

**PARLIAMENT OF UGANDA**

**Wednesday, 10 November 2021**

*Parliament met at 2.05 p.m. in Parliament House, Kampala.*

PRAYERS

*(The Deputy Speaker, Ms Anite Among, in the Chair.)*

*The House was called to order.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I would like to welcome you to today’s sitting. I would like to also thank you for your commitment in serving this country. In a special way, I would like to welcome the Rt Hon. Speaker of Parliament for coming to attend plenary. You are most welcome, Sir. *(Applause)* You are ably representing the people of Omoro. Thank you.

During yesterday’s sitting, we had an issue in regard to the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation. I promised that we would bring a list of members of the select committee that we have constituted in the Speaker’s Office under Rule 190 of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament. We will have the following members:

1. Hon. Xavier Kyooma – Chairperson
2. Hon. Paul Omara
3. Hon. Aisha Kabanda
4. Hon. Solomon Silwany
5. Hon. Tony Awany

The following are the terms of reference of the select committee on matters related to science, technology and innovation:

1. To establish the progress in development of a locally manufactured COVID-19 vaccine;
2. To establish the amount of funds so far released to the research, innovation and COVID-19 vaccine development;
3. To establish how effectively such funds have been utilised;
4. To establish the challenges faced in the development of COVID-19 vaccines and medicines;
5. To inquire into any other matters incidental to the above;
6. To recommend a way forward to Parliament; and
7. To report to Parliament within two weeks from today.

Honourable members, you will allow me to vary the Order Paper of today’s sitting. We will have a report from the Committee on Education and Sports immediately after matters of national importance. I would like to thank you once more for coming.

2.10

**MR PAULSON LUTTAMAGUZI (DP, Nakaseke County, Nakaseke):** Madam Speaker, in your communication yesterday, you talked about members being security conscious wherever they go. On a sad note, there has been another bomb blast today in Nakaseke in a village called Nvunanwa. The people are very anxious.

We would like the Government to quickly set up a committee of security experts to go to Nakaseke in Semuto Subcounty to carry out an investigation because the uniqueness of this bomb is that it came from the sky with a lot of lightning. Fortunately, it did not injure anyone but left a very big hole near someone’s home.

Madam Speaker, we, the people of Nakaseke are worried, just like the rest of the country. We would like to know what exactly is taking place in this former cradle land of the NRM. The Minister of Internal Affairs or whoever is in charge of security should quickly set up an investigative team to go to Nakaseke and find out more about these bombs. Thank you.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, hon. Luttamaguzi. Yesterday, we discussed the issue of bombs. You do not need to bring it up as an NRM issue; it is about Uganda and it affects all the Ugandans. It is not only the Opposition members that are dying, but all Ugandans. It is a matter for the whole country.

Honourable minister, you were supposed to give us feedback on issues of the bombs and the security concerns in the country.

2.13

**THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR INTERNAL AFFAIRS (Gen. David Muhoozi):** Madam Speaker, the matter of bombs is used generically to mean those related to terrorism but also other explosive substances that are found in some of these former warzones.

Regarding the incident in Nakaseke - not this one that hon. Luttamaguzi is talking about – it was a grenade by the description of witness accounts and related to a crime of passion. The supposed planter of that device, who left it in that home, and it eventually killed children, is on the run. He is being looked for. When we get him, we will put all the pieces together.

Nonetheless, that said, generally, according to the plea of hon. Luttamaguzi, we have periodically – like we did in the North and other areas like West Nile, sent people when such incidents happen to disarm some of these unidentified and exploded devices. We shall indeed send a team, like hon. Luttamaguzi is requesting that we come back to the House with better information but also action. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister. You may need to come up with a report on what is happening, though what you raised was not a procedural matter. You just smuggled it in. Let us hear matters of national importance.

2.15

**MR ATKINS KATUSABE (FDC, Bukonzo County West, Kasese)**: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank you for that perfect choice –

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I allowed him not to wear a mask when he is speaking because you do not understand him. You can remove your mask so that you can be understood.

**MR KATUSABE:** I appreciate your grace, Madam Speaker, and I would like to thank you for putting together a team in constituting the select committee.

Looking at your communication, a report that has just been released by the Inspector General of Government (IGG) indicates that Shs22 trillion is lost to corruption every year. Shs 1 trillion is lost to procurement fraud alone. This Parliament cannot afford to sit while seeing the country literally bleeding to death with COVID-19 in place. Everybody, including our fellow citizens, are struggling to survive and yet, Shs 22 trillion is lost annually.

I am happy that the Rt Hon. Speaker, Jacob Oulanyah, is here. I have a humble appeal to the leadership of this great House; that we prioritise the fight against corruption in this House. Everything else can await. Let us try, as the 11th Parliament, to save whatever is left because our fellow citizens are crying out for this Parliament to provide leadership, Madam Speaker.

Therefore, in relation to what you have just communicated, my point is that those committees, if it pleases both of you, should be clustered and segmented so that we send one to health, one to education and another to finance to try and save whatever is left. We cannot afford to be a Parliament that looks on while, literally, the country is bleeding to death because of corruption. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, hon. Atkins. We need to know our roles as Members of Parliament. We cannot go on a fishing expedition to “see if there is corruption here”. We need to get information that “this is what is happening”. For example, the information about innovation was provided to us and we are acting on it. Therefore, it is upon all of us, not only Members of Parliament, but the entire public.

**MS KUNIHIRA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise under Rule 130 of our Rules of Procedure. On 3rd, the Committee on Gender, Labour and Social Development read a report to do with the NSSF (Amendment) Bill, 2021.

If I recall well, you promised that you would be giving us time to debate that report, as it is catered for under rule 133.

Yesterday, we anxiously waited to debate but it was not called. We believed that today the Bill would appear on the Order Paper but to our surprise, it did not appear. May we be guided on what is happening? I remember that when the Bill was tabled, the Speaker promised that it would be given priority. Thank you very much.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Do you have the Order Paper with you? If you do, check on notice of business to follow; the Bill is there. It is not off the Order Paper.

In addition, as I told you, 87 per cent of the Members in this House are new, so, they need to understand this Bill. This is a very important Bill. We need to debate from an informed point of view. We are not just going to start debating what other Members have not understood. Members need to understand the Bill. It is still on the Order Paper. Therefore, be assured that it will come.

2.21

**MR ROBERT MIGADDE (NRM, Buvuma Islands County, Buvuma):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise on a matter of public importance. This same issue was on the Floor in the Ninth Parliament and 10th Parliament a number of times. So, allow me to bring it back because it has not been addressed.

It concerns the increasing number of people, specifically in Buvuma Islands, who are losing their lives due to crocodile attacks. In the recent past, we have lost seven people, the last one being on the 8th of November.

Fortunately, a seven-year-old boy called Shafiq Tamuleke only lost his hand. The others who lost their lives include Jimmy Mbatidde, James Kyanda and Paul Wabwire. In addition, these crocodiles have also consumed 16 cows in a very short period.

Madam Speaker, I am raising this issue because the last time it was raised, the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) delayed to respond. However, when they responded, they captured two crocodiles but the public was unhappy with their delay. So, they killed one of the captured crocodiles and UWA opened up cases against the local community. The LC I chairman was brought to Buganda Road Court over killing a crocodile much as the crocodiles had killed many of our people.

The boy is nursing wounds at Lugazi Hospital after losing his hand. My prayer is that the relevant ministry should not only take care of his medical bills, but also provide an artificial limb so that this boy can continue with his education and normal life.

Secondly, I request UWA *–(Interruption)*

**MR LUTTAMAGUZI**: Madam Speaker, yesterday we raised this matter: the absence of ministers in the House. We have a very big number – in fact, a record number – of ministers in Africa. However, it perturbs me to see an almost an empty bench of ministers. Who is going to answer these very important questions, Madam Speaker?

We are asking: Are the ministers undermining your authority? Are they too busy for this country? We have even reached an extent of borrowing hon. Mbwatekamwa – you can see him seated in the position of the Prime Minister. *(Laughter)* Where are these people, Madam Speaker? We should run this House seriously. Ugandans pay taxes such that these people can do their work. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, hon. Luttamaguzi. We have talked several times in this House that much as we respect the Executive, the Executive must also learn to respect the Legislature. *(Applause)* The work we do here is for the Executive.

It has become a daily song requesting ministers to come to the House. When we comment, they say the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker do not like us. We did not appoint you. The person who appointed you, appointed you to come and work. I do not know why you paralyse the work of Parliament.

Members are raising very important issues but there are no ministers to respond *–(Member rose\_) -* we are not raising the issue of finance. I know you are here as the Government Chief Whip but we need ministers in every sector. Let us have respect for each other. We may be fishermen or fisherwomen but we need to be in the House. Yes, hon. Sarah.

2.26

**MS SARAH OPENDI (NRM, Woman Representative, Tororo):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. You are aware that since the COVID-19 outbreak, our registration during attendance is not taken.

I am wondering, Madam Speaker, whether it would not be procedurally right for us to start registering our attendance to Parliament because it is clear in the Rules of Procedure that we are supposed to. It cannot be a schedule. Schedules are issued but not every Member attends even when they are scheduled to be here.

Therefore, would it not be procedurally right for us to start registering our attendance so as know those who have completely never attended any plenary session in a given period?

The secondly matter is about ministers not being here. When an issue is raised on the Floor, some ministers, instead of coming to the House, go on to address the media on a particular matter raised on the Floor.  For example, when hon. Yona Musinguzi raised the issue of the Shs50 billion that the Minister for Science and Technology had received for this vaccine, I listened on the media to the minister make comments about that matter while officiating at the science week. She was responding to that allegation in that meeting and saying she had never received the Shs 50 billion and that it was received by technical people. Yesterday, I again watched her on TV saying that the President knows where every coin of the Shs 50 billion went.

Is it procedurally right for ministers to be absent from this House and instead of coming to respond to matters here, they go to address the media on matters raised here yet the matters were not out there, they were raised on the Floor of the House? Is it procedurally right? Thank you.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Of course that is not procedurally correct. If a Member raises an issue on the Floor, the responsible minister should come and respond to that matter on the Floor. The Fourth Estate out there cannot act as the House.

Who is the acting Prime Minister? You must take note of that and you need to inform your ministers that, that is not the right procedure. You need to raise that with your ministers.

Ministers, please help us to help you. We need to work together.

**MR OKIN:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. In regard to the submission made by hon. Sarah Opendi, I rise to move a motion. Considering rule 59 of the Rules of Procedure, I move a motion without notice.

Now that we have had a situation where the other side is not able to respond to questions raised, I move that we suspend the House for some time and ask their whip to ensure they come in. This is because we cannot proceed like this, Madam Speaker because the other side cannot respond to the questions being raised.

I therefore, move that we suspend the House for sometime as we wait for them to come in. Thank you.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is not true that they are not ready to respond because the Minister of Internal Affairs has just responded to what was raised. We have the Minister of Tourism present in the House and he is going to respond to what is being raised by hon. Migadde. Can you continue?

**MR MIGADDE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now that these are Government crocodiles *– (Laughter)* – my prayers are:

1. The relevant ministry provides cages at different landing sites to enable our people safely fetch water;

2. They should take care of the treatment of the boy; and

3. The Ministry of Wildlife and Antiquities, through or together with UWA, should camp in the area and capture a number of the existing crocodiles so that our people can have peace for some time. I so pray.

2.32

**THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR TOURISM, WILDLIFE AND ANTIQUITIES (Mr Martin Mugarra):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank hon. Migadde for raising the issue. I had had a discussion with him earlier today.

Of course it is regrettable that crocodiles are increasing in number and UWA has not been able to put up permanent presence in that area. Picking two crocodiles is not good enough to solve the problem. We have agreed with UWA and hon. Migadde that we are going to maintain a permanent presence in that area until we have the crocodile numbers reduced.

Definitely we shall also take care of the bills at Kawolo Hospital at Lugazi, going forward. Thank you.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Honourable minister, the last time we had a session, we agreed we should meet all the people from those such affected areas. Hon. Peter is going to stand up on the same issue soon. Why don’t you create time to meet all the Members of Parliament from those affected areas and report back to the House?

**MR MUGARRA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. As you guided, we met all the Members from the communities surrounding protected areas. We even have a programme out and it is running from this month to December detailing when we shall be in those areas.

So, we are working with them to make sure we find a solution to these issues.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Additionally, Members, you can keep reaching out to these ministers. If there is an issue, do we have to wait for it to come to the House? Can’t you interact with these people and only bring the matter here after failing?

And you know we are going to spend a lot of time on these matters of national importance yet we have a congested Order Paper. You have a Member raising an issue of a Bill, we are still on matters of national importance. I think you should first consult these ministries on such matters.

**MS ABER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise on the same issue. The minister has just said, in his response, that we had a meeting.

Yes, indeed we had a meeting but since the meeting took place – a case in point being Kitgum District, Orom Sub-County where the elephants have been disturbing the community, destroying gardens and nothing has been done. What was given prior was only food relief but the elephants keep on advancing. They have so far covered about three sub counties.

The minister is saying we had a meeting and that this matter will be addressed and that UWA will take charge. However UWA has not done anything and they are saying that they do not have the budget to compensate the people whose gardens have been destroyed.

Is it procedurally right for the honourable minister to respond saying everything will be handled when in the actual sense, nothing will be done on ground and our people will continue suffering? Thank you.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We had actually agreed that if you do not have the money, you come up with a supplementary to help you fence off those areas. These animals should not stay with people. At the end of the day, the people will kill and eat the animals and you will arrest them.

So, you need to get money to help you have these places fenced off. Is that part of the supplementary? Do you have a supplementary on that?

**MR MUGARRA:** We do not have a supplementary right now but we are trying to budget for that in next year’s budget so that all this is handled.

Like I said, we are going to be in most of these communities. Madam Speaker, you said that after we have come up with all this information, we should compile and present a report to Parliament for its support so that we fence off these areas and we have this problem addressed.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** But it is because you have not come up with a report that Parliament has not supported you. Come up with a report – Hon. Katusabe, please, sit down because you have not come with the report and you have not requested Parliament to help you. That is why you find this problem all the time.

Honourable members, we have a very important motion that we must resolve in the next 10 minutes. I know I have many matters of national importance but the next matters will come immediately after the report of the Committee on Education and Sports. We will then continue with matters of national importance as we wait for the minister who can respond to the questions to come. I do not want matters to be raised when the ministers are not there. The Government Chief Whip, however, is saying the ministers are coming.

Honourable members, we are going to the next item.

MOTION FOR ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND SPORTS ON THE MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT URGING GOVERNMENT TO DEGAZETTE PART OF THE CENTRAL FOREST RESERVE AT LAROO-PECE DIVISION, GULU CITY, FOR USE BY GULU UNIVERSITY

2.38

**THE CHAIRPERSON, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND SPORTS (Mr John Twesigye):** I thank the Speaker for according us this opportunity to present a report of the Committee on Education and Sports on the motion for a resolution of Parliament urging Government to degazette part of the Central Forest Reserve at Laroo-Pece Division City in Gulu City for use by Gulu University.

This report is already uploaded on the iPads and Members can access it from there.

Madam Speaker, I request that you allow me read this report verbatim. It is a very brief report and it is specific to the terms of reference that were given to the committee by this House.

During the proceedings of the House –*(Interruption)*

**MR ARINAITWE:** According to the National Tree Planting Act, Section 8(2)(a), if you are passing a motion to degazette, you should simultaneously pass another motion to gazette. Therefore, I would expect that motion to gazette to be on the Order Paper. Thank you.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Honourable members, as you recall, this issue came to the House and it was referred to the Committee on Education and Sports for consideration. You will also recall that this House guided on the motion that was brought on the Floor seeking Government to have that place degazetted for expansion of Gulu University. Because there was a contention on the matter, that is why the Committee on Education and Sports was assigned to go on the ground, make a report to that effect and bring it to the House.

The issues that you are raising were brought on the Floor and they have been covered. You must also be aware that it is not this House that degazettes. Our work is to recommend and then, Government will come with a motion on degazettement. So, why don’t you allow the Member to read his report on what they were assigned to do before you raise your issue?

**MR TWESIGYE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for that wise ruling. As I was beginning my presentation, I said that during the proceedings of the House held on Tuesday, 14 September 2021, hon. Martin Ojara, Member of Parliament for Bardege-Layibi Division, Gulu City tabled a motion for a resolution of Parliament urging Government to degazzette part of the Central Forest Reserve at Laroo-Pece Division, Gulu City for use by Gulu University - the motion is attached to the report – to which the Rt Hon. Speaker referred to the Committee on Education and Sports for scrutiny.

To give a brief background, established through Instrument No.31 of 2003, Gulu University currently occupies a 12-acre piece of land formerly belonging to the District Farm Institute in Laroo-Pece Division in the now, Gulu City.

Since inception in 2002, Gulu University has witnessed increasing student enrollment that has necessitated establishment of key infrastructure to support university education in Uganda, the East African Community and beyond.

The increase in student population has continued to further strain the limited infrastructure thus inhibiting education service delivery.

In a bid to provide solutions to pressures on limited key infrastructure and to provide high quality university education, learning, research and development, National Forestry Authority (NFA) on 20 December 2006 issued Gulu University a temporary licence for 70 acres in the central forest reserve – that one is also attached - located in Laroo-Pece Division in the then Gulu Municipality for the purpose of establishing a Faculty of Medicine.

Methodology

1. In consideration of the motion, the committee held meetings with and scrutinised written memoranda from the following stakeholders:
2. The Mover and Seconders of the Motion; hon. Ojara Martin Mapenduzi, Member of Parliament for Bardege-Layibi Division, hon. Nakut Faith, Member of Parliament for Napak District and hon. Emmanuel Ongiertho, Member of Parliament of Jonam County;
3. Ministry of Education and Sports;
4. Minister of Water and Environment;
5. National Forestry Authority;
6. National Environment Management Authority;
7. Gulu University Council and Management. Those were met at the site at Gulu University.
8. We made reference to the following key documents. Madam Speaker, I beg that I do not read this detail since it is clear in the report.
9. We conducted a field visit to Gulu City, Kitgum and Nwoya Districts and held meetings with the following officials:
10. The Chairperson, Nwoya District Local Government;
11. The Chairperson, Nwoya District land Board;
12. The Chief Administrative Officer, Nwoya District Local Government;
13. The District Lands Officer, Nwoya.

The terms of reference given to us by this House were followed to the letter and in executing the assignment, the committee was guided by the following terms of reference as given by the House:

1. To establish physical possession of the 70 acres of the Central Forest Reserve by Gulu University with already established buildings/structures;
2. To establish the availability of the 500 acres offered by Gulu University to the National Forestry Authority as alternative land for the establishment of a new forest reserve.

These were the findings and observations.

Under terms of reference No.1, the committee established that in a bid to provide university education services, Gulu University established a number of key infrastructure on the 70 acres of the Central Forest Reserve.

These include the Faculty of Medicine, the Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, Biosystems Engineering Block, the Business Incubation Centre and Cassava Processing Plant, the Agro-food Incubation Facility, a Multifunction Research Laboratories, the university laboratory, Central Teaching Facility – construction is still ongoing, Madam Speaker - canteen – also, construction is still ongoing - the university playground and the Green Park Hostel.

Under terms of reference No.2, the committee established that the 500 acres of land in Nwoya District were available and registered in the names of Gulu University. The committee, however, observed that the 500 acres of land were on leasehold tenure of 49 years.

The committee was informed by Gulu University that it was in the process of having all the legal requirements expeditiously worked out to facilitate the process of issuing an amendment to the Statutory Order, declaring Gulu Central Forest Reserve by the minister.

In that regard, Nwoya District Land Board informed the committee that it was willing to support Gulu University to have the Leasehold Certificate of Title, comprising the 500 acres converted to freehold tenure to enable NFA own the land in perpetuity.

Recommendations

Under terms of reference No.1, the committee recommends that Parliament should approve the prayer sought in the motion and resolve that the minister responsible for water and environment urgently fulfills the President’s directive to degazette 70 acres of the central forest reserve at Laroo-Pece Division and avail the land to Gulu University for its expansion.

The Minister of Water and Environment should be given a timeframe within which to present to Parliament an amendment of the Statutory Order declaring the central forest reserve, degazetting the 70 acres in accordance with section 8 of the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act, 2003.

Recommendations under term of reference No.2

The committee recommends that Gulu University fast tracks:

1. The process of converting the Leasehold Certificate of Title comprising the 500 acres into a Freehold Certificate of Title, in accordance with Section 28 of the Land Act, Cap.227; and
2. The other requirements, precedent to the degazettement like carrying out an environmental impact assessment to facilitate expeditious handling of the degazettement process.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, the Committee on Education and Sports recommends that subject to the above findings, this House accepts and passes the prayer, as contained in the motion.

In the report uploaded on the iPads, it is indicated that it is a resolution but to read it again, we are concluding by saying that the Committee on Education and Sports recommends that subject to the above findings, this House accepts and passes the prayer, as contained in the motion.

Madam Speaker, we processed this report. We have the minutes. We have also attached copies of the pages of the attendance register. I beg to lay the report and minutes on the Table.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you very much, chairperson. The report of the chairperson of the Committee on Education and Sports was in response to the debate on the motion that was raised by hon. Mapenduzi Ojara.

The chairperson has said the 70 acres – they verified the 70 acres and he also verified the land that the university is giving to the community in exchange. I think that is within the law, of course mindful of Article 237(2)(b) that they hold the land in trust.

So, the report has been presented.

**MR ATWIJUKIRE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I beg to move an amendment in the motion now before the House, under rule 6(10) of our Rules of Procedure, to add a resolution to read as follows; that Government makes a comprehensive assessment, with a view of degazetting of all similar cases, including the districts of Mayuge, Jinja, Arua, Kayunga. *(Applause)*

Where there have been longstanding human settlements on central forest reserves, with acquiesce of Government and National Forestry Authority, it is equitable and just that the said forest reserves equally be degazetted for human settlement and subsequent human development. I beg to move, Madam Speaker.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, why are you shouting like this is a market? *(Laughter)* Hon. Nandala-Mafabi, did I hear you?

2.53

**MR NANDALA-MAFABI (FDC, Budadiri County West, Sironko):** Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity. Sometimes, some good motions are spoilt by some people who have vested interests – maybe great.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You know, the problem is you have not allowed me to open the motion for debate.

**MR NANDALA-MAFABI:** Thank you very much but greed should stop. *(Laughter)*

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** First of all, you need to know what the gist of the matter in the motion was from hon. Mapenduzi. This was a response to hon. Mapenduzi’s motion. So, he still needs to remind the House.

For example, hon. Nandala, you were not in the House that day. So, hon. Mapenduzi Ojara, can you give us the gist of what was in your motion?

2.54

**MR MAPENDUZI OJARA (Independent, Bardege-Layibi Division, Gulu City):** Madam Speaker, let me thank you for giving me the opportunity to talk about this motion again. I moved a motion for a resolution of Parliament, urging Government to degazette part of the central forest reserve at Laroo-Pece Division, Gulu City for use by Gulu University.

Madam Speaker, this motion was seconded and debated by this House. This House decided that the Committee on Education and Sports should do its part in getting the facts that would support or disapprove the information I presented. I went ahead to present supportive documents.

Just to give a summary, firstly, I stated very clearly that from the time Gulu University started to this day and from the time the district of Gulu gave the university the former district farm institute. The university has never had the opportunity to grow as we all expected because it did not have land.

As the committee has noted, to this day, the university sits on 12 acres of land for the former district farm institute, which was surrendered to it and which we consider as property legally owned by the university.

Madam Speaker, I also provided that in the spirit of making the university functional, Government decided to provide resources to establish different faculties. That was the time the university approached National Forest Authority. The two entities went into a memorandum of understanding and the Government provided the resources needed to establish those faculties. And as rightly mentioned by the chairperson of the committee those resources went to the construction of: the faculty of Agriculture; Faculty of Medicine; the multifunctional laboratory, which is at the level of Biosafety Level Three, and; many other facilities that were constructed on those 70 acres of land we are talking about.

Madam Speaker, I also provided documentary evidence that showed that the university had provided 500 acres in Nwoya in exchange for the 70 acres that we are talking about.

Therefore, not to repeat a lot of the information I provided, allow me to very sincerely thank the committee for doing a good job. They have provided all the facts and the figures and it would be fair for this Parliament to consider supporting this motion, not only in the spirit of promoting the education sector but also demonstrating that goodwill that the northern part of Uganda – and Uganda, generally – should develop and that education is key.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:**  Thank you, hon. Mapenduzi. The mover of the motion is very clear. He is asking the House to pass a resolution requiring the minister responsible – the Minister of Water and Environment – to urgently degazette the 70 acres for use by the university.

All that is required has been fulfilled and because of that, the education committee has also fulfilled what they were supposed to do and they confirm that they found out that the university needs land to expand. Due to that need, we are entrust it with this land for development, education and human settlement.

And because the report says the minister should come up with a motion to degazette it, I now put a question that the Report of the Committee on Education and Sports *–(Member rose\_) -* I am still on the Report of the Committee on Education and Sports; I know what you want - on the Motion for Resolution of Parliament urging Government to degazette part of the central forest reserve at Laroo-Pece Division, Gulu City for the use by Gulu University, be adopted by this House.

*(Question put and agreed to.)*

*Report adopted.*

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We have adopted the report of the Committee on Education and Sports *- (Members rose\_) -* and for your information, whoever wants to debate should know that this report was already debated and I have a *Hansard* here where the Rt Hon. Speaker was the presiding officer that day. All that was left was a vote on this motion.

**MR NAMBESHE:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. In a similar motion that was moved by hon. Tebandeke to degazette a central forest reserve, I vividly recall the Government Chief Whip deliberating on it and seeking your indulgence, Madam Speaker. He informed the House that the line ministry – Ministry of Water and Environment – had received a multiplicity of petitions pertaining to degazettement. And he pleaded with your Chair that, that minister be given space at his direction - and I am sure he has given direction to the minister - to come to the House because by law – the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act sys that such motion for degazettement “shall be moved by the minister.” The motion to degazette or even gazette is a preserve of the minister.

Madam Speaker, we, on this political divide, have a position and our views are always very strong for gazettement but very weak for degazettement. Therefore, wouldn’t you give audience, as per the plea of the Government Chief Whip, for the line minister to come and furnish this House with a comprehensive report on matters of degazettement and gazettement?

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:**  Was it still on this Gulu issue or the subsequent ones? These are different. For this, there is even a presidential directive for education purposes. There was a letter written. The minister is also in agreement and was only waiting for our resolution today.

**MR BASALIRWA:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. We run a risk of combining the matter before us with the other matters related to degazettement. *(Applause)*  We run that risk and it is so grave that as hon. Nandala-Mafabi mentioned, you are likely to undermine the motion or matter on the Floor with other matters that have not been canvassed.

Madam Speaker, the matter before us was debated, as you did say. It was justified by hon. Mapenduzi and we had an opportunity to discuss it. There is a report of the committee. I would think that, moving forward, Parliament takes a decision on that particular issue. On the other aspects of degazettement, as the Chief Opposition Whip has said, those of us on this side have views or positions generally but there is now this specific matter before us and it is important for the House to take a position on this matter because it has been debated and there is a committee report and moving forward should be very simple. Otherwise, we should not mix. I know that there are many interests when it comes to degazettement; everybody wants degazettement as if we are not alive to our obligations as Parliament to preserve the environment. We must be alive to that responsibility. *(Applause)*

Therefore, at this point in time, I do not think it would be prudent for us to begin talking about degazettement in Busoga or elsewhere. We would be missing the point. We should focus on the matter before us now and take a position. We debated and we know where we fall in as far as this matter is concerned because some of us were given opportunity to debate it.

Madam Speaker, the procedural issue I raised is whether we are proceeding right by not considering the matter on the Floor and attempting to consider other issues related to the de-gazettement, which were not for consideration.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, the report that we are considering is for Gulu. I am putting a question to the motion for a resolution of Parliament requiring the Minister of Water and Environment to urgently fulfill the Presidential directive to de-gazette 70 acres of Gulu Central Forest Reserve and avail the land for Gulu University for its expansion.

*(Question put and agreed to.)*

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The minister should bring a motion for de-gazettement of the 70 acres for expansion of Gulu. Thank you very much.

**MR JOHN TWESIGYE:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank you, honourable members and members of the committee who have helped me in working with the stakeholders I interacted with to see to it that this report reaches here and is accepted by the House. I thank you very much.

*(Whereupon the Deputy Speaker, Ms Anita Among exits the Chamber.)*

*(At 3.08 p.m., the Speaker, Mr Jacob Oulanyah, presiding\_)*

STATEMENT BY THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION ON ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT APPROACH TO THE PARISH DEVELOPMENT MODEL

3.08

**MR JOHN BAPTIST NAMBESHE (NUP, Manjiya County, Bududa):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. The statement by the Leader of the Opposition is an alternative development approach to the Parish Development Model.

You will appreciate that the Government has come up with numerous initiatives of financing interventions to the populace. They have come up with agricultural credit facility, Microfinance Support Centre, *Entandikwa,* *Bonna Bagaggawale,* the Youth Livelihood Fund and even *Emyooga* of recent. However, all these, as you will appreciate, have had virtually no considerable impact on the livelihoods of the local populace. What the Opposition has come up with is a silver bullet. This is a clarion call to Government that if you do not, in its entirety, adopt this alternative approach, you will be missing out on the cure to the mischief to all those previous initiatives, so to speak.

Mr Speaker, as usual, I am going to usher in my able shadow Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, hon. Muwanga Kivumbi to take us through this alternative development approach to the Parish Development Model. Thank you very much.

**THE SPEAKER:** Don't you think you should route that request through me - because you have no authority to –

**MR NAMBESHE:** Mr Speaker, I am delegating hon. Muwanga Kivumbi to hold the fort for me through your Chair, Sir.

**THE SPEAKER:** Hon. Muwanga Kivumbi -

3.10

**THE SHADOW MINISTER OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (Mr Muwanga Kivumbi):** Mr Speaker, I take this opportunity to welcome you back and to thank you for this opportunity.

When I was in high school, our famous headmaster the famous Abbas Mukasa Kawasi used to remind us that the biggest room in any house is the room for improvement. Therefore, it is in that spirit that we come on this Floor quite frequently to explore the angles of that room so that our humble people can benefit maximally in all the opportunities that come their way.

All people of Uganda come from a particular village and a particular parish. We were elected at that grass roots level and so, whatever takes place is of great concern to all of us. Therefore, any opportunity by Government and any coin spent must be optimally taken advantage of and serve the broadest of interests.

It is in that big spirit that we come up with an alternative policy - not policy as such - because we are seeking to improve and to optimise what will become of the Parish Model. Care must be taken. We are not opposed to it and we do not stand here to oppose the Parish Development Model. We are critical of it but we are not opposing it in this statement.

In the 2020/2021 budget, Government thought to roll out the Parish Development Model as a national development strategy. The funds to finance the strategy were initially proposed to be mobilised from reallocations towards PRDP, Luweero-Rwenzori Development Programme, NAADS seedlings, Operation Wealth Creation, Uganda Coffee Development Authority seedlings as well as an amalgamation of existing wealth funds such as Uganda Women Entrepreneurial Programme and the Youth Livelihood Programme. A total of Shs 453 billion was expected to be raised from amalgamation of which, Shs 444 billion was to be used as a revolving fund.

However, Parliament raised concerns on the feasibility of the model; critical then was the absence of the parish chiefs who were to be main coordinators of the model. Hence, it was resolved that allocation is reduced to Shs 200 billion this financial year. This was mainly targeted at recruiting parish chiefs to fill vacant posts in 5,192 parishes. This will raise the number of parish chiefs across the country to 10,594 parishes. The recruitment of parish chiefs was in line with the Section 69 of the Local Government Act.

However, in October 2021, it was noted that by the deadline of 30 September, most of the local governments had not yet recruited parish chiefs. Affected accounting officers were threatened with disciplinary action and the deadline was extended to 30 October.

Upon filling the post of parish chiefs across the country, it was proposed that Shs 18.87 million will be allocated per parish. This was later revised to Shs 30 million. This amount is equivalent to what was allocated to each apex SACCO under the *Emyooga* programme. Later, the President proposed to raise the allocation to Shs 100 million by next year's budget.

Nevertheless, based on the allocation, it was noted that Government prioritise the establishment of parish revolving funds. The key implementing agencies included the local government, Kampala Capital City Authority, Uganda Bureau of Statistics, the Ministry of Local Government as well as the Ministry of Information, Communication Technology and National Guidance, as indicated in that table.

Mr Speaker, the Parish Development Model centres on seven pillars that include; production, infrastructure and economic services, financial inclusion, social service, community data and information system, governance and administration and mindset change.

Its operations focus on prioritizing development of 18 commodities, which include coffee, cotton, cocoa, cassava, tea, vegetable oil, oil palms, maize, rice, sugarcane, fish, dairy, beef, bananas, beans, avocado, shea nuts, cashew nuts, and macadamia nuts.

Mr Speaker, I do not know, whether in hon. Nsereko’s parishes, any of those crops are grown or in Jinja Municipality or Gulu City at *(Interjection)* – or at Arua Park. *(Laughter)* However, that is for another day.

The prevailing bottlenecks to the Parish Development Model

Scrutiny of the Parish Development Model reveals that it does not address the prevailing bottlenecks hindering the transformation of our culture enterprise into profitable ventures.

The first critical bottleneck to transform agriculture to profitable venture is unstable prices. The Parish Development Model seeks to increase household income mainly through agriculture and financial service.

However, it is oblivious of the fact that majority of the citizens who are engaged in our agriculture require, not handouts, rather an environment that makes agriculture profitable.

While the agriculture sector needs quality inputs, extension services, insurance, arable land and financing among others, it should be noted that its potential is suppressed to a greater extent by unstable and unpredictable prices, which have been depreciating over the years.

This is largely attributed to bumper harvests, inadequate post harvesting infrastructure and unstable markets. Unfortunately, recent interventions such as the National Agriculture Advisory Services (NAADS) and Operation Wealth Creation (OWC) have failed to address these gaps; I wait to see how NAADS addresses. I have attached a graph that shows that for the last five years, there is instability of market prices, because finance follows predictability and durability.

Consequently, there is uncertainty in profitability, which draws away private sector capital from agriculture. Enterprises perceived to have durability, predictability, and predictable profitability, attract investments from the population. This largely explains why those that are perceived to be subsistence households, have individually mobilised resources through savings, borrowing, sale of agriculture produce and sale of assets, but usually land to invest in boda boda.

A critical analysis is - I went to a parish, honourable colleagues, when we were aiding COVID-19 affected people, one small parish, I realised they had 332 boda bodas in Kibibi town in my constituency. They had 70 mini-buses – the new model drones. The question is; why would one buy a boda boda and not a Friesian? Why would one invest Shs 70 million in a drone and not on the land he holds where he grows crops? As we think, the issue is just money.

Important to note is that majority of Ugandans seek loans or credit for non-farm enterprises and consumptive purposes other than investment in agriculture. I have attached here a graph which shows where Ugandans, who go to banks, when they borrow, do invest their money? You will see through this graph that only 5 per cent across the board will go to buy inputs for agriculture, but majority of people are in purchase of inputs and farms, consumptive goods, pay education, health; those are the reasons people go to borrow. Therefore, why don't people go to borrow to fund agriculture?

The Government has, on several occasions, initiated different interventions such as agriculture credit facilities, Macro Support Finance Centre, Entandikwa, *Bona Bagagawale*, Youth Livelihood Programme, Uganda Women Entrepreneur Programme and *Emyooga* among others.

Nevertheless, over 40 per cent of Ugandans still do not have access to any form of financial service. Amongst those that can access financial sources, 57 per cent of them source credit from informal sources such as village savings and loan associations, accumulated savings and credit associations, rotating funds and credit associations and merry-go-rounds; in Buganda they are called *Nigiina*.

Therefore, the Government financing interventions that require a minimum level of formality, particularly registration are largely shunned by targeted beneficiaries. That is why the campaign about my mindset change is so critical.

Besides the financing interventions are geared towards low earning households and designed as a revolving fund. They target a number of sectors. It has been noted over the years that beneficiaries are mainly involved in the sectors of our agriculture, trade, service and industry. This has been observed in the Youth Livelihood Programme and Uganda Women Entrepreneurship Programme.

It can, therefore, be deduced that the agriculture sector has not been short of financing options, rather, they have been too disjointed to make any considerable impact. Therein, we put a table to speak to it.

The second factor is inadequate recovery rate of evolving funds. On several occasions, Government facilitated evolving funds such as *Emyooga*, Youth Livelihood Programme and Uganda Women Entrepreneurship Programme have been considered as donations from Government. They are regarded as political tokens and parallel systems within Government.

Madam Speaker, most of these funds have a problem. When they are taken to the population, they think these are tokens from the Government. Quite you will find that people who have benefited in the Youth Livelihood Programme are the same women in women entrepreneurship and the same ones in NAADS, Operation Wealth Creation and these are normally those within the system and they are not mostly engaged in agriculture.

Under the Parish Development Model pillar on financial inclusion, Government proposes to establish a parish revolving fund that will lend to parish SACCOs and each of the SACCOs was scheduled to receive Shs 3.8 million in this financial year.

The parish SACCO is supposed to exist with *Emyooga*, which are constituents-based SACCOs. Each of these constituent-based SACCOs are allocated Shs 30 million. I will keep giving examples of urban SACCOs. A parish in Kisenyi or in hon. Balimwezo’s Nakawa or even Kira has the same number of people as my whole constituency. Moreover, you want to say each parish Shs 100 million irrespective of the population.

Two, you study the trends of Ugandans; more Ugandans, by the way are moving even in rural areas to staying urban centres than in villages. Therefore, as you target to go to villages, Ugandans are not leaving there.

Madam Speaker, the concern is raised on the fact that revolving funds set up by Government have poor recovery rates. And women here, listen but do not take me on because what I am going to speak about your associations are facts. For instance, in financial year 2019/2020, the youth livelihood programme recovered Shs 37 billion, 40 per cent out of the Shs 90 billion dispatched while the Uganda Women Entrepreneurship Fund only recovered Shs 16 billion, which is 23 per cent, out of the Shs 66.7 billion dispatched.

Therefore, even as you we talk about a revolving fund, will money actually revolve when the recovery rate is that miserable?

Cost of agricultural inputs

I do not even need to elucidate on this one. All of us know that agricultural inputs are costly. If I may try to elucidate, it will be a waste of time.

We know the problems associated with agricultural inputs. There is the issue of quality, then price, and then we have a lot of fake drugs. Those that are engaged in cattle and poultry know the losses they are making because of some fake drugs being sold somewhere.

Another factor is a replica of the failed initiatives. We keep repeating the same things all over: *Entandikwa; Emyooga; Tulembeke; Boona Bagagawale* and quite often without adequate research. I will read a paragraph here, it is also crucial to note that the Parish Development Model is almost structured like the Project for Restoration of Livelihood in Northern Uganda.

There is a project in Northern Uganda that should act as an example of what we are dealing with. Unlike the model, which has no projected lifespan, this project called Parimo was worth Shs 248 billion. It started in July 2015 and it is scheduled to close by 30 September 2022.

The project operates in the nine districts of Gulu, Omoro, Nwoya, Amuru, Adjumani, Agago, Pader, Kitgum and Lamwo; 100 parishes, 25 subcounties and 491 villages. The project components include livelihood, market linkages, infrastructure as well as programme management and coordination. They are similar to the pillars in the Parish Development Model, albeit under different nomenclature.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Public Service and Local Government revealed that the project was a failure and requires a forensic audit. It would only have been prudent to evaluate this and other failed strategies, such as those I have already talked about, before we embarked on these new initiatives.

The community information system being proposed in the Parish Development Model was initiated in 2005/2006 as a means of generating data from parish and sub county levels. This system was expected to respond faster to policy unlike the Uganda National Household Survey that is undertaken every three years.

The system was funded under Uganda Bureau of Statistics as the lead agency working in collaboration with the National Planning Authority, Ministry of Local Government and Ministry of Labour, Gender and Community Development.

Activities funded included political mobilisation, database setup, data recording and entities as well as community mobilisation, particularly at sub-county level.

Since 2005/2006, the system has been allocated public resources. It is therefore, misleading to indicate that the system was to commence in May 2021; it has been in existence.

A new name is being used to define the system. It is called Parish Based Management Information System. We are rolling out similar things, giving them different names with nothing new.

We also think that an alternative integrated development approach should be considered here. The Parish Development Model is largely intentioned at supporting and transforming livelihoods for those engaged in the formal sector. Emphasis has been placed on supporting agriculture, particularly production of the 18 commodities as well as financial inclusion through supporting the parish SACCOs.

However, as earlier highlighted, the strategy and the structure of the Parish Development Model is problematic. It is more inclined towards tokenism other than creating and supporting an enabling environment where intended beneficiaries will naturally position themselves to benefit from available opportunities.

Aware that the informal sector employs the majority of the population who contribute approximately 51 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product, it is critical that Government interventions are properly targeted to positively transform this livelihood.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, our second proposal is that we must establish a price stabilisation fund. Those who are in maize growing areas know that the prices of maize fluctuate so frequently. Even us who are growing coffee. Sometimes we are not very sure of the prices; it is common. Governments all over the world that are supporting agriculture are giving subsidies. We may not go that way but if we have a stabilisation fund, we will go a long way towards – I do not see that in the Parish Development Model.

The other alternative, in our humble view – and we are very radical about this – all these punches we are throwing in enterprises, in models, in *Emyooga* – if we did two things in this country, we would help better.

If we deem it necessary, we merge all these funds and set up a cooperative bank. *(Applause)* If not a cooperative bank, we can transform all these funds into an agricultural bank – a bank directly targeting agriculture; other than having different projects every other day where people access money and think it is tokenism.

If we dealt with the question of affordability and accessibility to finances where interest rates in commercial banks are high, in these banks, they will be very low. We will go a long way to eradicate this tokenism.

Of interest to us is the fact that one of the impediments to our cultural development is sustainability of soil fertility. Therefore, Government should first invest a lot of money in the establishment of a fertilizer factory. An attempt was made at this – let me read this; Uganda annually loses 80 Kgs of nutrients while adding parity of 1.15 Kgs. This has led to low yields across the country for the land is no longer virgin.

The present generation treats the land as though its fertility is a constant factor of production. This is attributed to poor farming methods, inadequate extension services, supply of fake fertilizers and prohibitive costs of fertilizers.

The latter is mainly driven by transportation and supply costs for the country imports a full range of fertilisers used in the agriculture sector. Consequently, there is land degradation in every part of the country.

To address the dwindling land fertility, a national fertiliser policy was passed by Cabinet in 2016. The policy sought to develop a national capacity in the production of fertilisers, a means of addressing this supply and quality constraints in the market. This would, in turn, contribute to boosting productivity, sustainability and supply chain, predictability of prices and increase in household income.

However, the policy hinged its interventions on intensifying importation and development of fertiliser factories on private investors such as public-private partnership. This was a case in Sukulu Phosphate Factory in Tororo and the proposed NDP III core project fertiliser-blending factory in Mbale. This approach has failed to yield dividends. Such investment requires – what we are saying is that the Government wanted to build this factory but it failed. This investment requires massive funding. It is only the State, if we are serious about transforming agriculture, that should be a lead agency in having a fertiliser factory.

Our humble view is – Mr Speaker, we want to address one last bottleneck, which touches an area where most of us come from. The Parish Development Model should be based on population density and not territory. When I look around, the most densely populated area of central region, under the Parish Development Model, will receive less money than Lango region, Acholi region and all the others.

Therefore, our humble appeal is that everywhere there are people, you give adequate money. Just saying that for every parish you give Shs 100 million, simply does not work.

With that, I beg to move. *(Applause)*

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you, hon. Muwanga, for the very powerful presentation you have made. It is quite articulate. It is not that I am surprised but it is just a confirmation of what you have always been to this House: bringing issues out clearly.

Honourable members, you may recall that this response is to a proposal that was brought to this House in the last Parliament and then, adopted. The team from the Opposition have now taken a decision to look at the document that was adopted by this House and make some responses and proposals.

It is going to be a kind of challenging debate because we do not have the initial document that was adopted to which this is a response. The suggestions, recommendations and changes are based on the original document. Be that as it may, however, we will find a way of navigating and having discussions on how we proceed with this.

I wanted to find out – because the discussion on the Parish Development Model is still going on in Cabinet as well – whether there is going to be a second presentation to Parliament on this same matter on the actual way forward in the implementation and whether there is going to be proposed legislations so that there is clarity on what we want to do when we finally begin implementing the Parish Development Model. I needed guidance from the Members of the Front Bench if there is such a document coming.

3.40

**THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR FINANCE, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (GENERAL DUTIES) (Mr Henry Musasizi):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate hon. Muwanga for his precise response to the previous framework, which was presented to this House in the 10th Parliament.

I wish to report that since then, there have been a number of engagements, processes and consultations in as far as the implementation of the Parish Development Model and the developing of workable and practical frameworks is concerned.

In this regard, Cabinet is yet to conclude the process of the agreed upon framework, notwithstanding the preparatory activities in as far as the implementation of the Parish Development Model is concerned.

I wish to undertake that when all these processes are concluded, we will come back to this House with a comprehensive statement, and, thereafter, be able to take on all the concerns that will come from this House. Thank you.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you, honourable minister. Honourable members, you now see where my issue arises. We are here and the Opposition has acted properly, although a bit late. It is because, ordinarily, this particular discussion should have taken place with the initial framework paper on the Parish Development Model, in which case, I do not know how it was handled. It could have gone to a committee but even this response could have gone to the committee so that we have a comprehensive debate, which would have taken this into account.

Now that these particular proposals have not been discussed and there is a pending discussion on these same matters, how do we proceed? When the final documentation comes from Cabinet, it will come here. I am hoping that the Leader of the Opposition and his team will have sufficient time to look at the final document. We will then see how we can accommodate a response and have a debate on this matter after a report from the committee.

I am just trying to think of how we can make this really detailed research positions accommodated within the processes when we are taking decisions. That is why I am raising these issues.

3.44

**MR GEOFREY EKANYA (FDC, Tororo North County, Tororo):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank hon. Muwanga, the Shadow Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. About a month ago, I represented the Committee on Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries in meeting all the local leaders in northern Uganda. We had teams from the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development and other Government agencies. We discussed, among other issues, the framework for the Parish Development Model.

As you and the minister have rightly said, certain components of the model are being implemented. I thank the Government because some of the key components to be implemented are recruitment and establishment of the structure – the secretariat and the Parish Chiefs – to ensure that the structure is on.

This is the way forward. My proposal is that all Members of Parliament – this framework was even uploaded on our iPads - need to read the proposal as Cabinet works out. We cannot stop the components that need to be implemented because life must continue. Parish Chiefs have been recruited; *Emyooga* money has been given.

Mr Speaker, I would like to thank you. Following your intervention, when you sent us to the ground, we ensured that the *Emyooga* funds were released because the community had put their counterpart funds in the account. So, that is going on as well as training.

My proposal is that we give ourselves a timeframe upon which Cabinet concludes and then we also conclude and this matter is referred to a committee. If all of us have issues – because we come from different areas –

The population issue is very serious. You cannot simply put all parishes to be parishes. Part of the issues are being resolved within the framework; the issues of information systems. You cannot say, “I live in a parish in Arua Park but also come from Tororo County”. You will have been captured in the information system under the National ID System.

We have not read about all these gaps that we are raising – we need to read and understand. Where need be, we may even have a seminar so that we discuss with technical people, ask questions and the issues are answered.

In the meantime, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development should move ahead with the frameworks that need to be implemented so that we lift our people out of poverty.

3.47

**MR MUHAMMAD NSEREKO (Independent, Kampala Central Division, Kampala):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Thank you, hon. Muwanga Kivumbi for your comprehensive report on the matter.

This subject is very touching to most of us. Hon. Muwanga Kivumbi has talked about the basis of statistics and differentials all over the country. However, I would like to – because we want to give a win-win, we all want to spur development in our country.

The President talked about three key issues. He talked about the issue of industrialisation and ICT. Let me focus on the issue of ICT because this is so passionate. Africa was left behind in the first phase of the agricultural revolution. We lost the industrial revolution and we are slowly losing the technological revolution, Mr Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER:** The way you are proceeding, you are now going to a full debate.

**MR NSEREKO:** No, I simply want to give a few proposals and they will be captured by either side. I am not going into the debate. Mr Speaker –

**THE SPEAKER:** It is because we needed guidance; how do we handle this?

**MR NSEREKO:** How we handle this is that let them capture our proposals and go with them to Cabinet because we will base on their proposals to come up with the alternative; whether one was left out or not. I would like to give one, two, three proposals. I request for a short time because this is so passionate.

Thank you, Mr Speaker, and you can get out your iPads and see the statistics. In technology, Apple Inc. – the first technology company – is in fifth position. Their net earnings per annum and value are more valuable than the GDP economy of Africa.

Apple Inc. is valued at about US$ 2.3 trillion. Net output of the entire Africa per annum is US$ 2.6 trillion. There is something we are missing to capture and some of our neighbours are now moving fast on the technological front.

I heard my comrade talk about capturing data. Without data, we cannot perform anything because it is the backbone of how you will perform; it is the engine. Without knowing how many people are staying in an area, doing what job, who got what fund before, which money they used it for and what their productivity is, how can we plan for the performance of the Parish Development Model?

Which direction do we want to drive the nation into for our young people, who are a nearly 55 per cent youthful population which is about to explode in the next 10 years? What are our projections? How are we going to compete?

Just look at our neighbours. Five tech companies have moved to the close neighbourhood. Why? Someone said that now technological transactions are at four per cent income tax for companies.

What the companies do is they register in Rwanda or Malta and when they are transacting, they do it from there. Let us say a company has been bought for US$ 6 billion, they leave four per cent rather than trading in a country where they will leave a certain figure.

I know, Mr Speaker, that this is not a speech for today. Given chance, I would like to share my views with honourable members on the technological revolution. If we do not try to catch up, we are going to be left behind.

However much we invest in agriculture, the person who determines the price of coffee in the world market is not seated in Uganda. The world coffee price is determined in Dubai. The world metal exchange price is determined in London. They produce nothing; they have no gold, no copper, no cobalt.

The world is moving towards mining. The world is going for clean energy and leaving fossil fuels and that is what you have been discussing in climate change. Who have 90 per cent of the minerals that are providing the engine of the world? Every gadget we have has a battery; the cars, laptops and phones. Where do you have lithium? Where do you have lead? It is in sub-Saharan Africa. Who gets zero? Sub-Saharan Africa. How are we prioritising our gains?

Whatever model I am seeing here talks about agriculture. No, agriculture is not the only source that will help us salvage this economy. Let us move technology to the people; to the young people. Take that Parish Development Model in form of issuing laptops, low cost of data and digital literacy. We have innovative people. Move electrification.

If we do that, Mr Speaker and it is captured, we shall compete in this world. Otherwise, we shall spend money and come back with no results. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wanted your help but it looks like you are very determined to go into a debate. My question was simple; can you reflect on the question and the next person standing first deals with my question before they proceed with any other matter?

3.53

**MR JONATHAN ODUR (UPC, Erute County South, Lira):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Your question is how we should deal with this matter. I think that the rules provide some guidance, which I want to refer to. Rule 53, where this statement comes from, provides, *“The statement by the Leader of the Opposition may be debated”.*

If time permits, Mr Speaker, I persuade you to allow Members to comment on this matter because Cabinet is currently improving the original version - if I understood the minister very well - of the Parish Development Model that was brought here.

Unless the minister thinks that the debate here briefly can prejudice the discussion in Cabinet - In my opinion, I do not think so because the information by the shadow minister provides more guidance and inside information.

Given that this Parish Development Model will need to be legitimised and accepted by both sides of the House, this would be the most appropriate time that these views are actually captured there.

I thought that I should persuade you, Mr Speaker, if you can allow a few minutes. However, in the alternative – if time is not available – then the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development should commit that he will find a way of presenting the same views because these are simply ideas.

He is not forcing Government to do A or B but at the end of it all, we believe that Government has taken a look at this statement and has either ignored it or taken some provisions from it. I thank you, Mr Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much, honourable member. The rules are very clear. Rule 53(2) says, *“A statement from the Leader of the Opposition attracts a debate of one hour”.* We will use one hour to discuss this report on its own and then the final documentation comes from the Cabinet, which the honourable minister has referred to; we will have another debate.

I am not sure whether there will be another report from the Opposition. I am just trying to think of how effective this is because this is a solid document in my opinion.

We can discuss it for an hour and when the final documentation comes, we will be making reference to it. However, we will not have the time to debate it, in terms of factoring it into the core of the debate, which will be coming in with the final report. It was just a proposition of being effective and using the time effectively.

However, if it is the opinion of the Members that we have a debate on this for about an hour, I have no objection. If you want to debate, it starts now. *(Member rose\_)* No, we are debating.

3.56

**MR EPHRAIM BIRAARO (NRM, Buhweju West County, Buhweju):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I take this opportunity to thank hon. Muwanga Kivumbi for his alternative statement about the Parish Development Model. He has raised an issue that has tickled me very much - about addressing the numbers per parish. Numbers are very important because if it goes into per capita utilisation, it matters very much.

Mr Speaker, before we come to the numbers, all the parishes we have in Uganda are not at the same level. If we want equitable development and movement of our people, we should look, when the Government is distributing this money and when the minister is coming up with a statement, he should incorporate the aspect of the current status of a particular parish.

For example, if you say that each parish is given Shs100 million, but the parish without electricity, water, road or a health centre is also given the same money as the one with everything. The two parishes will never develop at the same rate because one parish is already disadvantaged.

Therefore, I am of the view that as Government comes back with a statement, they should have incorporate the aspect of the current status of each administrative unit. Thank you very much.

3.58

**MR AMOS KANKUNDA (NRM, Rwampara County, Rwampara):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity. I appreciate my friend and colleague hon. Muwanga Kivumbi, for bringing out some of these issues that, with our attention, can add value to the proposed Parish Development Model.

I agree with you that the element of the population is important and that the terrain of a particular parish is equally an issue to consider as well as the nature of our level of urbanisation.

Having said that, I agree with you that it is important for the Government to go back and reconsider. However, like in Rwampara, when we consider the Shs100 million that is proposed per parish, it should just be a starter because there are a number of issues that we may need to address.

Mr Speaker, when you look at the pillars that are proposed, these are issues that will help our people. The people are already yearning to receive, and what addresses my concerns is that we shall have a community-based information system, which can help us subsequently, to address the areas that are lacking.

When we talk of the Area Based Commodity Development (ABCD), you realize that it gives an opportunity to the different areas to address the concerns that my brother talked about in terms of giving fertilizers, the nature of the soils, the need for extension workers and all that.

However, it is important that we understand what is going to be endgame of the parish development model, for example, when you consider one of the pillars; production, processing and marketing.

As Government, we need to be ready because it will be a problem when we are able to have outputs processed - anyway, before we process them, do we have the power? We should be able to understand the extension level of electricity in our areas. Even when we are able to process, how do we market instead of ending up having an issue of not marketing the products?

Otherwise, I would like to agree that the idea of the parish development model is good but we can add value to it. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

4.01

**MS AGNES AMEEDE (NRM, Woman Representative, Butebo)**: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was part of debate on this Parish Development Model in the 10th Parliament. It was a rich debate and it touched almost everything wider than what hon. Muwanga Kivumbi has presented.

We urged Government to go very fast but yet slow. It was as a result of that debate that I think Government decided to review the procedure and framework for the Parish Development Model. I am aware that something is underway.

The problem I have is that Government seems to present a picture as if the Parish Development Model is a magic wand to solve all bottlenecks to service delivery. I therefore, ask Government to make commitments to address those bottlenecks that hon. Kivumbi has presented; that the 10th Parliament also dwelt on. Where are the commitments to make those systems work? Where are the commitments that the extension workers will stop sitting at the districts and instead be on ground?

As you present it now, it is like everything will be systematic but that is not true. The money presented will not make those systems systematic. Therefore, my appeal is for you commit to us that you are going to give the extension workers, for example, transport to move to the ground and make commitments that will be part of the first consultative process before the Parish Development Model is rolled out? Thank you.

4.04

**MR SAMUEL OPIO (Independent, Kole North County, Kole):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the Leader of Opposition on this alternative policy. In the analysis I have categorised three areas. The first is on strategy issues; do we go with the parish development model or not? I believe we are all aligned; it may be difficult to change that now.

However, the second is on the structural issues and there are two structural fundamental issues here. On the administrative structures, we have seen a lot of challenges that emerged in *Emyooga* where the Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) were left aside. The reporting structures were given to district commercial officers, the CAOs having no powers. That resulted in a lot of challenges.

The second fundamental structural issues on the financing mechanism - at the start of this model, the indications were that the funds that were under District Discretion Development Equalisation Grant were going to be transferred into the Parish Model.

I think we are not solving the problem there. We are just reallocating the resources but at the same time denying other sectors the resources. These equalisation grants were to ensure that the priority areas in the districts had funds that can be helped to address this issue. I think we need to address the financing mechanism.

Then, lastly, the operational issues; how are we going to monitor and supervise? It is very easy right now for the Auditor-General to audit 135 districts but now we have 10,000 parishes. How will accountability and supervisory mechanisms be ensured? Thank you.

4.06

**DR LULUME BAYIGGA (DP, Buikwe County South, Buikwe):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker and thank you, the Leader of the Opposition, for this statement.

Mr Speaker, just a few days ago, I was listening to the Minister of Gender, Labour and Social Development in the Committee on Budget and it appeared like the ministry was taking the lead in educating the population about the Parish Model. The distribution of the Parish Model that earmarked Shs 100 million was also stipulated to us; Shs30 million for the women, Shs 30 million for the youth, Shs 10 million for the people with disabilities and then, another Shs30 million for the men. She also went ahead to explain very many things, as the lead ministry whereby she is going to undertake to teach us about the Parish Model. This threw us into another set of confusion.

However, on the face of it, Mr Speaker, I would like to highlight some of these numbers, which are evidence that the Parish Model did not take into account the poverty levels; of course, the numbers in terms of the population and the numbers of parishes per region. For instance, the Eastern Region, with the 2021 projected population of 10.8 million and with 1.53 million households, has a total of 3,273 parishes. By simple mathematics, it will take 327 billion and more. The Western Region, with the 2021 projected population of about 10.6 million with 1.9 households, has 2,517 parishes. The same mathematics applies; 251.7 billion.

The Northern region, which is the poorest region in this country, with a 2021 projected population of 8.6 million people; 1.09 million households have 2,300 parishes, and therefore, are entitled to 230 billion.

Finally, the Central region; the 2021 projected population is 11.9 million people and 2.3 million households have only 1,701 parishes. Simple mathematics will tell you only 170. This one lends credence to the fact that population density; the number of people per parish could have been a better quarter for the distribution of these resources.

Secondly, the lack of consultative authority in the Parish Model, as it is, neglected the marketing issue, which has weakened the efforts of everybody who is trying to ensure that, especially those whose livelihood is from agriculture.

Mr Speaker, you know that in the 1970s and 1980s, when we had strong cooperative movements, marketing strategies and international communities within the region, our farmers were richer than they are today.

Marketing is left to individuals. Even at the international level, it is individuals in this country who go and look for markets. In other countries, even within this region - it is not about individuals but the country itself investing to ensure that people and farms access international markets; even within the region - the region to access those regional markets, which trickles down to the primary producer.

In Uganda, it is different. Individuals must look for these markets. We thought that the Parish Model could address this to ensure that our producers are encouraged to continue to produce, once the market access issue is solved but it is not solved by the literature of this Parish Model.

Finally, we had the strong cooperative movements in my own constituency and we still have many cooperative societies still in existence. They are registered and have never been deregistered. They had common use infrastructure, including stores for their produce. These ones were left for themselves and nothing is being talked about these cooperative societies, which are in existence. For instance, in my constituency, there were two per parish and very many in other areas.

The discretion of this Government in some areas; these cooperative societies are being sponsored to do a few things in some regions but I am yet to know what arrangements the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development has for these cooperative societies. These were the fulcrum and centres for development, standards for crops, for instance, marketing strategies but nothing is being said about them.

If there was due consultation, as a process, these cooperative societies and the owners of these cooperative societies, which had pre-existed and are now - defunct members are still there; they have their common infrastructure; they had even banks - they should have been consulted and we see how they can be recapitalised.

You cannot talk about developing coffee, marketing coffee and postharvest handling when they have good stores - and then the Parish Model is proposing as if it is new - that people will sit and develop common use infrastructure.

For instance, our sugarcane growing parishes, if they wanted to have a common use infrastructure such as a sugar mill, it will cost more than Shs 100 million, which is offered in a single year. There are no provisions within the Parish Model to ensure that three or four parishes could come together to have Shs 500 million offered in a year so that they can have a common use infrastructure such as a sugar mill. If at all those kinds of bottlenecks are not addressed, then this money is going to end up like any other fund that has been provided before, including the *Emyooga*. Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much. I have seen Members from both Lower and Upper Madi. I will start with the Member from Lower Madi and then I will come to the Upper later.

4.14

**MR RONALD AFIDRA (NRM, Lower Madi County, Madi-Okollo):**  Thank you, Mr Speaker, for giving Lower Madi an opportunity to make a contribution to this debate. I would like to thank hon. Kivumbi for bringing the alternative perspective of how Government is implementing the Parish Development Model.

Honourable members, the ultimate purpose of this Parish Development Model - when I read it and when the President presented it to us - was for wealth creation and employment. These two key issues are the things that are affecting this country. The wealth disparity within this country is quite high, hence, the poverty that we are seeing in this country.

From the record, it is known that there are some particular regions in this country –

**THE SPEAKER**: Hold on, honourable. Proceed

**MR AFIDRA:** There is darkness in Lower Madi; indeed, my constituency does not have power. *(Laughter)*

**THE SPEAKER:** Are they trying to remind you? *(Laughter)*

**MR AFIDRA:** Back to the issue, the disparity in poverty in this country cannot only be addressed through the Parish Development Model. The Government has other interventions to address this and they are evidently being done by this Government.

I want to agree with hon. Kivumbi that the Shs 100 million that has been proposed is not enough, even to the perceived small parish that wants to address the seven key pillars of development.

Therefore, Mr Speaker, I can further argue and say that the Government should be able to do a cost-benefit analysis or research into each of these parishes; how much is equitably sufficient for all the parishes in this country to be brought to the same level of wealth creation and employment or whether the Shs 100 million is enough or not? I would say that Shs 100 million is not enough. The Government needs to increase that money.

The final one is on the integrated development approach being proposed by hon. Kivumbi. Mr Speaker, those four issues in the proposal, in my view, are good information to the Government to further take because they address the key pillars in the Parish Development Model. Therefore, it is going to take time for the Government to integrate this, for instance, re-establishing the Cooperative Bank. How did this collapse in this country? Some of us know our parents went to school through accessing finances through these cooperative unions. Now, these do not exist.

However, these are policy issues. I agree with them that the Government, in future or in the near future, can be able to accept some of these.

As, I conclude, the Parish Development Model is not a replica of some of the initiatives that the Government had made before. I say it is not a replica because the previous models did not anchor on the seven pillars being proposed by the Government *-(Interruption)*

**MR OLANYA:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to thank my colleague for raising a very important point. The information I would like to provide is that the Government needs to look at the districts or parishes, case by case.

If you look at it critically and compare my district, Amuru, with Gulu City, our needs may not be money. For us, we need farm implements. Instead of giving us money, where not everyone will benefit, the Government should plan and provide tractors to my parishes. This is far much better than the money they are advocating for. If the Government follows what we are saying by looking at these parishes case by case, the money would develop our people and automatically wealth would be created in our area. Thank you.

**MR AFIDRA:** Thank you for the information. The Parish Development Model and the choice of interventions are dependent on each of the parishes to take not really an implementation pushed by the Government. Therefore, those decisions are to be implemented by each parish depending on their need; the money is just a blanket offer. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER**: Thank you very much. Honourable members, the honourable member for Kilak rose on a point of information and started his information by using the word “if”. The information I would like to give you is, “if the Government…” That is not information; that is a full debate and his entire submission did not have information but a debate. So, next time, if you want to have a debate, rise like other Members and have a debate; it is more orderly. Can I now have Butambala?

4.21

**MS AISHA KABANDA (NUP, Woman Representative, Butambala):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Much appreciation to my Member of Parliament *–(Interruption)-*

**THE SPEAKER:** Point of procedure?

**MS OPENDI:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. You will note that a number of people are standing up wanting to contribute and you allocated only one hour to this debate.

**THE SPEAKER:** No, the rules did, not me.

**MS OPENDI:** Yes, as per the rules – I was still speaking. Mr Speaker, you have not allocated time. Therefore, we may have just a few people speaking on this matter. Would it not be procedurally right for you to allocate some limited time so that people can speak within a limited time and only focus on the relevant issues as they make their submissions? Otherwise, we may have just five people and the one hour is done. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER:** You know, honourable members, there are thematic debates that we usually have difficulties limiting Members’ time to speak because it takes quite some time to make a comment on a matter like the Parish Development Model. I think we would rather use fewer people than everyone speaking for a short time without making a point. *(Applause)* I think we are proceeding well for now and that is why I was reluctant to accept your procedural point. *(Laughter)*

**MS AISHA KABANDA:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the wise ruling. We know, as per the policy, that the Parish Development Model is for production, processing and marketing. Processing is about value addition. In addition, we know that for years, the Government has been singing about value addition. Actually, the last three manifestos of the NRM have been talking about value addition. One wonders why this value addition has not actually trickled down; people produce but whatever they produce, they sell in raw form.

I come from a district that grows ginger. Unfortunately, the Kenyans come all the way from Kenya to Butambala to buy ginger in its raw form from the farms. So, one wonders what has gone wrong.

Other than the “Parish Development Model for production, processing and marketing” being a song, what are we doing this time differently to make sure that when we say there will be processing, actually processing will take place and we sell finished products other than the raw-form products?

We have talked about zoning and enterprise selection for a long time. I do not know any Member who knows that in his constituency, these particular enterprises were selected and they are moving on well.

Therefore, despite these things having been very good, and we have been singing about them everywhere in the media, they have actually not been actualised. For example, the four-acre plan – that is when I support the Member of Parliament who says that it should be case by case. In my constituency, you would not find 80 per cent of the people holding four acres. Actually, the majority of my people hold half an acre.

In such a constituency, you need a completely different approach to help the people.

I thank hon. Muwanga Kivumbi for bringing in terms that we last heard a while back. When I was studying economics, I was told about buffer stocks and stabilisation funds. They told us that we could not understand those terms well because they were for the developed world and that they have not worked here, 30 years down the road.

When maize prices went very low, the Ministry of Trade and Industry came up with a Shs 500 price per kilogramme at least. That meant they saw a reason for Government to come in and help our people. However, it stopped there as if we are only here to fire brigade. What did we learn from that time? Didn’t we learn that sometimes we need to help farmers on prices? Prices have actually killed morale of our people in production. This season, prices are high and the next season they are very low and they fall off.

About soils losing fertility, hon. Muwanga Kivumbi is proposing that we should have a factory for fertilizer production. However, we should also remind ourselves of the fact that we have a full government department supposed to help us study our soils; NARO. They are supposed to inform us what is lacking in the soils so that we can input it.

Tell me any of our constituencies where they have actually studied soils and have advised us on what is lacking for the people to know what fertilisers to put. Instead our people go to the market and simply buy whatever they have been told to buy and plant it. Sometimes they actually over supply what is already in the soils.

We may probably need to decentralise the services of NARO to the districts for them to study the soils and give our people informed decisions.

As I conclude, we need to protect the farmers from the thuggery by people who are producing counterfeits; we need to help them. I do not know why it is so difficult. Everyone knows that there are counterfeits at container village. Everyone knows this but no one is bothered. People now and then buy counterfeits and fake drugs and animals and/or crops are affected. The ticks become resistant. I have heard the President complaining about ticks becoming resistant.

So, as long as we have not found solutions to those problems, we will sing about the parish model like many others but it will not help.

Finally, let me say something about access to credit facilities. We have put a lot of money in the Uganda Development Bank. However, I should inform this House that it is close to impossible for our ordinary people to access money from that Uganda Development Bank; it is very difficult. They say that they are not there to start up organisations so even when you put there money for agriculture to help our people, those people cannot actually access it. They end up going to commercial banks, which are very expensive. The interest rates are really high. When it becomes difficult to pay back - you know farming is seasonal - finally they go to money lenders.

At the end of it all, we provide facilities that help people who are well off while the have-nots end up having nothing and the little they have is taken away by the business people. Can Government step in to protect the ordinary people by offering stores close to the people to work with the people not to expose them to profit makers? I beg to submit.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much. Honourable members, the debate is on the statement by the Leader of the Opposition on the alternative development approach to the Parish Development Model. However, we are debating the Parish Development Model generally without focusing on what we are here for.

Hon. Aisha kabanda was kind enough to refer at least once to the submission of the Leader of the Opposition. Are we going to debate the statement of the LOP or just talk about the Parish Development Model generally? I am saying this because that debate can have another day.

4.29

**MR FRANCIS KATABAAZI (NUP, Kalungu East County, Kalungu):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to thank the LOP, represented by hon. Muwanga Kivumbi, for the wonderful statement he has brought up.

I would like to report that in my constituency, we have 52,000 voters and 17 parishes. My friend, hon. Wakholi in Butiru, Manafwa District has the same number of people but with 91 parishes. That means that if you multiply that by Shs 100 million, Kalungu East will get Shs 1.7 billion but my brother in Butiru – there are even parishes that have 126 people - will get Shs 9.1 billion. We have the same number of people.

As I am crying foul, we have another parish called Masajja here in Wakiso that has 60,000 people but they will also receive Shs 100 million.

So, I really find that approach of the parish model – like hon. Muwanga Kivumbi said, we should say that a certain number of people should be considered for the Shs 100 million and not necessarily a parish.

Leaving that and giving a solution, I had the chance of studying in a seminary. I wanted to be a priest but I was there for two years and three days. *(Laughter)*

**THE SPEAKER:** What happened?

**MR KATABAAZI:** I was advised –*(Laughter)*– but there is one thing I learnt from the seminary; a bit of Latin. There is a word called *Caput*, which means the head. It also means capital. So when you say capital city, it is the head city. For someone to give you capital, you must have an idea of how to multiply money.

We are having a problem of ideas being moving from up to down instead of people down generating ideas and sending them to our bosses to formulate the right recipes.

I happen to have studied a bit of micro finance and I know that cooperatives are the best way of succeeding because you cooperate when you already know each other. In fact, it brings out the idea of a team. A team is a group of people but not all groups of people are teams. In Uganda, we have so many groups of people that are not teams. That is why success is limited, mostly with *Emyooga* and all these other programmes that have been started.

Coming to an idea, which can bring us back, hon. Muwanga Kivumbi talked about restoring cooperative banks, I want to say that you cannot restore cooperative banks without cooperatives. That means we should first work hard to revamp cooperatives right from the villages; the grassroots where people who rear goats, rabbits and pigs can cooperate and where those who grow coffee cooperate because they know each other. That way, they can borrow to do something they already know because they have an idea in how to multiply this money. As I told you, the best capital is an idea.

I really have a strong feeling that if we restore those cooperatives that were there before: The Bugisu Cooperatives Union, Masaka Cooperative Union, Mengo East Cooperative Union, and all those others, we shall be on the right track because you are dealing with people who know each other and they are in the same vicinity.

In fact, if some of you have not joined the Parliamentary SACCO, you are missing out a lot. It is very important because as Members of Parliament – Let me give you an example. You see, cooperation helps. When you are a team, you can do greater things. If all Members of Parliament were saving Shs 2 million, that would be a billion plus. That means we can buy a plot of land on Kampala Road every month. At the end of the 60 months, we would have 60 plots of land. We would get big money –*(Interjections)* You see, God gave you two ears and one mouth. So, it is good to listen. *(Interruption)*

**MR SSERUKENYA:** Thank you. You talked of Masajja, which is my parish. The information is that we do not have 60,000 people in Masajja. We have 150,000 people. Therefore, Ssabagabo has 500,000 people. That is the information I want to give you. However, to add something, if this programme will work –

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable member, you have started your statement with the word, “if”.

**MR KATABAAZI:** Okay. Thank you. Now, I did not mean all the people in Masajja –

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable member, when we allow time for people to speak freely, you have to be conscious of other Members as well. We have to share the time.

**MR KATABAAZI:** I beg to submit.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you. Can I have the Member for Gulu City?

4.38

**MS BETTY AOL (FDC, Woman Representative, Gulu City):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for this intervention. If we went by the excitement about the Parish Development Model in the 10th Parliament, I think by today, everybody would be okay. However, to date, even some of the subcounties are not yet operational because of lack of funds. Where are we going to get enough money to fund the Parish Development Model with its seven pillars? Some of the pillars are okay. I did a bit of development work and going to the parish level is the best place to start on things like budget conference. When we talk about the budget conference, we start from the parish level so that the ideas come to the top. However, the idea of the Parish Development Model came from the top and it is going down. It looks like it is not going to be sustainable.

At the same time, you remember that we were to have health centres II in all the parishes in Uganda as required by the policy that all the parishes of Uganda should have health centres II. Later on, it was found not to be very practicable. The policy was not working. So, there was a resolution that the health centres II that were operational should be upgraded to health centres III and operate at the subcounty level.

Now, we are talking of parishes. It is good to recruit the parish chiefs but they should do the work the parish chiefs used to do instead of thinking that everything should now go to the parishes.

I want to tell you one thing about the cooperatives. Even when we should think about the cooperatives; for a cooperative in Palaro to register, they have to spend much and have to send their documents to Kampala. We should think about decentralising those kinds of services instead of people coming up to Kampala to register their cooperatives. Cooperatives would be better than the Parish Development Model. The model is good but let the technical people help us.

I also would like to say that we are still a Third World Country; We cannot ignore agriculture because it is still basic. Right now, the agricultural work we do, even those ones that are said to be commercialised are still subsistence. The field may be big; 20 or 100 acres but you will find that the labourers would still go to do subsistence and not so much mechanised agriculture.

The technical people should help us better. Our people are not being helped. We need agricultural extension workers instead of the excitement about the Parish Development Model. The model is very good but let us have the people who work at the parish level not to think that the Parish Development Model should become an administrative unit because the parish is already an administrative unit. It is as if the parish is the lowest level of Government. It cannot be the lowest level of Government. We still have subcounties and they are not facilitated.

Those parishes and villages should be financed. They are not being financed at all. We say 25 per cent of what is collected at subcounty level should go to villages and 10 per cent should go to parishes. All those are not happening. Instead of focusing on those things that have gaps, we are now thinking of only new things. These new things are not taking us anywhere. *Emyooga* is not taking us anywhere. Members, I just would like to tell you that *Emyooga* is a big frustration and disappointment. If you are at home - if you go to the villages, you will know that *Emyooga* is not working for us. *(Member timed out.)*

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you. Honourable members, let us share the time. I do not want to impose timelines but I want us to be responsible in using the time. For that reason, I am going to have Upper Madi County, Napak, Pakwach and Bukonzo County West.

4.44

**MR ISAAC ETUKA (NRM, Upper Madi County, Madi-Okollo):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, for this opportunity. I thank the Leader of the Opposition and hon. Muwanga Kivumbi for the alternative statement on the Parish Development Model.

A lot has been talked about the Parish Development Model. The Members here will bear with me that in this Government and previous Governments, if all the poverty eradication interventions had been properly managed, by now, we would be nearing middle income status –*(Interruption)*

**THE SPEAKER:** Proceed.

**MR ETUKA:** Mr Speaker, we would not see the level of poverty in this country because when you look at the funds we have got from PRDP, NAADS I and NAADS II; if all those other poverty eradication interventions were properly managed, by now, we would be somewhere.

We are now here debating the Parish Development Model whose main aim, among others, is to ensure balanced development in this country. Government has been aware about the population in various parts of this country.

However, we must be aware that in other countries like China, the U.S and others, people are instead rewarding less populated areas and families, so that the population can be controlled. Here, for us to say that we want to base it on population per parish is absolutely wrong and I will not accept that.

When you look at the purpose of the Parish Development Model, it is to bring equal development. Therefore, the parishes which already exist and those that may be created will simply be considered as parishes and then we see what to do in those.

Hon. Kivumbi talked about establishing an agricultural bank. At one point in this country, we had sub-county SACCOs. In fact, some of the sub-county SACCOs have now developed into village banks. I have one in my sub-county.

As we go for this Parish Development Model, we should empower the sub-county SACCOs, so that people can easily walk and have free interactions because we know the bureaucracies in the banks. Therefore, people may not be very comfortable. So, as we look into this model, the issue of strengthening the sub-county SACCOs should be highly considered.

Mr Speaker, one of the reasons many of our enterprises in the poverty eradication interventions fail is lack of capacity building. We organise many workshops elsewhere in the cities, towns and what-have-you but we do not build capacity of those who are supposed to be the beneficiaries.

In fact, one challenge has been that those who are supposed to benefit are denied the opportunity by the administrative structures by those who are there. The funds do not reach the real beneficiaries and that is why many people have remained poor.

Because their capacity is not well built, people go there with set minds. An honourable colleague talked about the bottom-top approach, which should really be impressed because many of our sub-county chiefs and officers go to these people with decisions already taken for the beneficiaries. Therefore, they are supposed to choose between what they cannot really manage.

So, the issue of capacity building should be taken very seriously.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much.

**MR ETUKA:** Hon. Kivumbi, lastly, as I conclude –

**THE SPEAKER:** No, no. no! Thank you very much. Let us share the time. If you are not going to share the time, I will force you to share it.

4.49

**MS FAITH NAKUT (NRM, Woman Representative, Napak)**: Mr Speaker, while the idea of population put across by hon. Kivumbi seems to be attractive and convincing, I recommend that we do not look at it in isolation. Some parishes in this country are very far away; they cannot be accessed.

If you go where the Ik people live, they are few but for you to access one person is a real challenge. You will have to climb mountains. It is the same for the Tepeth. You go to Buvuma Islands; you have to hire a boat to move from one parish to another.

So, if we are reasoning in terms of the cost of transporting these inputs or the cost of access to agricultural inputs, it means the people in those parishes who are fewer will incur 10 times more to access the inputs that the people in the city will pay.

If we look at population in isolation, we will miss the point and then make those other people who are not gifted, by virtue of being in that location suffer on behalf of those who are in town because we are near the production area of agricultural inputs. We are near the shops because we are many, so we take advantage of those few in the islands and on the hills of Mount Moroto. We take advantage of them and they suffer. That is my view that we do not take the population in isolation.

On population again, some of the statistics that are given by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics and that we use now for allocating budgets are not credible. I will give you an example.

We have three parishes in Napak. They were not counted in the last census. Their estimate is not included in the budgeting cycle. Another district receives a grant on their behalf. Now, when we bring this money of the Parish Development Model, where will those parishes receive their allocation from?

It means they will be floating; they will be left out in the planning process, just like the way they are left out now –*(Interjection)*– I will give you information, then I come back to conclude –*(Interjections)* – It is the same; he is giving me information –*(Interruption)*

**MR KINTU:** Thank you, my sister. Thank you, Mr Speaker. Since it is information, I have the pleasure to inform you. My sister is talking about parishes. There is one critical thing we are forgetting when she talks about other places left out.

Mr Speaker, we have a programme called, “Parish Community Association”, which was basically for different regions, like for Busoga and Rwenzori regions. This programme has only been given Shs 30 million per parish.

So, when we talk about exclusion, as Government, we should be mindful that much as we are emphasising on these other programmes, have we made a follow-up on what these other programmes like the Parish Community Association has done? Thank you.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much.

**MS NAKUT:** Mr Speaker, the second –

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you, Member for Napak.

4.53

**DR TIMOTHY BATUWA (Jinja South Division West, Jinja City):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I should say that Government has always, in many cases, come up with very good interventions that are very convincing on paper and it has only fallen short of backing them up with very good systems and structures.

I get this from the *Emyooga* Programme that I was privy to, being a Member of Parliament. The programme targeted vulnerable people, those without security or collateral that would have otherwise accessed money through the existing structures like the microfinance institutions or banks.

However, when *Emyooga* was rolled out, these targeted people did not receive that money. It is at this point that I see the intervention hon. Muwanga Kivumbi is proposing to come up with an agricultural bank or cooperative bank, as a very good structure and system to back up a very good Government programme of the Parish Development Model.

So, if we come up with a bank, firstly, we can target the population. The bank will only release money to the people that the Government intended to give it to.

Hon. Muwanga Kivumbi cited issues of recovery of this money that is lent out. The bank will be able to follow up on this money. It can make a presence in many of these subcounties. Ideally, banks are in urban areas and these people are challenged to get to banks.

However, when we come up with an agricultural bank, we can ensure it making a presence in these areas. When we were going in for *Emyooga*, we discovered that the existing human resource structure was the one being used to drive it. You would find the RDC, the Uganda Microfinance Support Centre and some of the staff at the local governments – who have their normal duties – being tasked, over and above their normal duties, to implement the *Emyooga* programme too.

Therefore, how much time was given for the supervision of *Emyooga*? Now, if we bring all this into a bank, that very good intervention will be successful.

Last but not least, I would like to speak to an aspect that the Government has neglected over time. I, together with some people, have interacted with and done farming but we have lost the money that we invested in there. This is because the cost of farming is very high.

When I talked to some farmers in Amuru, they told me that to do maize farming, one should sell a kilogramme at, at least Shs 730. Many times in many places, a kilogramme of maize goes for between Shs 500 and 600, other than this time round when we have scarcity.

Therefore, the cost of doing business is so high and neglected in many sectors of farming such as mechanisation. I was reading a report here – because in Parliament you have to be evidence-based. There is a research that was done by a university in Nigeria on how much a tractor would cost to plough. When you read its findings, you realise that it takes about 16 litres of diesel per hectare to plough at an optimum speed, depth and all that.

Here in Uganda, they will charge you Shs 150,000 per acre, yet here we are talking of a hectare, which is two acres, meaning that the cost of fuel to plough an acre is about eight litres of diesel, which should be about Shs 24,000 but farmers are charged Shs 150,000. Therefore, at the end of the day, they will not save anything.

Now these chemical inputs –

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**DR BATUWA:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

4.57

**MS JANE AVUR (NRM, Woman Representative, Pakwach):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to thank hon. Muwanga Kivumbi for the report. I equally would like to thank the minister for informing this House today that his ministry or Government is trying to review. That means the ideas coming out in this debate will still have room to be included in this Parish Development Model structure.

Mr Speaker, I would like to thank hon. Kivumbi for identifying the fact that we have had several interventions to pull the people of Uganda out of poverty but there is still a lot to be done. One of such gaps that he identified lead to the fact that Ugandans take a lot of this money that the Government has been giving out as mere token.

However, again, I would like to thank the Government that this time round, among the seven pillars, there is a component of the mindset change. I would like to address my mind to exactly that. If our minds were set or upright, given all these interventions, we would be far as a country.

Mr Speaker, I know that you frequently go to Omoro, your district and you see for yourself how, especially, the youth of this country do not like to work. Unless the ministries of finance or local government come in handy to deliver on the modules they have set to turn around the minds of Ugandans, we are still going to repeat the same mistakes.

Therefore, as we start thinking of disbursing the Shs 100 billion to each parish, I would like to persuade this House that we start with - it should have actually started and it should be continuous – creating awareness or training. I do not know what that module is but we should all be change agents in this. Otherwise, we are simply going to waste resources.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much.

5.00

**MR ATKINS KATUSABE (FDC, Bukonzo County West, Kasese):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I join the rest to welcome you back to your deserved seat. As national leaders, we all owe it to our fellow citizens that we represent but I think we have let them down for way too long. The problem with Government is that they want to shoot and aim later.

Research and development are like twin sisters; one precedes the other. Now, if I was talking to my community in Kasese, research would be Nyangoma, a female first born twin and development would be Nyakato and that is what we have right here in Buganda and elsewhere. And so, there is no way you can isolate research from development.

If you want to make a lot of progress, you have to ensure your interventions are evidence or science-based or driven. The problem we have with Government is that they come up with interventions that are not well thought out or guided by research and evidence.

Mr Speaker, I do not know how long this country is going to move without giving attention to universities. Universities, globally, are knowledge generators. However, it is extremely unfortunate that a lot of research that is undertaken in universities is lying on university shelves gathering dust, yet the Government is supposed to be the largest consumer of such research.

Mr Speaker, my Leader of Opposition, in his eloquent and distinguished presentation, mentioned something to do with soil fertility. Now, soil fertility comes about as a result of trying to restore – what they call soil restoration.

Makerere University has a fully-fledged research programme, thanks to the Swedish Government; it is called SIDA-SAREC, headed and coordinated by the current Vice-Chancellor of Makerere University in the whole of Africa. The Swedish Government found it not only in Makerere University but in Africa as a continent.

That particular programme was ranked No.1. Why? It is because it trained over 120 PhDs in soil fertility and soil conservation yet here we are as a country, stuck.

Mr Speaker, it is not about lamentation. I would like to be a part of solution givers or providers. It is not going to be enough for us to focus on agriculture if we cannot focus on industrialisation. I would rather that this parish model also ropes in the industrialisation element. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much, honourable. Honourable members, we have exceeded the one hour allowed by the rules of procedure though the debate has been very enriching. When the Speaker is speaking normally, Members *–(Laughter)–* but it looks like this is a very abnormal situation this afternoon.

You can see that we have spent over an hour already but I wanted to allow four people to speak and I already have them. You do not have to stand. I will have the honourable Member for Bukomansimbi, Member for Aringa, Member for Kassanda and Member for Bulamogi. Please, start and let us use the time properly.

5.05

**MS VERONICA NANYONDO (NUP, Woman Representative, Bukomansimbi):** Thank you, Mr Speaker and thank you, Leader of the Opposition, for the statement. We appreciate that the Parish Development Model, if considered very well, will bring great importance and will be of greater development to our society. However, before implementing it, we have to be prepared on both sides; the implementers and the beneficiaries.

As leaders, the parish chiefs and other local leaders together with the community, have to engage in different meetings so that the programme comes when people have knowledge of what is really going to take place.

Secondly, Mr Speaker, I suggest that while implementing the Parish Development Model, we think of tangible things that will benefit our parishes; not only for the current generation but for generations to come. For example, the *Emyooga* issue benefited only people that formed the groups. There is no impact left behind among the people that benefited from *Emyooga*.

If we plan well and prepare the Parish Model and think of the tangible things that will remain in our parishes as well as the next generation, this Parish Model will be of great importance to the community and I will support it. *(Interjections)* I will take information from the honourable Member of Wakiso. Thank you very much.

**MS NALUYIMA:** Thank you very much for giving way. Mr Speaker, this is Naluyima from Wakiso as well as the shadow Minister of Local Government.

The matter I wish to bring to this House and to inform her is that when we talk about the Parish Development Model, it is the same incident we incurred in *Emyooga.* It is something under governance; pillar number six. We really have to master and take keen note of this.

Under the Public Service and Local Government Committee, we have already asked the line minister to bring the implementation and the status of this Parish Development Model.

However, I would like to inform you, honourable members, that it is high time we looked at decentralisation *vis-a-vis* the Parish Development Model. The CAOs, local government leaders and the political heads are already complaining. They are being forced to ensure that chiefs are there but we have not yet allocated supervision funds for this model. This is a matter we have to follow keenly to ensure that the Parish Model does not fail like it was observed with *Emyooga*. Thank you very much.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable, thank you very much, honourable Member for Bukomansimbi.

5.08

**MR PATRICK NSAMBA (NUP, Kassanda County North, Kassanda):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I will begin by thanking Government for thinking about the parish as the planning space for the development of the country. However, the Parish Model should never have been a programme. It should have been a policy where you direct all your programmes. It should have come as a directive; that all your programmes must be planned and implemented at the parish level.

The problems we are talking about here emanate from the failure to make a policy. Instead, we went for a programme. We have 10,595 parishes, according to the Electoral Commission. If you divide the Shs 180 billion, you only have about Shs 17 million for each parish and here, we are promising the people that we are coming with the Parish Model and that every parish is going to get Shs 100 million.

When they were implementing the *Emyooga* programme, people registered associations and groups at every parish. I remember in Kassanda North, over 4,000 groups were formed. People spent money pulling together these groups and at the end of the day, only 18 groups got the money out of the 4,000. Therefore, this comes because of the problem.

Mr Speaker, I would like to thank hon. Muwanga Kivumbi for the proposal to have farmers get credit facilities. Some 71 per cent of our economy is dependent on agriculture. What we need are not hand-outs. I am a farmer. If we avail credit to the farmers, we will have provided a solution. *(Hon. Gorreth Namugga rose\_)* Oh my God, my sister needs information. Okay, fine, let me give you the time.

**MS NAMUGGA:** Thank you, hon. Oshabe, for giving way and thank you, Mr Speaker. The information I am giving to my colleague is that indeed, the Parish Model is not a programme but it would have been a policy because I doubt whether all the factors of production were ably considered. If you look at the factors of land, capital and labour, they were not handled comprehensively, when you look at the way the Parish Model was laid down. When you currently look at issues of land, if I mentioned Buganda Region, land has been split all over and many people no longer have an equivalent of an acre.

When you look at capital and it gets back to giving Shs 100 million, people cannot get sufficient capital to pull economic development, as alleged by the Parish Model.

Therefore, my colleague, I would like to inform you that as much as we support the Parish Model and it has to go on, it will not achieve socio-economic development and people will not come out of poverty, as alleged. Thank you.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much. Can I now have the Member for Aringa?

5.12

**MR GODFREY ONZIMA (NRM, Aringa North County, Yumbe):** Thank you very much. Mr Speaker, I represent Aringa North although most times, you refer to me as Aringa. I put that for the record.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity. I have listened to hon. Muwanga and I also thoroughly read his alternative report from the Opposition. It has 10 points; five of them are what they refer to as “the bottlenecks” and then, the other five consist of their alternative views.

When I put these points to contrast with the Parish Development Model, they seem misunderstood. His views seem to misunderstand the Parish Development Model because I have listened to the debates several times.

My understanding of the Parish Development Model was to do with how we tackle rural poverty. How do we mobilise the rural people who are out of the money economy into the money economy? At the same time, how do we increase accessibility of the local people to the existing Government programmes? These include, Youth Livelihood and Women Fund.

Initially, if youth were supposed to access this money; they would do so at the sub-county level. That therefore meant the number of people who accessed this money would be few. Therefore, Government decided to take this programme to the parish such that people can have more accessibility.

When I listen to colleagues, there seems to be a lot of misunderstanding of the Parish Development Model. When you look at the points advanced by hon. Muwanga - how will a factory for fertilisers mobilise the poor people? It can benefit people by boosting agriculture but the initial element is the element of mobilisation.

On the issue of programmes that had failed; most developed countries are struggling to see how they can catch up with the development. It is just like walking on a slippery ground. Once you fall, you can organise yourself and get up. The Parish Development Model is one of the ways of trying to get up and see how we can still move forward in a better way.

So, I do not agree with the assertion that because other programmes failed, therefore, this will fail as well. When you look at Operation Wealth Creation, many times, when we used to move to sub-counties, you would find a number of items abandoned there, very far from the villages and parishes so the few people who went to the sub-counties ended up picking them.

However, majority of the people in the villages could not access them. If these items were taken to parishes; at least in every parish, there is a trading centre, people will be able to access these things and pick them.

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

5.16

**MR SANON BWIRE (NRM, Bulamogi County, Kaliro):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have been in Local Government for 10 years as a district council Speaker. For many times, planning has been happening in Kampala, not considering the rural people in the villages.

When I looked at the Parish Development Model, as proposed by Government, I really saw an answer to the overwhelming outcries of the people in the villages. I thank hon. Kivumbi for proposing the alternative development approach. However, Members, Uganda is hardly 60 years old. This approach can work best for countries which are 300-and-something-years old. We are just the beginning. A rural woman in my village of Kajanabulwaire, can easily access money at a parish which is hardly two kilometres away from her home.

If you propose that we get money from Microfinance Support Centre, Women Entrepreneurship Programme; Shs 400 billion something and establish a cooperative bank and capitalise it with Shs 682 billion, I am telling you, you are risking the country into all kinds of bureaucracy.

How will a rural woman; my mother a graduate of primary two access money at a co-operative bank? I think it was very wise. If you do not know the stories happening to commercial banks - because they also have these facilities for example, agriculture programmes, but they asked for collateral. They even bring in so many conditionalities which make these rural people unable to access these facilities.

However, a SACCO at a parish capitalised by Government with Shs 100 million; this rural woman will come and borrow Shs 100,000 to buy seedlings of tomatoes, goes and cultivates, sells her tomatoes, after 100 days, she has brought back the money and another person who will take that money.

Mr Speaker –*(Interjection)*– you wait, my senior. I think that information is coming from a wrong angle.

I do not want to over dwell on this matter.

I would want to encourage the Leader of the Opposition to exhaustively read the Parish Development Model and internalise it; you will see that all the answers are contained in there and all the worries are addressed there. Why? (*Hon. Katusabe rose\_*)

**THE SPEAKER:**  You are already on the microphone before I have allowed you.

**MR BWIIRE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker for the protection. When we plan basing on population; that because this parish has 200,000 people and another parish has 50,000 people, therefore, this one with more people should be given more money. I want to tell you that there are situations when people are few, but they are poorer than the ones who are even many. *(Applause)* Therefore, I want to encourage Members that we agree and go by the Parish Development Model as proposed by Government, I beg submit.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much. Is there any response? Honourable members, we have done it; it is one and half-hours instead of an hour. I do not know if the Minister would want to give any comment on this matter.

5.21

**THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR FINANCE, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (GENERAL DUTIES) (Mr Henry Musasizi):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to allow hon. Rwamirama, the Minister of Agriculture to make a comment.

**THE SPEAKER:** Yes, Honourable, minister.

5.21

**THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR AGRICULTURE, ANIMAL INDUSTRY AND FISHERIES (ANIMAL INDUSTRY) (Lt Col (Rtd) Bright Rwamirama):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I want to thank my brother, hon. Muwanga Kivumbi for the ideas and generating this preemptive debate on the parish development model.

We are we are broken into sector working groups and we are taking care of all the issues raised by different stakeholders including the ministries implementing different pillars.

I would like to respond specifically on very few interesting points that were raised here. The first one was from hon. Afidra Olema Arnold. “Do not consider a parish to be at the same level of need and intervention”; this is correct.

Government has already identified this problem and we are looking at a Parish Development Model depending on the setup and the enterprise mix of the communities specifically urban areas.

We cannot assume that every parish - you cannot consider an urban parish at the same level with a rural parish. We shall come out with different prescribed remedies.

Number two is enterprise selection. This will be guided by science, but the real selection will be by the farmers. What do I mean? We have done soil suitability tests and we have simple science of measuring soil suitability at any point in the country using simple gadgets which can be operated by every extension worker. We can say that the soil composition here is suitable for enterprise A, B, C or D and we make a recommendation. Then the group will decide which one to go.

Hon. Muhammad Nsereko raised a very important point. He said that not only agriculture is going to transform our communities from poverty, to middle income status. Absolutely correct because even ICT innovation is required. That is why, as I said, in the urban settings, this is a serious consideration. And I think we are taking it up.

There is a Member, whose name I do not know yet, who said that she is concerned about soil suitability. I would like to assure the Members that we have advanced; we have done soil suitability in most parts of the country. We have science. At any point, we shall be able to guide the farmers on which enterprise is suitable for a particular area.

Mr Speaker, we shall have a comprehensive report presented by the lead ministry, which is local government, and I am happy that I have registered and attended this debate, because most of the issues are very interesting. Thank you.

**MR NANDALA-MAFABI:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I would like to also thank the Minister, hon. Lt Col Bright Rwamirama, for giving way.

Again, from a historical background, I happen to have served under hon. Lt Col Bright Rwamirama, when he was the chairperson of the finance committee, and the current minister of state.

The clarification I would like to seek from you is: our recommendations have always been – you remember when they sold the Uganda Commercial Bank, you led a team to fight it that it should not go? I think now you have kept quiet. But our recommendation has always been the re-establishment of the cooperative bank. What is your comment on that? I am asking this because it has been raised here.

**LT COL (RTD) RWAMIRAMA:** Thank you, hon. Nandala-Mafabi.  Yes, I led a team and I still believe that we were not wrong.

However, I would like to tell Members that at that time, the thinking was different. Now we have realised –*(Laughter)-* yes, when privatisation was taking place, many people thought it was going to solve problems. But equally, the Government has changed. And in this parish model, we are supporting cooperatives. I would like to assure the hon. Nandala-Mafabi that I will be one of those – I am first of all a farmer - who will support cooperatives, both in Government and outside it.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you very much, honourable members - he is not still holding the Floor to accept your clarification.

**LT COL (RTD) RWAMIRAMA:** Mr Speaker, is it in order for a Member not to put on a mask?

**THE SPEAKER:** This is the part that I do not appreciate very much; a debate without a decision. But the structure of the debate was premised on the response from the Leader of Opposition. And that is how the debate has gone. Brilliant ideas came up and we will see how to factor this in.

But honourable members, we must insist that there must be clarity on the mandate – who is going to do what; clarity on the issue of use of discretionary powers and in case of abuse, sanctions to the persons who are concerned.

We already had the parish development committees in the law. It has been a planning unit for local government. I hope we know that there parish development committees headed by the parish chiefs.

These things have been going on. Every year, the parish development committees were supposed to sit and generate 20 priority projects to be financed in the next financial year. They do this and it goes through to the local governments at the LC III, then it goes to the district and then it comes here.

However, when you go to follow up on the recommendations that have come from each parish, you find that they have been largely ignored.

Now we are using the failures of the parish development committees to reactivate it and give it more clarity and strength to do what they should have done initially by the original idea. I think we need to be clear when the ministers come here; we need to be clear on the fact that we do not need guidelines this time. Guidelines have misguided people. People have amended them as they pleased.

We need something that we will put in the Gazette to show the clarity on what is going to be done, so that everybody knows; whether that person is in Omoro, Isingiro, Rubanda or Bukomansimbi. That person should know it the same way the other persons from the other side or region know it; with clarity on how they should implement this project.

The *Emyooga* suffered this problem, because people interpreted – starting from the name - different pronunciations led to different interpretations, which led to different actions.

And when the investigations were done by you Members, you saw what had happened. It was all because there was no clarity and proper guidance.

That is why I like the British; they have a law for everything. If they are going to do a new road, which is a major project, they will pass a law under that road. So that there is clarity in the expenditure that is going to go there, and what monitoring mechanisms are going to be put in place to deal with that particular project.

I think this is a huge intervention. And we need to understand it properly because we are the ones going to ensure that it actually helps in socio-economic transformation. Otherwise, same old story, same old results.

Therefore, we need to get involved more actively and have these things. When it comes to Parliament and its committees, we will again pull out the one they passed in the 10th Parliament, the statement that had been made by the honourable Leader of Opposition and whatever will come from the minister. They should put all these things together again and have better interactions to see how best we can. We have to give this a shot and a good shot. And that means we should get properly involved. Thank you very much.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT REQUESTING TO WITHDRAW THE REQUEST TO BORROW UP TO EURO 99,270,833 FROM THE INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL BANK OF INDIA FINANCE THE MASINDI-BISSO-KABALE-KIZIRANFUMBI-BUTOOLE ROAD UPGRADING PROJECT

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable minister, please do not ignore the symbolic significance of this moment – withdrawal of a loan request.

5.32

**THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR FINANCE, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (GENERAL DUTIES) (Mr Henry Musasizi):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I beg to move a Motion for a Resolution of Parliament to withdraw the proposal to borrow up to Euros 96,270,833.84 from the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China, to finance the Masindi-Bisso-Kabale-Kiziranfumbi and Hohwa-Nyaihorongo-Kyarusesa-Butoole Road Upgrading Project.

The motion reads:

*“WHEREAS on Wednesday 22 September 2021, the Minister of State for Finance Planning and Economic Development tabled a motion for a resolution of Parliament to authorise Government to borrow up to €96,270,833.84 from the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China to finance the Masindi-Biiso, Kabaale-Kiziranfumbi and Hohwa-Nyairongo-Kyarusesa-Butoole Road Upgrading Project, and thereafter, the loan was referred to the Committee on National Economy for consideration;*

*AND WHEREAS the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China has withdrawn its offer to provide the said loan to the Government of Uganda;*

*COGNISANT of the fact that Rule 62 (1) of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament allows a Member, with leave of the House or committee to withdraw a motion before the question is put on the motion;*

*NOW, THERFORE, be it resolved by this House that a motion for a resolution of Parliament to authorise the Government to borrow a loan amounting to €96,270,833.84 from the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China to finance the Masindi-Biiso, Kabaale-Kiziranfumbi and Hohwa-Nyairongo-Kyarusesa-Butoole Road Upgrading Project be withdrawn from consideration by this House.”*

I beg to move, Mr Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER:** Is the motion seconded? It is seconded by Pakwach, Napak, Tororo and Kitgum. The motion is properly seconded. However, honourable members, there is a procedural challenge and here it is. When we wanted to amend the Rules of Procedure to make sure that all requests for loans should be submitted to the House by motions – that was the position of the people who proposed the amendment – the objection came from the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development.

Their fear, at that time, was: “You see, if we bring it by a motion, Members can decide to reject it immediately without even sending it to the committee”. I said: “That can never happen.” So, the procedure that is in the Rules of Procedure is that you just lay it as a paper. It comes under the rules on laying of papers. So, it is not a motion. This is the clumsy thing that we adopted out of fear that was completely baseless. We now find ourselves in this situation.

So, this motion, essentially, should be for withdrawal of a document because you only laid the document. That is what the rules say. If you acted outside the rules and moved a motion, you were then completely outside the Rules of Procedure. Now, to withdraw, we have to go by the rules. There is no other way a loan request could have come to this House rather than by “laying of papers”. That is what the rules say.

So, honourable minister, this motion, which is – first of all, even the wording - I do not know who drafted the motion: “… for a resolution of Parliament requesting to withdraw a request to borrow up to…” You can even see it is mouthful because there is no clarity on what we are seeking to do.

You laid the document that was sent to the committee. The committee is in the process of handling it. You have changed your mind about the document that you laid. The proper procedure requires you to come with a motion to say that you want to withdraw that document, which you laid because we have not taken a decision on the matter. So, would you like to restructure your motion so that we take a decision?

**MR NANDALA-MAFABI:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The procedural issue I am raising is, again, on our rules. Under the Rules of Procedure, for any document, like what the minister laid about the loan, the committees are given 45 days to produce a report. He brought his document here on 21 September 2021. Those were already 10 days to the end of that month. If you add 30 days for the month October, those were 40 days. If you add the 10 days for the month of November; those are 50 days. This means that the report has delayed to be put on the Order Paper but not that the minister can come and say, “I want to bring a motion”.

Are we proceeding well to say that, now, the minister, having discovered his mistakes – you see he is going to commercial banks and he is about to go to Parliamentary SACCO – to come now and say, “I want to withdraw” yet, as far as we are concerned, we are expecting the report of the Committee on National Economy.

**THE SPEAKER:** Is the Chairperson, Committee on National Economy here? Is there any member of the Committee on National Economy? Where is the Vice-Chairperson, Committee on National Economy? Hon. Iddi Isabirye, are you a member?

**MR IDDI ISABIRYE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am a Member of the Committee on National Economy. The information I would like to give this House is that the loan request has not yet been processed by the committee. The only loan request we have processed that is ready for presentation on the Floor is the education loan.

**THE SPEAKER:** Okay.

**MR NANDALA-MAFABI:** Mr Speaker, the procedural issue I am raising is about our committees –

**THE SPEAKER:** But I have not yet even ruled on the one you raised first. You are now piling up documents on my desk without giving me the opportunity to process them. Well, raise it.

**MR NANDALA-MAFABI:** Mr Speaker, thank you. The procedural issue I am raising is, if a committee has got some work to do, such as a Bill, and within 45 days they are not able to complete it, they should come here to ask for extension of time. I want to assume you are the Chairperson of the Committee on National Economy, hon. Iddi Isabirye, because you are the only member of the committee here. Has this committee asked for extension of time so that we can grant it or we declare them unable so that the whole House – when a committee is unable to perform its task, the whole House will be the one to determine its case.

**THE SPEAKER:** Thank you. Honourable members, you see, this is the challenge we have. The matter was sent to the Committee on National Economy – according to hon. Nandala-Mafabi’s calculation – 50 days ago. The Rules of Procedure gives the committee 45 days to report back. We are to rely on the information given by a member of the committee that they have not yet even started handling it.

There is no report that has been handled. Probably, the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development avoided going there knowing that there was already an issue. As a result, they were not able to process this loan. However, like I have guided, the motion should not be the way it is structured. It should be a short motion to withdraw a document that was laid before the House. Honourable minister, I would like you to restructure it that way so that we can take a decision on this matter.

**MR MUSASIZI:** Mr Speaker, I thank you for your guidance. I pray that I am allowed to go back to restructure the motion properly. I am unable to –

**THE SPEAKER:** It is a simple motion.

**MR MUSASIZI:** Mr Speaker, whereas on Wednesday, 22 September 2021, we laid a document before this House containing a request to borrow €96, 270,833.84 from the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China to finance Masindi-Biiso, Kabaale-Kiziranfumbi and Hohwa-Nyairongo-Kyarusesa-Butoole Road Upgrading Project, I beg this House that this document we laid be withdrawn.

I beg to move, Mr Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER: “**I would like to withdraw”. To be withdrawn; you are requesting us to allow you to withdraw that document.

**MR MUSASIZI:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, for being so kind to me. *(Laughter)* I beg to withdraw the statement.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, that is the proper motion for dealing with a matter of this nature. A document was laid here on 22 September. Now, the person who laid the document here has changed his mind about the processing of that document inside this House.

He is seeking the permission of the House to withdraw that document unconditionally. I have not yet heard him saying, “…based on the following”. He just said, “I would like to withdraw this document which I laid before the House on 22 September”.

Does this attract debate, honourable members? I know we like debating. I am looking at you very intensely.

**MR MUWANGA KIVUMBI:** Mr Speaker, I know that Government is the one with the sole purpose of processing loans and if they choose to, they can withdraw. However, that calls for a bigger concern. A bigger concern lies in the way we are now operating as a country. They are withdrawing a loan to build roads.

Looking at those roads, they are part of the oil roads, if I am not mistaken. When I look at that area, it is part of the area covered by oil roads. When you look at our rate of GDP debt to GDP ratio, it is rising.

With the current borrowing in the supplementary, it will shoot to 54 per cent. The driver to that is, we are no longer getting concessional loans; we are depending on domestic borrowing. Domestic borrowing is raising our interest rates and we are slowly sliding into the Dark Age.

Remember, we were relieved of our debt around 2016/2017 by the Paris Club, when they took to relieve Uganda of all the loans because part of the African continent could not pay. We are slowly sliding back.

Now when we see these loans withdrawn and there are funding needs in the budget, the alternative that the Government generates is to resort to short-term borrowing through Treasury bonds and bills. The net effect to our economy is devastating. Our debt management in the budget is going to be Shs 16 trillion out of Shs 45 trillion.

Therefore, as finance withdraws these concessional loans, a concern and big debate on the status of our economy should be brought to this House, Mr Speaker. The Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development should properly come up with a way on how to fund the needs, including the Parish Development Model we have been debating here – how you are going to do it. I never went into those issues.

My big concern is, as the minister withdraws, what are the alternatives? It is of concern. Where are you going to get the money? What has motivated China, which has been generous to now say, “We are not funding Uganda”? I beg to move, Mr Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER:** Would you like to move that I put the question?

**MR MUWANGA KIVUMBI:** Mr Speaker, I have no objection, if it is so fitting, that you put a question with that question.

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, the rules are clear. Once a motion has been moved for the Speaker to put the question, he deals with that immediately. That motion is not debatable. I will put the question to the motion that the question be put.

*(Question put and agreed to.)*

**THE SPEAKER:** I now put the question that the minister be allowed to withdraw the document that was laid on 22 September 2021; the request to borrow up to €96,270,833.84 from Industrial and Commercial Bank of China to finance the Masindi-Biiso, Kabaale-Kiziranfumbi and Hohwa-Nyairongo-Kyarusesa-Butoole Road Upgrading Project.

I now put the question that we grant the minister authority to withdraw his document. I will put the question.

*(Question put and agreed to.)*

*Motion adopted.*

**THE SPEAKER:** Honourable members, House is adjourned to tomorrow, 2 o’clock.

*(The House rose at 5.50 p.m. and adjourned until Thursday, 11 November 2021 at 2.00 p.m.)*