgent response from the Covid-19 management Centre.

My prayer is, the Ministry of Health should have a rapid intervention in the situation of St Mary’s Hospital Lacor, because it is going to run out of control and will spread all over northern Uganda.

Worst of all, as the Leader of the Opposition stated on the issue of power supply and power outages; this has also grounded the management of COVID-19 patients. This is because northern Uganda is now supposed to be dark by design.

I was even worried when Hon. Atiku was speaking; he had a power outage. I was even worried when I came; I thought this supply would still be cut off.

So, Madam Speaker, this is the situation. I request that the minister and the ministry take urgent action. I beg to submit.

**THE SPEAKER:** Fortunately, the Minister of Health is here. I believe she has heard the outcry from Lacor. Any commitment?

3.47

**THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR HEALTH (PRIMARY HEALTH CARE) (Dr Joyce Moriku):** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for raising this very important matter, concerning the state of St Mary’s Hospital, Lacor, as far as COVID-19 infection is concerned.

As we communicated last week, the country is already getting to experience the second wave of COVID-19 outbreak. The number of cases as you realise is already going up. Our curve is already growing up gradually.

When we look at the test result of yesterday, out of the tests done, we registered a total of 54 positive confirmed cases in the country. Out of that, Gulu alone has registered 42 positive cases.

Madam Speaker, among the institutions that we are critically looking at are the nurse training institutions, and all those institutions that provide more health-related training. Indeed, it is true that apart from the nurse health training institutions, we have the secondary schools that also stand at risk of getting the infections.

Coming to Lacor Hospital as my colleague has noted; it started with one student but spread like a wildfire. Out of the students who are in the hostel, quite a number of them turned out to be positive, as he said; close to 30 per cent of the population of the school.

Immediately we got this report, Madam Speaker, my ministry took immediate action by sending a team to Lacor. Ministry of Health response team, together with World Health Organisation –*(Interjection)* -

**THE SPEAKER:** No, please. Let us finish with Lacor.

**DR MORIKU:** Madam Speaker, what we found out is that, since the onset of the Covid-19 infections at school, a lot of measures have been put in place, especially the social distancing of the students’ sleeping area and classrooms.

What has come out is that after the first inspection, the students were found to be mixing up. They get close to one another, including in the classrooms. They sit next to one another. Because of this, that one person who got the infection managed to spread it to the rest of the students.

The ministry is now working together with the Ministry of Education and Sports, to ensure we sustain the spacing in the dormitories, classrooms and dining, wherever the students are going to be.

This is specifically for Lacor. The students have been isolated; they are getting treatment. The facilities have been fumigated and of course, there is a lot of concern for the patients on the ward. These students have been mixing up with the patients a lot.

However, I would like to assure the country that a lot of interest is already being paid to St Mary’s Hospital Lacor. And the health ministry is to ensure that we fumigate even the other wards we suspect cases of mixing might have occurred.

Previously we also had nursing institutions like Nsambya Nurse Training School. We also had Y.Y Okot Secondary School in Kitgum and other institutions. Now that this has come out seriously, we are going to give a lot of attention to the nurse training schools, including the secondary schools which are at risk of getting COVID-19 infections. I thank you.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much, honourable minister.

BILLS

FIRST READING

THE PUBLIC ENTERPRISES REFORM AND DIVESTURE REPEAL BILL, 2021

3.52

**MR MICHAEL MAWANDA (Independent, Igara County East, Bushenyi):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I beg to lay on the Table a Bill entitled, “The Public Enterprise Reform and Divesture Repeal Bill, 2021.

Madam Speaker, the Bill is not accompanied by a Certificate of Financial Implication, but we communicated on 15 July 2020, requesting for a Certificate of Financial Implication. I am proceeding under Rule 117(4). I beg to lay.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, the Bill is sent to the Committee on Finance, Planning and Economic Development. However, honourable member, I do not know whether we still have the 45 days in which to consider the Bill.

If it is not handled before the close of the 5th session, it will be saved for consideration later on. Thank you.

LAYING OF PAPERS

THE CORRIGENDA TO THE DRAFT BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2021/2022

3.54

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (Mr Matia Kasaija):** Madam Speaker, I wish to lay the Corrigenda to the Budget for Financial Year 2021/2022.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, of course it would have been better if the corrigenda had come before the sectoral committees presented their reports. However, it will be sent to the Committee on Budget.

I appeal to the chairpersons of the sessional committees to look at it during the sitting of the Committee on Budget. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ON THE PROPOSED PARISH MODEL

3.55

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (Mr Matia Kasaija):** Madam Speaker, this is a statement on the Parish Development Model.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for this timely opportunity to make a submission on implementation of the Parish Development Model, which is expected to start in the Fiscal Year 2021/2022.

Honourable colleagues, you will recall that on 30 January 2020, Parliament approved the Third National Development Plan (NDP III) of 2020/2021 -2024/2025. The goal of NDP III is to increase household incomes and improve the quality of life of Ugandans.

This goal demands our collective and focused effort together with the support of our partners in development, including the private sector. This collective effort is guided by the theme of the NDP III: "Sustainable Industrialisation for Inclusive Growth, Employment and Wealth Creation."

You will appreciate that internal and external markets are vital for our industrialisation agenda. This reality was made very apparent recently by the COVID-19 pandemic as you all know. The pandemic has reminded us of the urgent need to speed up our national efforts to rapidly grow the share of Ugandans in the monetised economy, where effective demand is generated to support industrial growth. We must do so without compromising the need to grow the quality and quantity of our exports to regional and international markets.

The 2014 National Population and Housing Census revealed that 68 per cent of Ugandan households relied on subsistence agriculture as their main source of livelihood. This number did not include subsistence households in the non-agricultural sectors.

Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) has since defined the subsistence economy to capture subsistence households in both the agriculture and non-agricultural sectors; and to distinguish between being in the subsistence economy and being poor as highlighted in Box 1 below.

The 2016/2017 Uganda National Household Survey revealed that 39 per cent of households - that is 3.3 million people - were in the subsistence economy, of which, 24.2 per cent were agricultural households and 14.8 per cent were non-agricultural households as shown in Table 1 below.

UBOS has further undertaken to establish the share of all households in the subsistence economy using the 2019/2020 Uganda National Household Survey, and these estimates will be released at end of April 2021.

Definition of Households in the Subsistence Economy

(I am reading from Box 1.) Households in subsistence economy are defined as those engaged in production of goods and/or services whose returns are only enough or unable to meet their basic food and non-food requirements. They include households engaged in subsistence farming, earning a wage or salary or operating a business and completely not working.

You are aware that in 1992, 56 per cent of Ugandans were living below the national poverty line. By 2016/2017, Government's poverty eradication efforts had reduced this share to 21.4 per cent - that is 8 million people. The Youth Livelihood Programme (YLP) and the Uganda Women Empowerment Programme (UWEP) are some of the recent development programmes helping to further drive down poverty.

Despite the general success registered by these and other related programmes, they continue to be characterised by the following limitations:

1. Their coverage has been localised to a few parishes at a given time.
2. They have not been directly relevant to the country's industrialisation and food security agenda.
3. They generally suffer from high administrative costs.
4. Their services are relatively expensive for their intended beneficiaries.

I will illustrate this point later in my statement.

Having two out of every five Ugandans living from hand-to-mouth is unacceptable. Let me repeat this: Having two out of every five Ugandans living from hand-to-mouth is unacceptable. Government is convinced that nothing can better guarantee inclusive growth and employment for Ugandans than equitable participation of more Ugandans in the monetised economy.

It is the above background that I now wish to proceed to talk about the Parish Development Model, a reform that is fully backed by the Local Government Act, 1997; the Public Sector Transformation Programme of NDP III; the Manifesto of the National Resistance Movement of 2021-2026 and both presidential and Cabinet directives on priority commodities for Area-Based Commodity Development.

The Parish Development Model

The Parish Development Model is a strategy for organising and delivering public and private sector interventions for wealth creation and employment generation at the parish level as the lowest economic planning unit. Its implementation marks a major milestone in Uganda's development journey in three main ways:

1. It accelerates implementation of Area-Based Commodity Development planning, which is vital for realising the quantity and quality of agricultural production required for agro-industrialisation and export development.
2. It extends the whole-of-Government approach for development to the parish level in a consolidated manner as opposed to working in silos.
3. It localises Vision 2040 and the National Development Plan for effective measurement and management of development interventions.

The Parish Development Model is made up of seven pillars under Table 2. These pillars are implemented by both public and private sector institutions at the Central Government and local government levels. The pillars are:

1. Production, processing and marketing (Value Chain Development).
2. Infrastructure and Economic Services.
3. Financial Inclusion.
4. Social services.
5. Community Data (Community Information System).
6. Governance and administration.
7. Mindset Change.

The Local Government Act, 1997 provides for the parish as a planning unit of Government. Section 47 specifically provides for an 11-member parish executive committee comprising of the members listed in Table 3 below. One-third of the parish executive committee members should be women. Let me repeat this: One-third of the parish executive committee members should be women. I expected to hear women clapping for me. *(Laughter)*

The Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide for Parishes/Wards issued by the Ministry of Local Government in 2003 adopted the parish council as the default Parish Development Committee (PDC). The same guide also provides for co-opted people with expertise to advise the PDC in technical areas under consideration by the PDC. This effectively makes the PDC a technical arm of the parish council. The co-opted people represent various experiences and interests. They include representatives of faith-based organisations and reputable persons such as retired civil servants like teachers.

The composition of Parish Executive Committee (PDC) includes the following:

1. The chairperson
2. The vice-chairperson
3. The General secretary
4. Secretary for information, communication and education
5. Secretary for security
6. Secretary for finance
7. Secretary for production and environmental affairs and
8. Secretary for youth
9. Secretary for women
10. Secretary for persons with disabilities, and
11. Secretary for council of elder persons.

The Local Government Act further provides under section 69 that the parish chief will be responsible for ensuring implementation of district and Government policies and programmes in his or her area of jurisdiction. It mandates the parish chief to assist the parish council in planning, budgeting and budget implementation; supervise or monitor the implementation of socio-economic development projects; and to implement lawfu1 policies and decisions of the council. The parish chief is under the supervision of the parish council, sub-county chief and chief administrative officer.

Results framework of the Parish Development Model (PDM)

Madam Speaker, the goal of the PDM is socio-economic transformation for wealth creation and employment generation at the parish level. Performance against this goal will be measured by the share of households who graduate into the non-subsistence economy. This share will be monitored and reported on at parish, district and national levels.

Madam Speaker, the Parish Development Model consists of the following three components, which are briefly highlighted below: The Strategic Planning and Financing; Commercial Household Production; and Performance Results.

Strategic Planning and Financing

The Government has identified and prioritised the development of 18 commodities under the Parish Development Model, which is under Tab1e no. 4. These are commodities that have market locally and internationally. These are: coffee, cotton, cocoa, cassava, tea, vegetable oils/oi1 palm, maize, rice, sugarcane, fish, diary, beef, bananas, beans, avocado, shea nut, cashew nuts, and macadamia nuts.

Successful implementation of the Parish Development Model requires ready market and value addition for the production surplus from the parish. This market is provided by SMEs and co-operatives engaged in processing, manufacturing and exporting of the 18 priority commodities which I have just read above.

The sustainable growth and development of these SMEs requires a competitive business environment including access to development finance. To this end, the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, will play its role of strategic economic planning and financing as highlighted below:

1. Negotiating Markets: Working under regional and international economic co-operation frameworks such as East African Community to drive up volumes and values of Ugandan exports.
2. Value Chain Development, Zonal and National: Guiding public and private investment to support processing and manufacturing at the zonal and district level. This includes having in place zonal-specific economic plans for development of commodity value chains in support of increased production and productivity at the parish level, which we are envisaging.
3. Fostering a Competitiveness Business Environment: Prudent management of the macro economy to ensure a stable and low-cost business environment capable of attracting private investment and boosting exports.
4. Mobilising the SME Financing: Alignment of micro financing strategies at the parish level with financing strategies for SMEs, co-operatives and industrialists at the zonal and national level under the auspices of the National Financial Inclusion Strategy and the Financial Sector Development Strategy.

Commercial Household Production

Madam Speaker, under the Parish Model, the CAO will be tasked with the responsibility to achieve a sustainable production surplus of the applicable commodities by the parishes in his/her district.

Performance Results

Madam Speaker, consistent with the whole-of-government approach, the Office of the Prime Minister together with Uganda Bureaus of Statistics, Ministry of Local Government and the Ministry of ICT and National Guidance will spearhead the government-wide coordination of performance measurement and management under the Parish Development Model.

Specific interventions of the Parish Development Model

Madam Speaker, each of the seven pillars of the parish model has specific interventions and budgets allocated to it. Details are contained in a document titled “A Quick Guide to the Parish Development Model” that I would like to lay on the Table. Thank you.

Of the seven pillars of the model, pillar 3 on financial inclusion represents the most significant changes for the budget for in the Financial Year 2021/2022. I will therefore highlight the key interventions and budgets contained under this pillar.

Pillar 3 - financial inclusion: interventions under this pillar are intended to promote savings and investment by households in activities with a potential for generating a production surplus. The specific interventions include:

1. Establishment and capitalisation of the Parish Revolving Fund.
2. Supervision of parish-based SACCOs by Uganda Microfinance Regulatory Authority.
3. Capitalisation of constituency-based SACCOs under the Presidential Initiative for Wealth Creation and Jobs that is *Emyooga* for households in the non-subsistence economy.

Participating parish-SACCOs under the Parish Development Model will lend funds from the Parish Revolving Fund to individual households or household collectives at concessional interest rate inflation plus one per cent. This is intended to ensure that there is no loss of value of money.

Uganda Shillings 404.3 billion has been budgeted for capitalisation of the Parish Revolving Funds in Financial Year 2021 /2022. This translates to an average allocation of Shs 38.16 million per parish. Government will allocate more funds to further capitalise the Parish Revolving Fund in the subsequent financial years of the NDP III period.

To allow time for consultations and preparation of detailed allocation criteria for parish-specific allocation of funds, parishes will receive a uniform allocation of Shs 38.16 million in this coming financial year.

In Financial Year 2022/2023 and the medium term, the specific amount of funds to be allocated to the Revolving Fund of the respective parishes will be determined using the following broad criteria:

1. Share of households in the subsistence economy by sub-county. This will be established using a parish register to be established under pillar 5 of the model.
2. Affirmative action for special groups; women, youth and persons with disabilities. Consistent with the current affirmative policy of Government, we are proposing that parishes allocate 30 per cent of the money from the Parish Resolving Fund to household enterprises endorsed by women in the household.
3. Affirmative action for different regions and zones based on parameters such as poverty.

How will the parish model be financed?

Madam Speaker, with exception of pillar 3 on Financial Inclusion, all pillars of the Parish Development Model will continue to be funded under existing arrangements. In Financial Year 2021/2022, the Pillar 3 of the Parish Development Model will be financed through amalgamation of the wealth funds listed in Table 5 below.

Let me read it.

Table 5. Amalgamated funds to finance the Parish Model in the Financial Year 2021/2022

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S/No. | Wealth fund | FY 2021/2022  Allocation (billions) |
|  | Youth Livelihood Fund | - |
|  | Uganda Women Empowerment Fund | 32 |
|  | PRDP | 98 |
|  | Luweero-Rwenzori Development Programme | 9.3 |
|  | NAADS (Seedlings) | 56 |
|  | Agri-LED (OWC) | 200 |
|  | UCDA (Seedlings) | 58 |
|  | Totals | 453.3 |

A total of Shs 59 billion that is currently in circulation under the existing arrangement of the Youth Livelihood Programme and Uganda Women’s Empowerment Programme (UWEP) will also be channelled to the Parish Revolving Fund upon its recovery from beneficiaries with time.

The amalgamated funds under the Parish Revolving Fund will be distributed as summarised in Table 6 below and I will read it.

Table 6 Reallocation Summary of Amalgamated Funds in billions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Parish Revolving Funds | Admin. costs | Staff costs | CIS Data Tools | Training | Sub-totals |
| District Local Governments | 404.3 | 2.2 | 15.0 | 26.8 | 0 | 448.3 |
| UBoS |  |  |  | 0.8 | 3.2 | 4.0 |
| MoLG |  | 1.0 |  |  |  | 1.0 |
| MICT&NG |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total | 400.0 | 3.2 | 15.0 | 28.6 | 3.2 |  |
| Grand total |  |  |  |  |  | 453.3 |

That is how we are proposing to reallocate the money but we can receive further guidance from this House.

Comparison of the Parish Development Model with past and existing wealth creation funds

Madam Speaker, I would like us to listen to each other on this because we have had feelings from our friends that what we have been doing was not right.

Compared to past and existing affirmative action interventions, the Parish Development Model has the following strengths:

1. It is a universal programme covering all the 10,594 parishes of the country (2021 Figures). This provides for fair and equitable access to resources.

In addition, district local governments receive a bigger resource in total than is possible under existing initiatives. For example, Soroti District (including Soroti City) with a total of 49 parishes and 503 villages, will receive an allocation of Shs 3 billion under the Parish Development Model. This is far higher than what is available under existing initiatives (Shs 1.2 billion under Youth Livelihood Programme and Shs 0.58 billion under UWEP in the Financial Year 2020/2021.

1. It is more inclusive than existing initiatives because it caters for all interest groups in a parish (women, youth, persons with disabilities and other unspecified minority interest groups).
2. It is implemented through established Government structures, which significantly lowers its administrative costs compared to existing arrangements of a similar nature.
3. It is designed to build and develop parish institutions as opposed to simply delivering time bound interventions.
4. Its credit is lower than that of existing initiatives. Loans from the Parish Revolving Fund will have an interest rate of inflation rate + one per cent compared to a surcharge of five per cent under the Youth Livelihood Programme and a service fee of five per cent under the Uganda Women’s Empowerment Programme.
5. Under the Parish Model, the funds allocated to the Parish Revolving Fund belong to the residents of the parish and will be managed by a specialised financial institution (Parish SACCOs) that is supervised by a regulator for their perpetual use and multiplication.
6. Its commodity focus (18 priority commodities) has an unrivalled relevance for the country's food security and industrialisation agenda.

The prior actions for implementation of the Parish Model

Cabinet approved implementation of the Parish Development Model (PDM) as the delivery strategy for transitioning households out of the subsistence economy, with effect from 01 July 2021.

A number of prior actions will be implemented by end of the Financial Year 2020/2021 and at the start of the Financial Year 2021/2022, for successful implementation of the Parish Development Model.

It is expected that the Parish Development Model will be fully operational by the start of the second quarter of the Financial Year 2021/2022. The detailed implementation roadmap is contained in the Guide to the Parish Development Model, which I have just laid on the Table.

In conclusion, I have highlighted the cause for graduating more of our fellow citizens from the subsistence economy. These citizens include women, youth, the elderly and persons with disabilities. They are resident in the parishes where the Parish Development Model will be implemented.

Under the Parish Development Model, a bigger number of these citizens will have access to more resources than has been possible under any affirmative programme we are implementing in the country today.

I therefore call upon my colleagues to seize this unique opportunity of making a lifetime difference in the lives of the 39 per cent of Ugandan households in the subsistence economy, by extending their full support for the implementation of the Parish Development Model starting in the Financial Year 2021/2022. I beg to submit.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, honourable Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. Honourable members, you will recall that we were debating a motion here and the junior Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development informed us that they needed to explain the parish model so that it informs our budgeting process. That is why the minister came today. You can make a few comments.

**Ms ogwal:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the presentation made by the minister on the Parish Development Model. Most of us are very intrigued because we are hearing it for the first time. One thing I would like the members to understand is that the Budget of the next financial year will be based on this model. Therefore, we should understand the implication of the Parish Development Model.

However, the reason why I have stood on a procedural point is that we had requested the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development to first articulate the Parish Development Model to the Budget Committee, which is going to take care of our budgetary needs. Once we understand it, we shall then translate it into budgetary terms. We can also articulate it to Parliament.

We were supposed to meet the ministry today but the meeting was postponed to Monday. I got surprised when I watched the minister on Television presenting to Parliament the parish model and yet, the fundamental documents that help to shape the budget, for example, the National Budget Framework Paper and the NDP III were not incorporated under the parish model; as the budget committee, we were able to see that these two critical positions were not catered for.

The people that run those critical agencies told us that they had no idea about them, which surprised me. Therefore, we told them to go and first understand, educate each other and then come back. We expected them to come today as a team. The NDP boss told us that whatever parish model was being articulated was not aligned to what is contained in the NDP III.

Madam Speaker, we appreciate and we all want money to trickle down but we must also be aware, as leaders of this country, that we have put structures in place. We must know the implication in terms of the cost of demolishing those structures. We do not want a situation where we will hurriedly bring critical programmes like this – and they use very sweet words; that money is trickling down to the lowest like *Emyooga*.

If you ask a question about *Emyooga*, they will say that they want your constituency to know that you do not want money to go to them but we knew that *Emyooga* was going to collapse at the gate. We are now surprised that the same ministry is now saying *Emyooga* must undergo forensic audit.

As Parliament, we had told them that you cannot come with an important project that trickles down to our people and yet, we do not even understand it.

We are now talking about the parish model, which is first of all, going to collapse. The UWEP money for women collapsed. They used the money and collapsed it. The ministry of agriculture must be close because it will have nothing since all these projects you are talking about on coffee and cotton will now not be driven under the ministry of agriculture but under a different agency.

Parliament has a responsibility. Are we procedurally operating in accordance with the structural setup as we understand it, in the professional workout, organic natural structure from the President and various ministries with their accountability and budget and specialised agencies? Can we withdraw *Emyooga*? Tell this Parliament and God that we will do a god job.

Madam Speaker, whichever way you guide us, I know that if we do not think over this properly, like *Emyooga*, it will also collapse at the gate. Next year, when we talk about the budget, do not say you did not know. I am here to request you to guide us on the way we are proceeding.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, the reason the minister came today is because when we were debating a motion to halt the merger of UWEP funds with the other funds, we demanded to know this new parish model. How is it going to impact the resources? That is why we asked for this presentation.

Honourable minister, on page 8 of your paper, under 21, you say, *“*We are proposing that parishes allocate 30 per cent from the parish revolving fund to household enterprises to the rest of the women in the household.”

Is it what you are going to do? Our worry is that the UWEP funds are going to be diverted into other things. We want to know if this is just a proposal or a commitment, before we take a decision. Is this 30 per cent a commitment?

4.30

**MS SYDA BBUMBA (NRM, Nakaseke North County, Nakaseke):** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank the minister of finance for the presentation.

I stand here to discuss the paper, as the person who was the lead party in framing the UWEP and other marginalised funds. These funds were supposed to address the impediments marginalised groups encountered in accessing funding in economic development.

At the time these funds were put in place, the population of Uganda was less than 30 million but today, we are 45 million. Inflation has gone up over the last 15 years and so, the Shs 30 billion, which they have been putting under UWEP and other allocations to the marginalised funds are just a show-off; they do not match the need.

I know at one time I was there but they have been concealing information. They do not give us the true picture of what has been happening. I think Shs 30 billion to a population of 45 million, where the women constitute 52 per cent, is very little money. They are just sprinkling it. What we want is meaningful money for economic development of the women.

The women, who constitute the bigger part of our population, are the most hardworking and committed to the welfare of the family. Ugandan women are known for their high entrepreneurship and commitment. If they put up sufficient money, this poverty they are talking of would become history.

Their proposal is to merge the funds and put about Shs 480 billion in the parish model out of which 30 per cent would go to the women. When you look at it arithmetically, it makes a lot of sense because 30 per cent of Shs 480 billion is over Shs 150 billion compared to the Shs 30 billion they are getting now.

That is why I am saying that the ministry of finance is not giving out sufficient information to sensitise the people. There is more money but how it will be managed is the problem. Right now, this money has been administered at the district and now you are bringing it down. Do you have the skills and appropriate structures to manage that money?

Again, what we are not bringing out well is that this 30 per cent is following the constitutional command. The women will be eligible to access even the 70 per cent. That is what he is not bringing out. If that comes out well, there will be more money on the table. If the women have got more money, they will be the first arrivals in the middle income status we are talking about. We have not gone far on that route because the women, who are the workers, have not had access to reasonable capital for their business.

If the ministry of finance can give us assurance that they have got a mechanism of managing this money and make an irrevocable commitment that the 30 per cent for the women will not be touched, even if there are budget cuts, it will be protected and that the women will still be eligible to access the 70 per cent. I wish to submit.

**MS KAMATEEKA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the minister for finance for bringing us the explanation on the parish model programme because we did not know; now we know.

Let me start with the 30 per cent - even hon. Bbumba said that women in Uganda are more than 50 per cent. So, why would you want to give women a mere 30 per cent? This is not 1995 when women were given only a third because they did not know their potential.

In all these years, the NRM has put effort into empowering women, they have proved themselves. They have even been faithful with this money and returned it. Why would you want to give them 30 per cent using the Constitution as an excuse? The women in Uganda -

**THE SPEAKER:** They are proposing 50 per cent.

**MS KAMATEEKA:** Yes, they have proved themselves capable and there are very many single parent women-headed households and so, if we want to make a difference, we should give more money to the women.

The UWEP has been successful. It should be maintained and other funding should be supplementary and if the money has to go to the parish, let the UWEP money be doubled so that women can do their work.

We appreciate the low interest rate because now, it is 1 per cent but there is no money that has been provided for training the parish councils; it is such a shame.

You are giving Shs 3.3 billion to Uganda Bureau of Statistics to come and report on the performance of people you have not trained. Can we provide money for training? Otherwise, we are just groping in the dark.

There is no provision for storing this produce. There are no concrete market and no plans for value addition. If in this plan we had a factory per district and different factories within the region, it would make a lot more sense.

People are going to be made to pay membership into the parish SACCO like it happened to the *Emyooga* where people sold their property, took debts to be members but up to now, they have not received the *Emyooga* money.

We are going to demand that women pay money into this SACCO when the women already belong to their organisations. Can we give them money in the organisations where they belong?

Finally, we appreciate the focus on commodities but where are the extension workers to guide people on how to grow these things and get maximum production from the crops?

There is no plan for extension workers to guide these people on how to grow crops using this money so as get meaningful and qualitative harvest.

The parish model is good. It is taking more money down to the grassroots but we must increase the percentage of the money going to the women to 50 per cent *–(Interruption)*

**MR PATRICK NSAMBA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The information I am giving my colleague is that if she is really fighting for women, she should not fall for the percentage.

Leave the UWEP money - Government wants services at the parish level - only demand the ministry of gender to implement the UWEP activities at parish level. Otherwise, once you start falling for the percentage, you will have missed it.

Let these be partners; let Coffee Development Authority (UCDA) be a partner at parish level and let UWEP be a partner at parish level but not to take away their money.

**MS KAMATEEKA:** Thank you, honourable colleague. Indeed, I had noted that UWEP has been successful. It has been tested and proved. Let the parish model continue while it picks lessons from UWEP.

Let the UWEP funds be doubled but remain under the supervision of ministry of gender and the rest of the funds go to the parish as the parish model picks lessons from UWEP. I beg to submit.

4.41

**MR RICHARD OTHIENO (NRM, West Budama County North, Tororo):** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for giving me this opportunity to raise issues for clarification. I listened to the minister very attentively. He said that the parish is going to be the planning level. If the parish is the planning level, why are you turning it into an implementation level?

Secondly, if you want interventions to be at the parish level, why are you removing money from entities? Why don’t you ask them to do their implementation at the parish level?

Why are you taking away money from professional entities, which can implement their programmes to the Ministry of Local Government, which has its own issues?

Three *–(Interruption)*

**MS NAKIWALA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thought that I would make this clear to my colleague for purposes of this debate. The practice is - for example, in the youth livelihood programme - the money we are talking about already belongs to the Ministry of Local Government.

When we sent the money for the very first time to the districts, it became theirs through a revolving fund and we made contracts with the respective chief administrative officers to the effect that whatever they collected became money for that particular district to revolve.

It no longer comes back to the central Government or to the ministry of gender. As we talk, the money that is purportedly for Youth Livelihood Programme is money that is entirely and exclusively the property of the Ministry of Local Government.

Madam Speaker, hon. Kamateeka is asking me to add on something. The reason we did that was that the ministry of gender does not have accounting presence at the district level. The Community Development Officers (CDOs) belong to the Ministry of Local Government.

When I went to Kayunga to supervise the Youth Livelihood Programme four years ago, I realised that there were some malpractices. Therefore, I announced there and then that I had instructed that they terminate or investigate the code of conduct and practices of the CDO.

After some time, I went back to find out whether that was implemented. They then told me, “She is not in your line of supervision as the minister of gender”. So, the money and practice of the Youth Livelihood Programme is entirely the responsibility of the Ministry of Local Government.

What we have –*(Interjections)*- What we have, Madam Speaker –*(Interruption)*

**THE SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**MR OKUPA:** Honourable minister, I expected you to know the rules and you should not have continued to speak.

There are two ministers in that ministry - I do not want to mention names – who were here last week. The position they gave is contrary to what this minister is now giving here. Can we know who is giving us the correct picture about this?

The senior ministers in the ministry were here and they gave a position. Now, you have come and given a different perspective. Who is right? Is it in order for a junior minister to come and contradict what we received from the senior ministers, Madam Speaker?

**MS NAKIWALA:** Thank you very much. I was –*(Laughter)*

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I think this parish model is new to everybody. Let us hear each other out, understand it and then, we take a position.

**MS NAKIWALA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. That is the information I wanted to give; that the money is already with the Ministry of Local Government. We do not have any more control over it over the years.

**THE SPEAKER:** I really need clarification on the CDO because I thought it belongs to the ministry of gender.

**MR OTHIENO:** Thank you. Madam Speaker, it is very clear that the ministry needed more information than she was giving.

I would like to inform the minister that in 2019, Uganda Coffee Development Authority generated $492 million and now, the Government is taking away all the money from coffee. This means that we are foregoing $492 million, in terms of revenue, simply because you want to promote the parish model. This is why we are saying leave UCDA to implement its programmes at parish level. That is what we are saying, honourable minister. You need that information. Also, even when you look at –

Madam Speaker, UCDA has got a programme, which they call “parish model advisors”. Currently, they are operating in 6,069 parishes in 126 coffee growing areas. Why do you remove money from an entity, which is already operating at parish level and is offering professional extension services and you are saying, “Leave this money; give it to the Ministry of Local Government? You are saying, “UCDA, you can go home and do other things. Let the Ministry of Local Government do it.”

This is what we are saying. There is a problem of direction here. *(Interjections)* I am giving you facts.

Madam Speaker, if you look at – again, the minister talked about priority commodities. I have had the opportunity to look at these commodities and I am going to give an example of Bukedi.

In Bukedi, where I come from, they are prioritising provision of milk coolers for the commodity that they are talking about. We are not cattle keepers in Bukedi. So, if you are telling us that under these programmes, you are prioritising provision of milk coolers, where are the animals?

Madam Speaker, you can see the technocrats have hurried with this programme. They have not had time but because they must justify money going to certain areas, they come and now confuse the country without any clear, well thought out programmes.

The minister was talking about wealth funds. I would like to tell the minister that PRDP, for instance, is not a wealth fund. The PRDP is a stabilisation/recovery fund. *(Applause)* When you now start bundling PRDP as a wealth fund, it means you have lost the plot, right from the very beginning. Luweero is also not a wealth fund, per se, but a recovery and stabilisation fund.

I can go on and on but I would like to say finally – the clarification I want is: the minister is now telling us that this is a life-changing intervention. However, we have had many of these interventions.

I would like to remind the minister - and he tells us what happened. We had something called “*Okulembeka*”. We had something called *Entandikwa*. We have Prosperity for All. We have Operation Wealth Creation and most recently, Emyooga. All the time, whenever you were introducing it, you were saying, “These are life-changing opportunities for the country”.

Madam Speaker, what happened? *Emyooga* has just started but it has already collapsed. Our worry is; why is the Government in a rush to implement a programme, where the country has not been involved in deciding the destiny of this country because we are all Ugandans?

If there is a new programme, involve all Ugandans. Let us discuss these things, understand if it is okay and we all buy it as Ugandans. Not  a certain group of technocrats sitting in the ministry of finance and coming to say, “We are imposing this on Ugandans”, when we are actually seeing there are more challenges than answers they are giving. Thank you, Madam Speaker. *(Applause)*

4.51

**MR JAMES KABERUKA (NRM, Kinkizi County West, Kanungu):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. This parish model is indeed a model but I went to school. A model and project are different in both outlook and practice. I am surprised that the minister has presented a parish model in the form of a programme.

A model is innovation, like the way when COVID-19 pandemic came. You said we cannot close Parliament but we can be in this model. Others can close but we can continue operating but in this kind of arrangement. That is a model. However, the minister has turned a model into a project.

The parish model she is talking about is giving Shs I billion to the Ministry of Local Government to coordinate the whole country. They are not giving us the right information, as hon. Bbumba has said. This document is unearthing their nakedness.

There is a steering committee supposed to oversee this parish mode, headed by the minister of finance. Therefore, local Government is a conduit to make sure they convince Ugandans to go through with their thing. Otherwise, this thing is amorphous and they themselves have not even internalised it.

On this Shs 430 billion, they are going to recruit staff and Shs 230 billion is going to go into procurements alone. They are telling us 30 per cent of the fund is going to the women and youth. Where is that money? You need to calculate 30 per cent out of the remaining Shs 200 billion and not Shs 400 billion.

Madam Speaker, they are talking of computers that they are going give to the people who are going to get the parish data. I am costing each computer at Shs 7 million only. When you multiply Shs 7 million for the computers by 10,594 parishes in the country, you will remain with only a peanut from this money.

It is proper –*(Interruption)*

**THE SPEAKER:** Let us have a point of order from hon. Bahati.

**MR BAHATI:** Madam Speaker, I have much respect for hon. Kaberuka who represents some of my relatives in the House. *(Laughter)* However, I would like to put him to order because the statement, which has been presented by the minister, states in Table 6, which all of us can look at now, that out of Shs 453.3 billion; Shs 400 billion is for the revolving fund. Administration costs are Shs 3.2 billion, staffing costs, Shs 15 billion, ICT data and others cost Shs 20 billion and training of sub-county staff costs Shs 3.2 billion.

Is it in order for hon. Kaberuka to mislead the House that Shs 250 billion is for procurement, when in the figures we have in the statement presented in the House this afternoon is Shs 400 billion out of Shs 453 billion? We are referring to the statement the minister of finance has presented and not the document that you have. I do not know where you got it from.

Is hon. Kaberuka in order to mislead the House about this important programme?

**THE SPEAKER:** Hon. Kaberuka, can you substantiate your allegations?

**MR KABERUKA:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the minister. Indeed, we are learning. According to hon. Othieno, we have come a long way from many interventions being sweet-talked here and they end up shams in the field.

I am talking logically and he must also tell us logically what it implies to get a computer for a person in the parish to collect data. How much money is paid for a computer in the ministry of finance? How much money are you going to use to buy computers for the 10,594 parishes?

I am speaking logically and I am telling you that mathematically, the money that is meant for computers only is too much.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable Members, let us stick to the motion. The question was whether the UWEP fund should join the other funds..

**MR KABERUKA:** My concern is that the Parish Development Model is not bad. The Parish Development Model is not rocket science where we need to pull money from MDAs to put it in a basket to fund it. Parliament should maintain its practice by ensuring that every UWEP programme is operating at the parish level. We should not move money away from UWEP to put it in the Parish Development Model.

Indeed, the parish should be where the planning is done as shown in this presentation. However, this is a gimmick to remove money from the MDAs. When there is scarcity of money, the first culprits to suffer are these monies. They will be removed and the Government will then say they did not get money for the Parish Development Model.

When we ring-fence the money and say it is for women who make up 60 per cent of the population of Uganda and we operationalise it at the parish level, it will work. The money should not be removed from the UWEP. If the Youth Livelihood Fund is there, let it be operationalised at the parish level. We should not allow money to be removed from any agencies and put it in the Parish Development Model as if this is rocket science.

**MR KISA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank my colleague for giving way. I am a professional teacher and when people talk about a model, I know that anything to be implemented as a model must have been successfully piloted before it is rolled out.

The *Emyooga* programme that is almost collapsing was piloted in Kassanda District only and once they saw it was operating well in that district, they decided to roll it out. That is where the problem came from.

My view is that the Government should have come out clearly to give us a perspective of how this model had worked before it is brought to Parliament to be approved for implementation. That is the information I would like to give. Thank you.

**MS ASAMO:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the minister for his presentation. We shall all agree that the Parish Development Model will be nearer to our people.

Our Government has implemented a lot of programmes and we would be very rich but all of them end up in failure stories. If you check the Youth Livelihood Fund, people say they thought it was a “thank you” from the President. We even do not know where *Entandikwa* ended.

Before we even see much of the programmes like UWEP where there is some result, now we want to amalgamate them. I represent a special interest group. The moment they put this fund in a general bowel, it is very hard for the special interest group to get this money.

However little the money the women have is, let it be theirs so that they know how to manage it. We had already empowered the women councils at the parish level. They are in charge of the meetings at the subcounty. Now, we are killing that structure. You are going to bring – I will tell you that every parish will have a chairman, and not a single a lady chairperson. There will be countable women who will take the position of chairperson.

Every parish will have a parish chief who is a man. Already with UWEP, before they sign your form, you are asked for something in return. You hear things like, “Give us something” or “Give us airtime” or “I don’t have a boda boda”. Are we really right to think we are helping our people by bringing sentiments here?

A fellow *mwalimu*, hon. Kisa,has spoken on piloting. I also wondered why we cannot test the Parish Development Model in some parishes before taking it to all the 10,594 parishes. Try it first somewhere meanwhile this other fund is running concurrently so that we have something to weigh. When UBOS does the monitoring and evaluation, they can give us a report.

I see Shs 15 billion is going to staffing and yet our women have been volunteering in UWEP. Nobody has been giving them payment but they have been happy. I went to Rwanda and Kenya and I have seen that they empower women who have not gone to school. The governments of those countries help those women to export their goods. As a result, they get a lot of money. The Masai women are empowered; they make baskets, beads and many more and the Government takes them there.

I also worry, Honourable Minister. We talk of coffee - how many women own those lands? Otherwise, it is going to be the man taking the proceeds. *(Interjections)*  Yes, you dig and do everything but the man will say “Bring the money here.” Are you really giving us the right thing by thinking that we should clap for you because you have made us a third?

We know women are in the councils but how many of them raise their voices? Let us talk of this thing when we know practically - I am a down-to-earth person and I stay in the village. I know what happens because that is where by constituents are. I cannot sit in a boardroom and appreciate and say, “yes to parish model” for the sake of talking.

We have just brought in a big term *Emyooga* but people are crying. They say: “They have told us to contribute this and that”; we are talking about supporting poor people but you bring in other things.

Honourable minister, I would like to propose that let us pilot this project in some of your parishes meanwhile the other programmes like the UWEP fund are running. It should be running somewhere and you also test. When somebody tells me that there is no staff in the districts, then, I am asking, all these ministry programmes are running in the local Governments and they are unfunded - most of the money is at national level. Why don’t we transfer all the money of monitoring and everything back to the local Government. That is where the programmes are run.

That argument does not satisfy me because this money, which is at the local Government, is monitored again by a minister at headquarters or somebody. We are being told that UBOS will be coming, somebody from ministry of finance and may be somebody from Operation Wealth Creation; I do not know because I have not understood.

Honourable minister, you need to help me as a politician, when I am monitoring, who am I monitoring? Am I monitoring the parish, the Subcounty or chief administrative officer? If I am taking a committee down there, where are we going to see the effects of this model? What is your marketing strategy? Really to move us from poverty - the 68 per cent - and make sure that by this time, these people have money in their houses; it is not about giving people peanuts without impact. We would have lost Shs 400 billion in one financial year.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, even with UWEP, we have never had 100 per cent release. Are you assuring us that in this one, you will be releasing it 100 per cent without cutting? Is it ring-fenced so that by the time we support you, we have answers to take back to those people in the villages. I thank you.

5.07

**MS VIOLET AKURUT (NRM, Woman Representative, Katakwi):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Allow me to thank the minister for the statement on the parish model. I have three concerns on this parish model that I wanted to bring forth as we discuss this model.

The first one that I am not satisfied with or convinced on is on the constitution - that is the executive committee of the parish model. Knowing that 52 per cent of our population is constituted by women, I was wondering what informed the composition of the executive where just a third is given to women. I would propose that we could have had maybe 50 per cent of the executive being constituted by women, knowing that we are looking at the poverty situation in the country.

By the figures that the minister gave of 68 per cent of our people doing agriculture, most of it is being done by women. Therefore, I expected the constitution of the executive to be by more than 50 per cent of the women; since it is more of them that undertake agriculture in our communities.

The second aspect that I am not comfortable with is; did the ministry do the evaluation of the affirmative action programmes? I know that UWEP and the Youth Livelihood Fund were instituted as an affirmative action for the women and the youth. For us to say that we are going to collapse these programmes of UWEP and Youth livelihood Fund to get the funding for this parish model, then we have missed the point of affirmative action for women.

I would think that true, the parish model is a good one. And honestly, I would be one of the best beneficiaries; I have 108 parishes in Katakwi that would have given us about Shs 40 billion under this model. However, for us to collapse UWEP programme and Youth Livelihood Fund, we are missing a point because those were affirmative action programmes.

Thirdly, Madam Speaker, I had an opportunity to look at the PRDP III, under one of the programmes of PRDP III is there is regional development; catch-up programmes of Bukedi, Busoga, Teso, Karamoja subregions and northern Uganda. Those are regions that are being looked to be under or below the poverty line. As such, the Government has instituted a programme of regional development bringing them to equality with the rest of the regions.

For us to say that we are going to close PRDP, NUSAF and the rest - and of course, I know the parish model, we are going to all the parishes, then are we not widening the poverty gap in the country? Even those that are not experiencing poverty, so to say, will have the parish model programme in their parishes.

Therefore, what are we doing about these catch-up programmes; we call them recovery and stabilisation programmes if we are going to use the funding meant for them - funding meant for Bukedi, Teso, Karamoja subregions and northern Uganda for these parish model projects or programmes.

Madam Speaker, my recommendation would be that let the parish model be a standalone or a complementary or a supplementary programme to the rest of the programmes that are already running in the country like UWEP, Youth Livelihood Fund, NUSAF, PRDP and the rest. That is my humble contribution Madam Speaker. Thank you.

5.11

**MS ESTHER ANYAKUN (NRM, Woman Representative, Nakapiripirit)**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank the minister for this presentation. I truly want to support this parish model. I remember I heard the minister talking about how to empower sub-regions for example those that have been hit very much by poverty levels. I come from one of the sub-regions - that is Karamoja; subregions like Bukedi and Busoga.

We have been trying to see how these sub-regions can appear in black and white in the NDP so that they also curve a level to be balanced like other regions. Probably this parish model is going to help us.

One challenge we have had with Government programmes is beneficiary identification. Whatever the district tries to identify, if the CDO does not have a “technical know-who” in the particular sub-county, people end up not getting these services.

You find the same beneficiary is in NUSAF, UWEP, OPM and NAADs. Now, I believe this model is going to help us to go down to the people, for example, in my constituency Nakapiripirit District and they will be in position to control. The only challenge that the ministry has to help us with is the technical part of it. Who is going to monitor this at the parish level and not the parish chiefs? They also have issues of getting “*kitu kidogo”* from the beneficiaries.

We should streamline that and then we make sure that this goes to the people. I believe this thing is going to work. Even when I got to know about it, I was very happy that it will reach the people of Nakapiripirit down in the villages; those hard-to-reach areas that you, Madam Speaker, have been to and my people have not been benefiting from this project. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

5.13

**MS AGNES AMEEDE (NRM, Woman Representative, Butebo):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also thank the minister for the statement. However, I stand here as a skeptic over this model. There are very many models to development but this particular one needs to be carefully thought out. When I was a student at Makerere as an undergraduate, there was a public lecture and the keynote speaker of the day was Prof. Mahmood Mamdani. He made a statement that decentralisation in Uganda as of now is like decentralising corruption. It amused us very much. We giggled and laughed but I have lived to see that.

Poverty is prevalent in Uganda because of many institutional and structural challenges that I call upon the Government to address before jumping into this model. Poverty cannot be addressed overnight; it is a gradual process.

In 2018, we had the opportunity to benefit from NUSAF as a district but there is nothing to write about. Honourable minister, I am here to tell you that your model is going to fail if you fuse it with politics. Divest development issues from politics. Let the politicians be the policy makers and supervisors but not implementers.

Why are we not concentrating on one thing?  We start this, drop it and start that. We have half a dose of everything. There are progressive people in the villages. What do they do differently from the rest of the people? Have we analysed, for instance, those who are progressing; is the issue capital? Let it be and then let us increase credit access for those who are progressive so that the others can learn from them. Let the credit be managed by a professional institution. Please, stop tempting civil servants to steal this money.

Why do I talk of half dose? What is the focus of our Government? Fifty years down the road, there are still children seated on the ground. Is it creating wealth that is urgent? If an uneducated person gets proper education, perhaps they will create wealth for themselves.

Our children in the villages are not studying; our health care and rural roads are bad. Why don’t we focus on those areas rather than throwing around money, which be stolen?

Finally, I implore you, honourable minister. This money you are going to send will be little without any impactful meaning. Therefore, we are just deceiving Ugandans. Why don’t you, for example, pool this money and subsidise areas that the majority are engaged in like Agriculture? Put good seeds and fertilisers at sub-counties. Put hatcheries so that many people can be raised up at once instead of a few individuals.

Lastly, there is the *Emyooga* issue. Butebo did not get this money. You ran away from *Emyooga* queries and came to this. I would like you to give a statement, if there is a possibility that for those who want to opt out of the *Emyooga*, to have their money refunded. Thank you.

5.18

**MR MICHAEL TIMUZIGU (NRM, Kajara County, Ntungamo):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the minister for presenting and giving us light about the parish model. It is today that we should remind the minister and the entire Cabinet that it is not time to introduce new things, which we do not understand when the economy is not doing well and our budget is not sufficient to cater for even the programmes that have been running.

The UWEP, for example, does not have enough money. We have not raised enough money for Youth Livelihood Fund and other programmes, which are supposed to do better work that has been tested in this country.

It is not time now to test new programmes when we do not have enough money. We are borrowing to the extent that we are about to reach our threshold, which will make us fail to borrow in the next financial year. I am worried when they talk about 49.9 per cent, which is almost 50. As we talk about this model, the highest probability surrounding that money is that it will be stolen. When I say that, I really believe so. How can you say that the model will cover the entire country when there is no money, yet, UWEP and Youth Livelihood Fund have not covered the entire country and have spent very many years? Those funds have been here and not covered the entire country.

It is totally impossible. Maybe it will cover the entire country by benefiting the chief administrative officer and other individuals and the rest of the people will remain poor.

Lastly, it has been well documented by the minister that our rural people do not have money. Now that we know that, why overtax them and send back the money? In that process, it is deducted through different ways of spending on the personnel and all kinds of implementation.

Why don’t we leave our people with their money; they save it, raise capital and make Uganda prosper? Why overtax them and then send the money back? Of course, by the time it reaches there, it will be about 40 per cent. Why don’t we leave there 100 per cent instead of 100 and take back 40 per cent? Thank you.

5.21

**MR GODFREY ONZIMA (NRM, Aringa North County, Yumbe):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. When I followed this debate from the other motion where the other honourable member – I have forgotten who moved a motion that the women fund should not be put together -

**THE SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition, hon. Aol.

**MR GODFREY ONZIMA:** Thank you. When I followed that debate that day, to date, there seems to be a critical question, which is not being answered. That seems to be the source of confusion.

When we say that the women’s fund will be put together with other funds and implemented at parish model, what is this money going to do at the parish level? If it is to be accessed by women at parish level other than the previous levels, I do not think this confusion will come. *(Applause)*

Therefore, when we talk about parish model, it will appear initially that the last local Government point of service delivery is the sub-county. The youth and women are supposed to access their money there. If Government said that instead of people accessing services at the sub-county where maybe fewer people are benefiting, let us take it to a parish level such that it is taken nearer the people therefore more people are to access it, I do not think there would be this debate.

Sometime back when we had adopted decentralisation, the element of decentralisation was brought about by the World Bank that the governments will adopt good governance, which meant that more people should be involved in decision-making and services should be taken nearer to the people. Then, the people in charge of service delivery should be more accountable to people. If we say that sub-counties are a bit far, let us go closer to the parish level; where is the problem, honourable members?

I think the confusion here is that there seems to be a kind of understanding that when this money is taken, it is taken to implement the model. My understanding is that women will access this money at parish level.

I support this because we are politicians and politics influences service delivery. Sometimes, you find that at a sub-county level, the women from the LC III chairperson’s parish may even benefit more than other women from other parishes.

If there are discrepancies of this nature and we say this should be put to an end so that the services are taken to the parish level and so that more people will benefit, many that have been side-lined can come on board. Honourable members, I do not see any challenge with this.

I would like us to see if the money is enough and that should be the question. When I looked at this money, I noticed that it is supposed to be Shs 490 billion to implement the parish model, which is supposed to go to 10,595 parishes. When you divide this, each parish gets around Shs 46 million. The question is, is this enough?

However, as far as the programme is concerned, I see it as effective decentralisation and a way of taking services closer to the people. Thank you very much.

5.26

**MS MARGARET BABA DIRI (NRM, Woman Representative, Koboko):** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am not amused with the parish model. This is not the first time that the Government is introducing such a programme and most of them have failed. There are very few, probably like UWEP, which have succeeded.

Why do I think this programme will also follow the rest and fail? - because they are using the same method of distributing the money. They say that people must form SACCOs. Do you know how tedious it is to form a SACCO? You have to register, contribute and come all the way to Kampala to ensure that it is registered with a cooperative here, which is a long process. It takes time to get that money.

How many women out there will be able to contribute and access this money from these SACCOs? How many SACCOs have collapsed? I remember, in 2006, we were encouraged to form SACCOs at subcounty level so that people could get money. We all endeavoured but most of these SACCOs collapsed. People’s money was spent by others and now when you talk of SACCOS, the people are not impressed with them. The way in which this money is going to be given is a way of failure.

In addition, the training you are talking of takes one or two days but the training of how to implement the programme – For example, if you are growing coffee, how are you going to grow it? How is the coffee monitored? How is it harvested up to the end? That applies to whether you take maize or livestock. The training is not adequate.

There is also the aspect of the supply of the inputs. For example, they will ask for seeds, transport seeds from elsewhere and by the time they reach there, all will be withered and they cannot progress.

The method of distribution is the same. I do not know how we can change it. I think what is very important is that we must emphasise training of our individuals by the right people; for example, the extension workers and those doing business so that by the time they pick that money, they will know what to use it for. Otherwise, if we are not careful, it will follow the same trend.

The UWEP is doing well. Instead of doing it at the sub-county level, we can bring it to the parish level so that the women can access their money. This also applies to the youths. Instead of killing other programmes and depending on a programme which may collapse – Believe me or not, this programme will follow the same trend. Let us have a better way of training our people so that when they get the money, they can implement and improve their lives. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

5.30

**MR STEPHEN MUKITALE (Independent, Buliisa County, Buliisa):** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank the minister for bringing this information to the Floor because we have a ministry of national guidance. It is unfortunate for this debate to have taken place for some time without clearly coming out at that level.

We are almost celebrating the silver jubilee of decentralisation in Uganda, as devolution of taking services nearer to the people with districts as the centre of operation but implementation mostly at the sub-county. I am a student of devolution but the planning area has been the parish. What you are not telling this Parliament - and you have experts such as the National Planning Authority – is what went wrong with decentralisation that all the attempts to transit and migrate our people from peasantry have failed? There is no data and reference to it and yet there is the *Entandiikwa* and Prosperity For All programmes, which are all good efforts.

The other day, while contributing to this motion, I said, “You do not have to rob a Nyakato to give birth to a strong Isingoma.” Let me amend my statement; “You do not have to kill a Nyakato to produce an Isingoma.” That is what we are trying to do.

If UWEP is a success story, it should only be enhanced. There are already existing structures at a parish such as SACCOs at that level. Why this policy reversal? There is some confusion at the technical level; maybe somebody is giving them instructions and that is why they have lost their expertise and they can give the minister a document, which clearly shows that there is some unnecessary rush.

I would also have expected the minister, at this point in time and more so, the National Planning Authority – We did not achieve middle income status last year; the economy was hit hard in 2020 by COVID-19. We have been having success enterprises at that level; progressive farmers and lead farmers. They are now struggling. Why don’t you come with a COVID-19 stimulus response to help those who are a success story with proven performance? You are now proposing to go to a grey area, which you do not even know whether it will succeed at all, you would have a much better effect.

Parliament in the constitutional amendment after looking at the challenges of decentralisation did come up with article 178 of the Constitution and that was the regional tier Government. Specifically, section (a) equalisation of areas like Busoga; my grandchildren where all our people used to go and work but it is now been called a poor area.

The household survey and others have brought out areas of chronic poverty; why don’t you pilot in those areas where there are challenges?

Last year and on this budget, we introduced cities, we failed to get regional Governments but cities came and I thank Government for that. I was one person who was pushing for that motion but it should not just be political cities.

These should be economic zones with industrial parks, with all the value addition and silos. You cannot do it at parish but it has to be at some level. If we are going to transform, it cannot be a jack of all trades and master of none, there must be some level of specialisation in every zone.

Yesterday, we were talking about ecological zones. Equally, in our agriculture, there are areas privileged in some peculiarities and so, you zone those areas; within that Bunyoro zone, Teso, Bukedi, Ankole zone; Kigezi is now talking of high value tea, then you give them value addition at that level.

That is the model we except that having tried for 25 years to use decentralisation and we have had challenges, can we now look at the regional efforts? However, to go down to the parish, you cannot have any impact.

We are sprinkling resources; can we give serious review of this well-intended programme? I can understand the frustration of Government in as far as failing to migrate households from subsistence. Let us not do it in a panicky but in a more organised way.

The NPA working with experts and cannot run away from local Government. The fact is, even as we talk of 25 years, the resources are still at the centre not at the districts. Can we take resources at least at the region? Yesterday, we were discussing roads equipment lacking in a district, then we can have regional effort to make sure that we intervene for our people at that level when there is a challenge.

I plead that as we implement year two of NDPIII, we focus because if we do not, I do not think we are performing on the revenue side. The situation is not good.

My final submission is that Government is giving mixed messages to taxpayers. Very soon, they will riot and refuse to pay taxes because you are telling people you have a lot of money to throw around. We have challenges in revenue and should consolidate resources so that we put it where there is a turn on investment. Thank you.

5.38

**Mr MUWANGA KIVUMBI (DP, Butambala County,** **Butambala):** Madam Speaker, the fight against grassroots poverty is the most non-partisan fight that this country can engage in. I would like this Parliament to be informed that this model is informed by a research that we found severely wanting.

When you go to the third paragraph of the minister’s statement, he said subsistence farming constituted 68 per cent and when you go to page 2 on the table 1, he said that people who are in abject poverty are 39 per cent. Therefore, we are now saying that 39 per cent of Ugandans are the only poor people. In the detailed guideline he laid on the Table, he mounts out research on subsistence across the country.

For example, on the map, he shows that in Karamoja, only 19 per cent are engaged in agriculture that the rest of the population is engaged in stone crashing, that poverty levels in upward central region is at 3 per cent.

when we study Busoga, which you know very well, in their map, they are saying that only 27 per cent of people from Busoga are engaged in agriculture - that is the basic research that informs this model.

Another data that this House should know is that only 33 per cent of the parishes in Uganda have parish chiefs while the rest of the parishes do not have.

Madam Speaker, another issue that was touched that is very clear is supplying inadequacy and causing scarcity and when you do that, you cause discretion. When you cause discretion, you invite corruption.

This money is very little. We calculated that the money available per parish will be Shs 41 million. If you divide it into two average households, each will be entitled to not more than Shs 70,000.

Therefore, how are you going to evolve Shs 40 billion in five-year round scale to kick out poverty? That is why my submission is that this money-first of all what we are debating about is peanuts. If Government wants to make a big affront on poverty go down there with serious money that can make a difference.

Two, if I have a pair of eggs and I have very many starving children and want to give them food to eat, do I roll the few eggs I have or I go to the market and buy a new tray of eggs?

Government is only rolling eggs from one tray to another, you are simply juggling poverty around.

I made a passionate submission and later on the President picked it although he attributed it to the ministry of finance. If we adequately gave the budget committee to do adequate surgery, we would recover trillions of money that you can invest in the parish model.

Let them empower the budget committee to clearly look at this budget, leave the NAADS money that small. Trillions of money is in Defence and Security. If Government today says that we will not buy new vehicles for Government officials, we can have a trillion saved; if you can cut all the rights and special meals and everything, we can have this money.

Honourable minister, we have debated this. Why don’t you leave this small money in CDA and wherever, it is small and go where there are trillions of money piled. Please, go after those sectors and find real money but not to the already suffering sectors and you want to cut them.

I am one of the people who think that the parish model should be implemented but my approach is, why don’t we invest one year in adequate research, recruitment of workers then in the next year you roll over something that you are sure of.

We have been doing this over and over again and we get the same results; twice beaten is twice shy. We have gambled with all these other programmes. Let us not hurry. The Government is going to embark on a fresh, new five-year term. You have done this hurriedly and not achieved much. Why don’t you rest – pause for one year, do research, go to the grassroots and implement a well-thought out programme?

I beg to move, Madam Speaker.

5.44

**MR JOSEPH KOLUO (NRM, Toroma County, Katakwi):** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. The presentation of the minister on the parish model is very good on paper. However, the challenge that I see will be at implementation.

I request the minister to test this model at regional level in - for example – eastern, northern, central, south-western and southern Uganda, to see whether this will succeed.

Honourable minister, I need clarification from you: you mentioned health as a social service. According to what we know, the health centres II all over the country were phased out. How are the people going to benefit?

Secondly, the youths need to benefit from their skills. In some areas – for example, in Toroma County that I represent, there is totally no vocational training institute or technical school. How will the youth from that area benefit?

Therefore, I request that if this model is brought, the first place where you should open a technical school should be Toroma County. I thank you.

5.46

**MR RICHARD OSEKU (NRM, Kibale County, Pallisa):** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My submission will be on what I call an assumption by the ministry of finance under the parish model, where the third pillar will be largely for the financial inclusion of the people.

I think this is where there is a big problem. What the ministry envisages is that there will be a revolving fund based in the parishes and it will be money for the people. However, I would like to point out to this Parliament that the fundamental problem that affected *Emyooga* and failed it from the word go, was that it was premised on participating SACCOs being the ones to manage and implement the programme.

These SACCOs were non-existent and where they existed, people were not trained and so when the money was sent to the districts, people were stuck. The implementers – the Government structures at the local Government level had already gone ahead to pick money from the people.

The people were complaining and now, being stuck there. The money is said to be in the districts but nobody is accessing it. I see the same thing happening if we rush to implement this parish model thing that the minister is talking about.

Madam Speaker, it is also very important to know the capacity of our people to handle money. We are talking about poor people. I have seen, when some of the projects are implemented, some people get compensated with millions of money but they spend it and remain as poor as they were before. Therefore, there is need to first build the capacity of these people.

However, when you look at this parish model project, you realise there has been no consultation with the people. There is what I would call an ambush and this is becoming a problem to Government. Every other time, they come with a programme; it is like an ambush. Today, you are moving, and then tomorrow, they say, “Today, it is this one.”

People have talked about *Entandikwa*, Prosperity For All, *Emyooga*, among others. Government should stop ambushing this country because in so doing, they are not doing it well. The people are instead losing out.

The other day I talked about this money being tagged to availability of land, in terms of increasing productivity for agriculture. It was only yesterday – but I think on 14th of this month – when we saw a correspondence from the Permanent Secretary of the ministry of agriculture to the CAOs, asking them to avail information about availability and ownership of land, to facilitate agricultural mechanisation to increase productivity.

This is evidence that Government has not done enough research. It has not collected enough information to enable it come up with a proper way to implement this parish model programme.

For that matter – indeed, like members have observed – I think Government should stay the implementation of this programme a little because you can see they are saying that by the second quarter of the financial year 2021/2022, this programme should be running.

However, the time left is not enough for it to implement this programme to the satisfaction and benefit of the people.

The issue of the market has clearly been talked about. For the several times we have been successful to produce more, we have seen chaos - sugarcanes, maize, rice - people are importing rice when there is rice here.

There is no market for our maize but then, you come again and borrow money to give it to the people to buy that maize but no maize has ever been bought from the people. Remember, honourable minister, Parliament gave money here.

All these things need to be properly addressed. We need to think about the issues of the market. In the East, for example, we produce potatoes and fruits but even with the Soroti Fruit Factory being in place, they are not buying fruits from the people.

This must be addressed because at the end of it all, even if we succeeded in increasing productivity and there is no market for people to sell these things to, they are going to be more frustrated. They will not come out of the poverty that we are striving to fight.

Government will have done us a disservice. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

5.51

**MR JOSEPH SSEWUNGU (DP, Kalungu County West, Kalungu):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to inform you that for those of you supporting this parish model, the only achievement you have got out of that support is that for the first time, the minister has stayed longer in this House than ever before. *(Laughter)*

I beseech hon. Matia Kasaija to spare time, get into his vehicle and drive to Akokoro at the grave of the late Dr Milton Obote, spend a night there while saying some prayers and ask him how he managed poverty during his time as President of this country, between 1981 to 1985.

Why am I saying this, Madam Speaker? I come from Kalungu. During that time, in my village – not even a parish – there is nobody who could take coffee to a store first to get money. However, you could go to a store and tell the owner, “Mister, I have coffee at home and I do not have school fees. Can you give me five empty bags and money worth those empty bags?” Then the owner of the store would give the coffee farmer money and the empty bags. He harvests his coffee, after taking his children to St Henry’s College or to Namasagali. After a week, he will take the coffee to the store manager and enjoy his life. That was what used to happen.

Madam Speaker, when I was in secondary school in 1986, my father was not a poor man. Honourable minister, by 1971, my father was importing lorries into Uganda while he was in Masaka. In 1979, 90 of his lorries were bombed. He had a franchise with FAP.

After harvesting his coffee, he would allow his children to go into his coffee plantation. He would say, “Now my children, I have finished harvesting my share. You are free now to go into the garden to harvest some coffee so that you get pocket money for your use at school”. That was how we managed to wear shirts like Azzaro, Jiko, Walker and Sarif trousers, for those of you who know these clothes - (*Laughter*). However, this was not out of hand-outs and the parish development model.

This is what is happening. There was a prison warden in one of the prison cells and he was given permission to serve prisoners food. He gave them two eggs every morning as their lunch. Then he gave them four bananas for their supper. One day, he told them, “I have fed you very well for the last month. From today, I am going to give you two bananas in the morning and four eggs in the evening.” The prisoners clapped so much that their diet had been changed. Had the diet changed? There was no change in the diet. What the Government and hon. Kasaija are doing is playing with the feeding when it is not nutritious to the people.

Let the minister go and look at the TDA manifesto. Many political parties like FDC and the National Unity Platform write manifestos; take time and read them. You were with the Rt Hon. Amama Mbabazi.

When you read the TDA manifesto, hon. Amama Mbabazi said that whoever had a loan by the time of the 2016 elections, the Government was going to pay back the loans to free them from the burden, as long as the loan was not above Shs 5 million.

We asked him, “Mr Prime Minister, you were in the Government. Where are you going to get the money to pay back all these loans of Shs 5 million and below taken by the people?” He said, “No, the money we have in microfinance can pay back all these loans so that the people become free to start working again.”

When you go to the parish level, the TDA was planning to put a centre of excellence at every parish so that the Government would give these areas money. You would take your coffee and beans and the Government would buy them; even if they lose market, the farmer has got food.

However, here we are with hon. Ksaiaja. Honourable minister, tell us the difference between *Emyooga,* Operation Wealth Creation, Steady Progress vis-à-vis the parish model development. There is no difference. Are you going to collapse them? What is happening now is that the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development will be nugatory, as long as you put in this programme because you are taking the Youth Livelihood Fund to local government and you are – *(Member timed out.)*

**THE SPEAKER:** Conclude please.

**MR SSEWUNGU:** You are taking UWEP to the local government. Hon. Kasaija, I ask you to go to Akokoro where the late Dr Milton Obote was buried and spend a night there. You cannot go to Amin’s grave because we do not know where it is. Pray so that you get the knowledge from the late President. Otherwise, if I were the President, I would not keep you in that ministry with this statement. That is why I am not even reading through it because I did not find substance in it that can sustain this country. Thank you.

5.57

**MR ROBERT CENTENARY (FDC, Kasese Municipality, Kasese):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My understanding of a model is that it is a standard of operation that is well researched, scientifically proven and there are some hypothetical situations that are put under research, until you come up with conclusions.

My question to the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development is, what hypothetical questions are you trying to answer through this parish development model that has not been answered by other Government interventions? I would like to interest myself in the Parish Credit Association Model, which is a financial inclusion approach that was piloted through the Ministry for Luwero-Rwenzori Triangle. I know in Busoga, they had a budget of Shs 4.4 billion for the PCAs. In the Luwero-Rwenzori Triangle, we had Shs 9.3 billion, which has been taken away, and yet we are looking at financial inclusion.

In my opinion, when you pilot a certain approach, the lessons learnt are used to, first of all, improve that model that you are trying to pilot and then you roll it out. Instead of enhancing the model that has already been tested by, for instance the Luwero-Rwenzori Triangle, you are now taking away the entire budget of Shs 9.3 billion into an amalgamated fund. How different is it going to be implemented by a ministry that has not even tried to implement it?

At least the Luwero-Rwenzori Triangle has been implementing the programme for a few years and they know the challenges, what to do and the success stories. They are well documented. In my opinion, honourable minister, I think we should not kill Government MDAs but we should allow them to grow the models that they have already piloted and which they are implementing. We should enhance them financially instead of taking away even the little money from them. It is not that they have failed to implement this model. The Luwero-Rwenzori Triangle has been implementing it but they did not have enough funds.

Some of these funding opportunities that were given to those agencies were as a result of affirmative action. I recall that in 2015, we had a programme called Luwero-Rwenzori Development Programme, where your ministry had budgeted Shs 540 billion to support the regions and sub regions that were affected by war but the programme was underfunded.

Before a project even gets into maturity and takes off, you are killing it by bringing a new one. Why are you confusing Ugandans? Why don’t we mainstream the parish development model into all Government implementation programmes without even necessarily amalgamating these funds? For instance, if the Uganda Women Entrepreneurship Programme budget is meagre, why don’t we add and say that for all the parishes in the country, we will enhance the budget of the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development to continue supporting the UWEP. However, put a condition so that this money trickles down to all parishes. That way, we shall be rolling out the Parish Development Model.

Why don’t we say that UCDA will provide coffee seedlings and if the money for procuring the seedlings is not sufficient, our farmers can be profiled at parish level so that we support them directly without amalgamating resources? Otherwise, this is going to stress the Ministry of Local Government.

I can see this budget has Shs 200 billion being picked from Agri-LED. Agri-LED is a concept that was developed when Gen. Salim Saleh camped in the Rwenzori Region. It was supposed to do roads and support construction of markets. Before it even takes off, you want to take away the money into an amalgamated fund. Are we really moving in the right direction, honourable minister?

I would propose that you do not hasten to implement this parish development model. It is a very good model. However, can we have further research into how best we can have it mainstreamed into all the Government programmes so that everyone is able to benefit from it? Otherwise, it is going to suffer the same fate that *Emyooga* did. In Kasese, we were so excited about *Emyooga* but at the time of implementation, they were calling the NRM structures and side lining other Ugandans who are also taxpayers. It ended up being a political programme failing at the onset. I beg to move.

6.03

**MS LILLY ADONG** (**Independent, Woman Representative**, **Nwoya):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank the minister for presenting this model. I see that this is another slogan that is being brought in to entice Ugandans to think that their problems will end tomorrow, if this programme is implemented to the dot.

Madam Speaker, having worked in the Local Government, I feel it is like a normal structure. I remember in 2002/2005 when they brought in the sub-county model of service delivery. Somehow, it brought a bit of changes because they recruited staff. I am just wondering if this Parish Model will also include adding more staff at the parish level. Sincerely, we have only one parish chief and in some places, they are not there. Who is going to be in charge of this mobilisation if we think that it is only money that the people lack in the villages? It is not money.

We lack the will and may be the market stimulus so that people are able to sell whatever they have. I am one of those who participated vigorously to mobilise the community at all levels in anything but it has come to a point where I cannot mobilise anymore. You mobilise and within a short time, you remain with the programme in your hands and you do not even know who to go to - there is no market.

It is a lesson that the moment you get a functional system, you simply have to build on and not destroy it. As a country, we regret destroying the cooperative movements that we had in place. I remember, when I was still a bit young, how farmers used to coordinate the growing cotton and the men used to get involved. However, now, there is no clear market. We have the middlemen running over.

Even if you encourage these people to grow and maybe produce rice, where are they going to sell it? The middlemen still take away all the profits.

Madam speaker, I request that we rethink and make sure that all the facilities needed - another thing I want to talk about is the SACCOs. We have success stories about SACCOs. In some places, the people are really poor and SACCOs may not be a vehicle to make them succeed. When you look at the interest that is put on SACCOs, - *(Member timed out*)

6.06

**MR JACOB OPOLOT (Independent, Pallisa County, Pallisa):** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, for giving us the opportunity to discuss this matter. I have quietly listened to expressions made by the different stakeholders both within and outside Parliament on the issue of the parish model. I get a little scared about our country.

Yes, one will say that whatever has been said or we have said is the normal and expected resistance to change or the skepticism but you find that most of it is out of painful experience over time and with the same people.

One wonders; when you say, “parish model”; is it because the parish model works without consultation and it is something that is so magical that it must be brought just as a bang on the people, or is it something that should have been developed out of a consultative process, which would enable to strengthen it but also enable to sensitise the stakeholders who are supposed to be involved?

Madam Speaker, I would like to say that - I am sorry if it may sound unpleasant but I have to say it because there is nowhere else I can say it - I am pained because we have found ourselves so many times in situations where Parliament appears to be resisting a good idea. However, you find that something is new but Parliament has not been informed and involved.

As representatives of the people, we must be sure before something is introduced to our people. As part of the leadership in the country, we must be assured that this model will not be just mere showbiz like the previous models.

Madam Speaker, the honourable Members have shared here their experiences of other schemes and you wonder; we seem to be so much in a hurry to do certain things in our very own lifetime. We do not give ourselves time to fully run the cycle of implementing a particular programme or model and learn from it in order to reinvent another model. We just want all these things to happen in our lifetime. For instance, if you are a finance minister, there were other finance ministers before you and there will be other finance ministers. Why are we in a hurry?

Madam Speaker, I would also say with great confidence that it is possible that even us - I have failed to support or oppose the motion because I want to say that none of us here can say with 100 per cent confidence that it is very bad, neither can anyone here say that it is the best so we can implement.

Therefore, we have to refer to the experience that is making people sceptical. People have referred to UWEP; it is because it is something that we have seen working and touching people’s lives meaningfully. We are right to be sceptical because what you are bringing now has not been piloted anywhere; we cannot confidently defend it here. We are not yet sure of it. Honourable minister, where has it worked and how has it worked?

Therefore, it seems we have a set of people who want to keep bringing new ideas and implement them to test but it is also possible that we want to implement them to grab something out of them. That is the painful experience we have had.

Before people understand *Entandikwa* and *Emyooga* and they are demanding for a forensic audit, you want to run away to the parish model so that the outcome of the so called forensic audit of *Emyooga* will find when we have moved to other things; and people are still learning the new thing. That is the painful experience I have and it is part of this Parliament.

This parish model has no proven path neither is there evidence of any success to refer to that one can say that this was done this way and it worked out this way and therefore, if we made these improvements and modifications, it will perform even much better. Therefore, one wonders -

Madam Speaker, you will bear with me, I have taken long without saying a word in this House. I would like to say that if you are a Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, I would think that this is now the time you should be thinking of having a specialised and well-trained unit in the ministry that should guide and nurture development programmes and approaches.

You should not just be running up and down and all over the place with things that have no proof of performance simply because you think you are in charge and therefore, people should just take everything down their throats. It is very unfortunate.

Can we have a well-trained technical team that can establish long-term strategies and handle issues of development and not these disposable technocrats who will leave today and tomorrow another one comes with his or her ideas/

Finally, when we talk of a parish, I may want to ask what it is and one will say it is obvious. However, are parishes of the same size and considerations across the country? There are parishes that are smaller, some bigger, others small but more populated and those whose geography itself complicates matters. What do you have in plan for such?

I have risen to say a word but I am mixed up because I am wondering why we are always on the run with different programmes and not involving the critical stakeholders, right from inception. This makes Parliament appear shabby and uncooperative when some of these would-be useful strategies are being introduced. That is the bit I wanted to say, without delving into the minister’s presentation. Thank you.

6.15

**MS SANTA ALUM (UPC, Woman Representative, Oyam):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I contributed to this debate last Tuesday. Today, I would like to get some areas of clarification. To hear that money is going down to the parish level is very pleasing, I think, to all Members of this House.

However, which vehicle are we using to take this money to our people? I thought the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development has been doing and performing very well as far as the women’s fund is concerned.

The minister talked of “amalgamation of funds”. With the economics that I did, companies are always amalgamated when either of the companies involved serves as legal entities and therefore, there is need for a complete new entity to be formed to house the different assets and the liabilities of the companies.

I would like to ask the minister; when you look at amalgamation of funds, you see that we have the Uganda Women’s Empowerment Programme (UWEP), the Youth Livelihood, PRDP, NAADS, Agri-LED and UCDA. I wonder what the problem is to call for this amalgamation of funds.

When you look at these programmes, you will find that UWEP has been successful throughout the country. Why do we amalgamate it - with the little economics that I studied up to the university?

Secondly, my request is that if the minister feels like amalgamation of funds is very good, let them amalgamate the PRDP, NAADS and maybe Agri-LED and leave out the women’s fund and UCDA alone. Coffee is the number one export to this country. The women’s fund is our pride as a country and women.

The other issue I would like to get clarification on is that when the minister was presenting, he made mention of training, to be done by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS). I do not know the structure that UBOS will use. Besides, the women council of this country was elected throughout the country. They have been helping in mobilisation and training of the women.

I would like to know where the council, which is everywhere to the parish level, will be involved in this programme. They are there and they are about five per village. Where do we get the women in this issue because this money is theirs? The women problem is unique to them.

Some ministries have been recalling their staff from the local Government, for example, one ministry wanted to recall the veterinary officers because of the issues – it is not one ministry that wants to recentralise their staff.

If ministries are trying to recentralise their staff from the Ministry of Local Government and here, we want to throw a very successful programme of the women to the same ministry, what are we doing? What intention do we have for the women of this country?

I would like to end by requesting that the minister should first pilot this programme. I want to invite you to Oyam District to be one of the districts to pilot this programme and we see how best it will move. Thank you.

6.20

**MS LUCY AKELLO (FDC, Women Representative, Amuru):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a few points of clarification that I seek from the minister. While debating the motion last time, hon. Bahati stated that this parish model would see the increment of the UWEP Fund from the current Shs 30 billion or so to about Shs 150 billion. I do not see this reflected because I have seen the statement of the honourable minister and it is still at Shs 32 billion. Where is the increment that the minister was talking about?

I would like to also add my voice by saying that I think we are not ready for this parish model. Growing up and even up to now, they still ask you, “Who is your role model?” I would like to also ask the minister who your role model was when you came up with this model.

Also, I see a lot of “amalgamate” here and there. I would like to bring out one ministry that is seriously affected by this - the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development. We saw the Youth Livelihood Fund leave the ministry. No wonder I see a dash in the contribution of the Youth Fund to the parish model. Maybe I also need an explanation from the minister on that.

We have seen the National Social Security Fund (NSSF) also go and UWEP is now in the departure lounge, going. Why must we continue to harm the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development?

I remember when I was on the committee on gender, there was also a very big discussion on whether the labour courts must still be under the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development. There was also a proposal that it should go to the Judiciary.

In a nutshell, they are picking out all the essential programmes, projects and activities of the ministry and taking them somewhere. Maybe we should also think about finally amalgamating all these ministries and only have the Office of the Prime Minister. Maybe we will have a better job and help with the parish model. Madam Speaker, this is my opinion. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

6.23

**MS DOROTHY NSHAIJA (NRM, Woman Representative, Kamwenge):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to join Members of Parliament to thank the Government of Uganda, which thought about the women of this country in terms of empowering them economically. At the same time, I would like to thank our honourable Minister for Finance for bringing such a model at this time.

Madam Speaker and Members, I am one of the members that started the formation of SACCOs in the region of Bunyoro and Toro. That money was for the Government and it was funded under the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Food Programme. Money amounting to Shs 2 billion was given to women groups in the two regions I have mentioned above.

When I joined Parliament, I shared with members of the committee on Gender then, led by hon. Margaret Komuhangi. We started building from that. It is a history of this Government of Uganda where we benchmarked to get the UWEP Programme, which we thought was a saviour of the women of this country to also be economically empowered.

We thank H.E the President who decided to give us a small portion of the collections of this country from the taxes in 2014 and promised us that Shs 50 billion would be allocated to UWEP. It is very alarming and unfortunate that we were only given Shs 18 billion. Out of the Shs 18 billion that has been given to women of this country, the recovery rate is very promising. It is at 82 per cent.

In my opinion, we still demand the Shs 50 billion balance. This would have been the time to give us more money in the UWEP so that we can form districts with banks for women at district level. The money that has been sent to our districts would be put in a lump sum and create banks for women, like what is taking place in Kenya.

It is unfortunate when we want to take the little portion of the Shs 18 billion that has been allocated to the women of this country to amalgamate it in a pool, whereby our women do not have the capacity to struggle with the men of this country at that level.

We have the affirmative action, which was supposed to be reviewed after 10 years. It has been around without being reviewed. Can we assume that failure to review the affirmative action *–(Member timed out.)*

**THE SPEAKER:** You have half a minute to conclude.

**MS AZAIRWE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I conclude, I would like to say that I have been a regional whip for Rwenzori region in my district, where the Parish Community Association Model of giving Shs 20 million per parish was started. It is true that it is doing very well but this money – we are talking about the PCA programme which is a parish model.

It should not be a parish model because for something to be a model, it should be exemplary and have areas for people to learn. We have not studied it to its conclusion. How then do we pilot it and say that it has worked when we do not have the research?

We feel that it is very important for us to still consider Article 32 of the Constitution; it is very active and still needed. We still have the women representatives in this Parliament and at all levels - the 3 per cent. You cannot say that we should go to one pool and fight with men, when we do not have that strength and economic empowerment to fight in the same bowel at the parish level. If we think that the affirmative action and the Article 32 of this Constitution now lie idle, then we need to amend the Constitution.

Concerning the agro-led and the other programmes that you want to amalgamate, I would like to support hon. Opolot that it would be much better for each and every programme we have in this country to go down to the grassroots because that is where our people are. That is where the service is needed at the parish level but we should go with it directly and not amalgamate it into one.

If it is UWEP, let us have it at parish level. All the women in the parish will benefit and struggle because it is nearer to them. If it is USE or Agri-LED, let it be at the parish level but let us not make it a pool where we think that all Ugandans are empowered to go and fight in one bowel. I thank you, Madam Speaker.

6.29

**MR LAWRENCE MANGUSHO (NRM, Kween County, Kween):** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for giving me this opportunity. I would like to thank the honourable minister for the introduction of the parish model that he has presented before the House today.

I know that every leader here would have wanted these issues of poverty eradication to trickle down to the parishes, which is very important as far as our economy is concerned. If we do not have the bottom-up approach as far as economic activities and players are concerned, then we are not going very far. The economy will not shoot up.

We must also now understand the critical areas. Has the parish model been structured to address the current challenges we face? After Operation Wealth Creation and these other poverty alleviation programmes, we have been able to over produce in some areas. For example, we have issues in Busoga where we have over produced the sugarcane, maize in Sebei and other South Western parts of the country, and tobacco and milk in the West. Are we addressing the issue of value addition and marketing, which is increasing poverty in this country?

Madam Speaker, if we can focus behind the last two or three months after this election, we will realise that people were not voting on issues but were voting against poverty - a big problem in the countryside.

We have just explained the *Emyooga* programme and before it takes off, we are now on the parish based model. Even leaders have been victims of some of these new programmes. For example, people are supposed to form cooperatives and groups. When these peasants are told to form groups, the fall-back position is us, the leaders. They want money for opening the account and forming the groups. When you tell them to put themselves in groups, the next day they come to you saying they have no contribution for the group.

These new programmes, which are not yielding results as yet, should be streamlined in a way that they address the challenges we face. We know that the women are key players in as far as production is concerned. Once you have the women active in *– (Member timed out.)*

6.32

**MR ROBERT NTENDE (Independent, Bunya County South, Mayuge):** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and honourable minister, for this intervention that you are proposing for this country.

Madam Speaker, we have a challenge in this country and the biggest one, from what the minister has put on paper - which he has called pillar number seven - is the mind-set. Mind-set is a very crucial issue in this country if we are to succeed in our efforts of helping Ugandans to come out of poverty.

This mind-set can be categorised into three levels in this country, as of now. We have a mind-set which is developmental and this is the one the minister is actually bringing forward. But remember, the mind-set at this time accounts for only 10 per cent.

The other mind-set is political. We are coming out of a situation where we have been in politics, our mind-set is excited and whatever programme you bring forward is political. We are likely to face a scenario where the population will simply say, yes, they are bringing money to appreciate us for voting our President; let us enjoy it. You will not see any development on the ground as that mind-set is vivid.

The other mind-set, which accounts for the biggest percentage is the one of not being concerned. The people out there – whatever good programme you bring on board - are not concerned. They are actually comfortably living in their poverty. I will ask you; did this issue of poverty just come yesterday into this country? Our people have been living with poverty since time immemorial and the NRM, in particular, has been supervising this poverty for 35 years. I do not see reason why we should hurriedly move and put money into the *wanainchi* when they are not prepared –*(Member timed out.)*

**THE SPEAKER:** Please, conclude.

**MR NTENDE:** I would implore you and your team to go back and convince Government that much as this programme is good and as leaders we need it, give us time to sensitise people for a full year. By the time we put money in the economy, our people will be ready to utilise this money and you will see some results but where we are now, try it, you will see. This so called parish model is not a model. From the village economics that I know, a model class is one that has excelled. Tell us from your presentation which model class of parishes you have presented to this House. I thank you.

6.36

**MR PAUL AMORU (NRM, Dokolo County North, Dokolo):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would also like to thank the minister for this presentation. However, I have the following observations to make. First of all, the idea of having a parish model, in my view, is the way to go. However, we need to move slowly as we bring it on board.

The first problem that the minister’s proposal has had is by beginning to dip his fingers into existing programmes like UWEP. UWEP is a success story everywhere and it is the only one we have seen, where the ordinary woman in the village is beginning to tap into. Therefore, instead of encouraging that particular model, this new model, which has not been tested, is seeking to give it a very untimely death.

In my view, amalgamating these other programmes while coming in to start this wonderful one is just going to make the whole situation very messy. I propose that we keep UWEP and the other programmes because the objectives for which these funds or programmes were started have not been fully realised.

The two can co-exist; we can continue to pursue the idea of empowering our women because the parish model should eventually be mainstreamed. It is an idea that must now be reflected across all the sectors. The implementation should go and target a parish and the funds can now be increased over time but to try to amalgamate, especially the successful ones like the women’s programme yet women are the main contributors in terms of production in agriculture in the country, is not well conceived.

Madam Speaker, like was proposed earlier, the minister needs more time in the one year that is following because we have just come out of the election period. It is possible to have this parish model implemented as a pilot in a few areas as you do more research, and also going to the villages to profile the farmers there. This will happen as we prepare to support them directly. You should ensure that we have cooperatives that are functional and that the administrative units of parishes have parish chiefs because we have heard reports that not all of them have properly been instituted.

Therefore, to try to move in to implement this mega programme in one go across the country could result into a stillbirth.

As I conclude, it has also been mentioned that a number of other good programmes have not received the necessary support that is needed to succeed. For example, last year, the Minister of Agriculture came to Olweny Rice Scheme in Dokolo with a number of heavy earth moving equipment and told us that Dokolo would be the regional agricultural mechanisation centre. Honourable members, as I speak, it is more than a year and those machines are parked there. When I tried to follow this matter up, I was told that the operators are not yet there. Government needs to train the operators.

My point here is that the existing programmes that have not received the necessary support that is required should be mapped out and the ones that are viable should be supported to grow as we move ultimately, probably a year from now, into implementing the parish model robustly, which I very much support, although we are not fully ready to have it started.

I thank you, Madam Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much. Honourable members, 28 Members have contributed on this issue. We had planned for 20 minutes but because of the importance of the subject, we had to give it this much time. Can I invite the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development? Okay, let us hear from the LOP quickly.

6.42

**THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (Ms Betty Aol):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank the honourable minister for the presentation because in a way, it has given us some additional information on the Shs 32 billion for women.

However, if we have to summarise the debate, you will find that we have said, leave the women fund to stand alone; do not amalgamate this into other funds.

One thing that makes me wonder is that when we have the PRDP, it is supposed to be an equalisation fund. The Luweero fund is also supposed to be an equalisation fund and UWEP is for the whole country. My appeal is that all of us love the parish model but it has to be piloted somewhere and also for us to be convinced. Where is this emanating from? All of a sudden, there is a parish model; from *Emyooga* to parish model.

Who are these people working underground? Do they have good intentions? If they have good intentions, why can’t they also try to sensitise people before they can concretise on the model? We love it but for now, let UWEP be a stand-alone.

You can encourage it to be implemented at parish level. The money is very little that not all the parishes can access this. So, our appeal is for you to add to it. Those people who are working underground could also be mafias who are just trying to get money to steal –*(Interruption)*

**MS OGWAL:** Thank you for giving way. The information I want to give is that this Parliament is the one that pushed for the creation of a specific ministry to monitor the impact of any Government intervention, to improve on the welfare of rural women and rural youth.

We felt that affirmative action, which has its root in the Constitution, was known because we could monitor it through representation in Parliament and at local council level. However, there was no way to monitor how affirmative action would help the rural women and rural youth.

That is why we felt there should be a ministry of gender for this special interest group. When we are talking, we must ensure that the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development remains relevant in monitoring the progress that we are making in changing the welfare of the rural women and youths generally.

That is the information I wanted to give.

**THE SPEAKER:** Please conclude.

**MS BETTY AOL:** In summary, we say that UWEP should not be amalgamated with other funds; UWEP should stand alone. However we will be very happy if you add – is it – Shs 120 billion on top of the Shs 32 billion for us to have Shs 150 billion; that is about 30 per cent of the Shs 450 billion you have presented before us.

Finally, in the North, we have the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund livelihood. We are waiting for NUSAF livelihood to be rolled out to all the parishes in the North because where the programme has been piloted, it has been very successful.

This will also be additional, on top of what we usually have as normal. Those people should not deceive you; those mafia should stop deceiving people that the parish model, which has not been implemented, tried or piloted, is the best. It could be the best and it sounds the best but first pilot it. Leave us with UWEP to stand-alone. It can also be implemented at parish level. Thank you.

6.48

**THE MINISTER OF KAMPALA CAPITAL CITY AFFAIRS (Ms Betty Amongi):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am speaking because I am a member of the Cabinet Sub-Committee on the parish model, chaired by the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development.

Firstly, I thank Members that they have appreciated that the parish model is a good one for delivering issues related to poverty alleviation. However, they are concerned about amalgamation, the timing of implementation and other concerns of probably first piloting it.

Madam Speaker, when this matter was brought to Cabinet, His Excellency brought the report from his tour. Members will recall that in 2018, His Excellency the President toured all the 18 zones in the country. What was he preaching? He was preaching the parish model and most of us were in our various zonal meetings with our councillors and appreciated His Excellency’s message.

It was on that basis that His Excellency set up a team of economists. That team made a study on the parish model, presented it to him and a team was constituted, led by Gen. Salim Saleh, who worked for the last one year to bring the parish model.

The study on the parish model, which was brought by the economists, was based on the fact that they discovered that the impediment to economic empowerment to the people is access to capital, especially access to cheap capital.

When you go to most of these areas, it is not easy for a rural person to access. Even members of Parliament access cheaper capital than your people in the constituency. Most of them access capital from the local microfinance at 36 per cent and above.

So, the economists proposed that Government should come up with an intervention to address the issue of access to capital and the issue of interest rates to capital. Another problem they discovered is that for most of the programmes that were being implemented, they were telling the people what they should undertake.

This time, they said, “If you are able to allow the population to determine the intervention they want to undertake to address poverty, then it would be much easier, instead of buying seedlings and taking to them, which they might not be in need of.” That was the basis of the parish model.

On the issue of UWEP, we raised concern on the programme. What we agreed on the issue of UWEP in the committee – as of now – is that the guideline that Ministry of Local Government will come with will allow the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development to still have the supervisory and monitoring role.

However, the major issue was at what point the women should access the money. Should we leave women to access the money the way it is because at the moment, in UWEP, the mechanism of identification is at the subcounty level. When you identify groups at subcounty level, they are sent to the district. The district compiles the list of those groups and sends it to the ministry.

Then again, the ministry starts going backward. It again sends the list back to the district. That is when the district will now send the money to the groups. I am just talking about the procedures of UWEP – *(Interruption)*

**MR KIBALYA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development came and presented a report, which had been debated in Cabinet. After the presentation, the House debated the statement and took a position. A member of the Cabinet that sent the report, which the minister presented earlier, has again come to present another version of the report. Is it in order for a minister, whose colleague presented the other statement to come and present the same report on how the economy - for example, while I am one of the best economists in my area, I was not consulted?

Another version of the statement has come saying there was consultation here and there. Anyhow, is it in order for a Cabinet member to make another presentation of a statement that was already presented by the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development to the House?

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I actually do not know what the minister came to do because the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, who is in charge of the sector, came and spoke to us; he brought a paper.

Honourable ministers, no one is saying they do not want the Parish Development Model. The members are only asking, are you ready for it? If I were to ask the Minister of Finance to give me a list of the parish chiefs of this country today, can he do it, because what you want is the money to be in the budget? You want money for this model in the new financial year but who is going to handle that issue? Are you really ready?

Uganda is not ending tomorrow. Why don’t you move slowly? Maybe first do a pilot. Let us do an experiment but you are stampeding and it is not right. *(Applause)*

**MS AMONGI:** Madam Speaker, I am going to conclude. I am not making a presentation. The issue with UWEP is that as a committee - I started by saying that there is a committee that is also handling this - I appreciate the issue of UWEP.

As of now, the reason we agreed that we go to the parish level is that the parish is more accessible and shorter. That is why I was trying to say that currently, UWEP is at the sub-county level but that we are now trying to go to the parish level. We are also saying that 30 per cent of the money is to be given to women. If Members feel that 30 per cent is lower – it is because the 30 per cent is actually more than the current money that is being accessed by women.

So, under this Parish Development Model, women will have more money at the parish level than – *(Interruption)*

**MR KABERUKA:** Thank you, honourable minister, for trying to convince the Parliament to understand your point. You have said that UWEP is being taken to the parish level. The Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, who is in charge of this presentation, has said that the 30 per cent will go to women. This is an amalgamated fund.

Why are you saying that UWEP has been taken to the parish when we have only a percentage of that money going to women? As a woman, why are you trying to convince other women to support that fake approach by saying the women have not been marginalised in the Parish Development Model?

**MS AMONGI:** Thirty per cent, under the Parish Development Model, would be more than the current money for women under UWEP. The current UWEP money is for the same purpose. The purpose of UWEP is to provide cheap capital to women so that they are got out of poverty.

Why this similar fund is called the Wealth Fund is because it is also intended to get people out of poverty. Maybe the problem is with the name. The other fund is called UWEP and this one is called the Wealth Fund, which *–(Member timed out.)*

**THE SPEAKER:** You know those are just gymnastics.

**MS AMONGI:** I can get the clarification, if the Speaker permits.

**MS AOL:** You know we had Operation Wealth Creation, headed by one person. However, UWEP is under an institution. The problem is that in Uganda, we always want to continuously undermine institutions in place of individuals.

It is good you mentioned that the Parish Development Model came from Gulu. Why don’t we go slow? Can you clarify why an institution should be made weaker in place of an individual’s view and idea? I know that a lot of people now go to Gulu over to access wealth creation funds but this is not something that most of us buy. We want institutions to be made strong. We want the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development to carry out its work.

You were a whole Chairperson of UWOPA. Why couldn’t you also advise Cabinet on this matter? You should have told them that UWEP has been operating well in spite of the little resources it has. Instead of crying that it should be taken elsewhere, add more money to UWEP to help it continue serving our people better while it is under an institution. Thank you.

**THE SPEAKER:** Minister of Finance, I think you have listened to the debate. I hope you have understood that Members are not objecting to the Parish Development Model Programme. They are just asking you to move cautiously and plan better instead of stampeding the country. That is what they are saying.

**MR KASAIJA:** What is the aim of the Parish Development Model Programme? The aim is to get rid of poverty from all parts of Uganda. I hope none of us has an objection to that. We have tried, through the Uganda Women Entrepreneurship Programme (UWEP), which I support 100 per cent but poverty is still in existence and amidst us.

The model we are talking about is born out of research. It is not something that - as I heard some of our colleagues say, a one man’s idea. No, it is an idea that has been chewed in and out and we thought that this parish model would be able to tackle the problem. The silos, women, youth and disabled have not fulfilled what we want them to fulfill since other people do not access that money.

I would like to challenge the women Members here. Does every woman in Uganda access -*(Interjection)-*? Everybody in the parish - as long as he or she has the capacity to work will access that money. We are ready to put more money, if we find that the demand for the resource - this resource we are putting is simply because your budget is in trouble. We did not have sufficient money. We could even have put a trillion.

I am saying that it is better to start. Let us start and then move on. We may see pitfalls but we shall try to rectify them.  The Member who got it very well - I am not trying to praise him but hon. Onzima got it well. This project will help every individual in a parish who has got something to do in order to progress.

Secondly, we are not going to do - you know this country is zoned. Not everybody will do the same thing in the same part of the country. People may go for coffee, others may go for potatoes, others may go for chicken and others may go for pigs, as long as that enterprise is profitable. We have a strong feeling that in executing this parish model, everybody will be able to come up.

My biggest worry, as your Minister for Finance, Planning and Economic Development is the market. That is the issue that we shall come and debate later on. We believe that at parish level, it will work; people will wake up because -

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable minister, do you expect the people of Busoga to believe you, when they have spent five years without selling sugarcane? Do you expect the people of Busoga, who are struggling with sugarcane for five years to believe what you are saying? You have no market, there is no processing and you are now saying that they will wake up. Please be serious.

**MR KASAIJA:** Madam Speaker, I know the problem in Busoga very well. There was no planning. People were told to grow maize and there was nobody planning to put up a factory. In this arrangement, we are going to plan –*(Interjection)*

**THE SPEAKER:** My difficulty is that you have known the issue of sugarcane in Busoga for five years. You have not even brought one small factory yet you are telling us to produce more sugarcane.

**MR KASAIJA:** Madam Speaker, you know what I am doing in Busoga now as far as sugarcane is concerned. I have had to subsidise transport for that sugarcane to be taken to Atiak and we have now agreed with the cooperative union - I do not remember its name but we put a factory for the people of Busoga; that is what was missing.

This time round, we are not going to allow people to produce without a plan on how value addition is going to be done. Maybe it was not made clear in my statement.

Therefore, I pray - and I am not going to add more. Let us go and start it then we can correct whatever may have gone wrong. Otherwise, no policy can be 100 per cent correct –*(Interjection)–* I thought I would conclude here.

Madam Speaker, I pray that you give us authority to proceed.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable minister, we ask you to pilot.

**DR BUKENYA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The President recently has been talking about a lot of science and scientific things. In science, like in medicine, when there is malaria, you think of the medicine, test it and then afterwards you roll out. Unfortunately, hon. Kasaija and team have refused to grasp the concept of science, which is applicable in normal life, where you have a problem.

We all think that the parish model could be the right prescription, like we have agreed with the Government over time with *Emyooga* and others. The prayer of the House is that we adopt a scientific model.

Let us pilot on the parish model so that we can know whether it is going to work and finally roll out. Otherwise, Uganda has been around for many years and it is definitely going to be around for a long time. Therefore, we all agree that the parish model can work. However, why should we suffocate all the other programmes and rush into something, which we are not sure of –*(Interruption)-*

**MS OGWAL**: You are talking about piloting but I would like you to clarify. We have been piloting on the village model - I do not know whether Members are aware of some modern village model that we have been piloting.

Therefore, can we know the progress of that village piloting, which has been going on for a number of years? What is the progress? What are the successes? How many modern villages have we covered such that when we go to pilot with the parish, we know the successes from the village piloting system? Can you clarify to me before you graduate to the parish pilot?

**DR BUKENYA:** Madam Speaker, I am not party to the village pilot. The implementer of the village pilot is still here. Even if he is not here, he is very well represented. Therefore, I insist that we take a scientific approach to things because we think the parish is the right prescription to poverty - yet it may not be.

Let us go as you proposed, Madam Speaker, slowly. One year is not very long, hon. Matia Kasaija. Let us give ourselves one year. Of the Shs 450 billion, let us get Shs 20 billion and we pilot this, while we prepare the parishes to even recruit the parish chiefs because they are not there. Otherwise, half of the parishes do not have parish chiefs.

Madam Speaker, recruitment in government agencies, when we approve money in June, starts in December. Therefore, by the time we complete the year, we shall have reallocated that Shs 450 billion to another emergency because it will be redundant somewhere and there will be pressure from somewhere.

Therefore, let us leave UWEP to operate and we look for money from elsewhere, within a year, to run those other parish programmes concurrently. Otherwise, we are going to suffocate Luweero. You cannot give Karamoja Parish the same money as the parishes in Kampala. Otherwise, Karamoja is doing very badly. What can Shs 30 million do for a parish in Muyenga, where hon. Bahati stays? We are going to take that money to the parish and because people have no health care, they will borrow it to go to hospital. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

7.12

**THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR FINANCE, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (PLANNING) (Mr David Bahati):** Madam Speaker, let me join colleagues in thanking the Leader of the Opposition, who moved the motion, on which basis we have been. When you accepted to take the holding decision, we have supplied this information to the House. Debate has been very constructive and encouraging. *(Applause.)*

I think the minister has made the most important point. Many members asked, “Why the urgency?” The urgency is one of those things that the minister stated that out of every five households in Uganda, two are in subsistence.

As Nyerere said, when the rest of the world is walking, Africa must be running because there is urgency to move very fast and get out of this poverty.

The parish model must be understood that it has seven pillars. The financial inclusion, which we have focused on this afternoon, is not the only pillar in the parish model. We are talking about infrastructure. Are we saying that we should not focus on the parish in terms of infrastructure? We should go slowly.

Our thinking was that –

**THE SPEAKER:** What infrastructure are you going to put at the parish, for instance? Are you going to construct parish headquarters, roads or health centres II?

**MR BAHATI:** One of the infrastructures is that when the Minister of Water and Environment is coming to this House to account for what they have done, they should come to tell us out of the 10, 584 parishes, how many water points they have constructed in these parishes. That is what we would like to see.

When the Ministry of Works and Transport is constructing roads, we want to see what they are doing about this. Therefore, the parish model looks at all these others. However, this afternoon, we have focused on financial inclusion. Hon. Lucy said that I said, during the last debate, that we are increasing the money for the women. Our thinking was that from May up to the end of the first quarter, we are going to do all these preparations.

As we speak, out of the 10,000 parishes, we have about five thousand parish chiefs who are already recruited. We are going to use the six months that we have from now up to September - those are about five months - to do all these preparatory activities and make this Parish Model, especially financial inclusion, ready to implement.

Our thinking was that there is urgency of now and that when we put this money at the parish, we are increasing the money for the women. The supervision, the policy formulation and oversight will remain with the ministry of gender.

We think that this money will increase and all the women, after all, are found in parishes and not districts. Out of all the money we collect as Government which is Shs 21 trillion, Shs 4 trillion goes to the working Ugandans. Out of the population of 40 million, the working population is around five million and yet they take Shs 4 trillion.

We are saying that if we take the money to the parishes, we are getting the money in the hands of the rest of the population who are not working. This is the time to take this important decision to implement a lifetime strategy, to alleviate poverty in this country.

I would prefer that we consult on your suggestion, whether or not we should implement it in some parishes. We shall come back to this House on Tuesday regarding that final position.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable minister, can you also say that you are going to recruit when you have not advertised and people have not applied? You are talking of between June and September – really, let us take one step at a time.

**MR BAHATI:** From the Permanent Secretary who is here in the strangers’ gallery, the recruitment process is already –*(Interjections)*– it does not take a lot of time. We will be providing jobs to the graduates who are there to be employed.

Madam Speaker, we can come back on Tuesday –

**THE SPEAKER:** Do the consultation about our proposals because we are partners with Government on this issue, together with the population. Please take our views seriously and think about them.

**MR BAHATI:** We can come back on Tuesday on the issue of implementation but I am very glad that all of us agree that the parish model will actually help this country get out of poverty. The issue is, should we implement it now or do we do it gradually? We shall come back on Tuesday after very thorough consultation with the rest of Government. Thank you.

**MR KABERUKA:** Madam Speaker, the minister should not insinuate that the Parliament is refusing this model - because every person who has talked has said this is a good proposal. However, look at the seven pillars. The first pillar is production, the second is infrastructure, the third is financial inclusion, the fourth is social services, the fifth is community debtor, the sixth is governance and administration and the seventh is mind-set change.

Madam Speaker, the minister is failing to tell us how this peanut is going to be evaluated on this.

Everybody is saying that this model would be good but where is the money to do all this? Where are the other monies? Why don’t we implement this model by putting all the other monies you are keeping out there to this model; to make sure these seven pillars work out other than just giving us a white elephant?

7.20

**THE FIRST DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND DEPUTY LEADER OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS (Gen. Moses Ali):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I must say something because I know that I am the Deputy Leader of Government Business in Parliament – *(Interjection)* - I am also a General but the need for that will be outside this House. So, I am not going to use the title of General because I do not need it here.

Madam Speaker, we all know what common knowledge is to us; that 68 per cent of our economy is subsistence. This problem we are talking about is as real like COVID-19. Poverty is real.

I heard the minister of finance, among other issues he raised, say, “Let us start.” It means I have already heard all he has said. We shall improve as we go on. That is a very big concession. The minister has accepted all the proposals.

If he insisted on a one-year pilot project, then, that money meant for this coming budget will not be used because piloting means he is not going to use that money and therefore, we will start and decide to either continue or not.

If we agree with the Ministry of Finance – what is missing is what guarantees Parliament wishes for the Ministry of Finance to make so that they agree on that proposal of “let us start”?

I do not know whether it is within our regulations but we could agree for the Speaker to get us some few special committees to assist the Ministry of Finance in implementing it. He said, “Let us start” but we should also remember what has been raised.

In my view, that is a win-win situation because as we sit here, we represent the country. The country, through its agencies like Cabinet and the Ministry of Finance, are preparing a budget. This will involve a lot of money for the sake of the poor in the country, with the possibility of the Ministry of Finance increasing that money.

If you cannot decide today, let us think over it until Tuesday next week. How much shall we lose if we postpone it for another year? How much poverty will bite? *(Laughter)* This young man here says that he wants to put Shs 430 billion; it is small but it is better than nothing. We could start from there and add another Shs 330 billion, if he could make that promise.

Madam Speaker, I suggest that we sleep over this until Tuesday and then we can conclude in one way or the other. Thank you for the opportunity. Even now, I must go and break my fast but because of this very important debate, I forgot that.

**THE SPEAKER:** Prime Minister, I hear you. What you are saying is some kind of agreed roadmap of activities. I think that is acceptable. We can sit and work out a programme to see where we are going and how we are going there. Let us work on a roadmap together. We can reconvene on Tuesday.

I would like to apologise to the Prime Minister and the other muslims for delaying them over this period of Ramadan. The House is adjourned to Tuesday at 2.00 p.m.

*(The House rose at 7.27 p.m. and adjourned until Tuesday, 27 April 2021 at 2.00 p.m.)*