

**CITIZEN PETITION
AGAINST
THE PROTECTION OF SOVEREIGNTY BILL, 2026
(BILL NO. 13 OF 2026)**

Filed Pursuant to Article 1, Article 29, and Article 38 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995 (as amended)

24 April 2026

TO:

The Rt. Hon. Speaker of Parliament

Parliament of the Republic of Uganda, Kampala.

The Hon. Attorney General

Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, Kampala.

Clerk to Parliament

The Parliament of Uganda
Kampala.

The Hon. Minister of Internal Affairs

Ministry of Internal Affairs, Kampala.

Chairperson Legal Parliamentary Affairs

Parliament of Uganda, Kampala.

Chairperson of Defense and Security

Parliament of Uganda.

The Members of Parliament

Rwenzori Region Constituencies
(Fort Portal City, Kasese, Kabarole, Bundibugyo, Ntoroko, Bunyangabu, Kamwenge, and Kyegegwa).

Cc: The Hon. Chief Justice of the Republic of Uganda

The Judiciary of the Republic of Uganda
Kampala.

Cc: The Chairperson, Uganda Human Rights Commission

Uganda Human Rights Commission
Plot 20/22 Buganda Road, Kampala.

Cc: The Chairperson, Inter-Religious Council of Uganda (IRCU)

Inter-Religious Council of Uganda, Kampala.



RE: CITIZEN PETITION AGAINST THE PROTECTION OF SOVEREIGNTY BILL, 2026 (BILL NO. 13 OF 2026) -- A CALL FOR WITHDRAWAL OR FUNDAMENTAL AMENDMENT ON CONSTITUTIONAL, GOVERNANCE, AND HUMAN RIGHTS GROUNDS.

I. INTRODUCTION AND STANDING OF THE PETITIONER

This Petition is filed by a citizen of the Republic of Uganda exercising the constitutional right guaranteed under Article 1(1) of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995 (as amended) (hereinafter 'the Constitution'), which provides that all power belongs to the people, and under Article 38, which guarantees every citizen the right to participate in the affairs of government and to participate in peaceful activities to influence the policies of government through civic organizations.

The Petitioner, **Fr. Charles Oyo, BA (Phil.), BA (Theol.), MA (Theol.), MA (Pub. Admin. & Mgmt.), Cert. HRM, PhD (Governance & Peace Studies)**, is a governance scholar, researcher, and diocesan priest of the Catholic Diocese of Fort Portal, based in Fort Portal City, Uganda.

Fr. Oyo is a researcher at Uganda Martyrs University, affiliated with the Directorate of Graduate Studies, Research, and Education (DGSRE), Department of Governance, Religion, and Ethics. He holds a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Governance and Peace Studies from the same institution, with a specialization in board governance. His doctoral investigation examined governing board functionality in institutional settings across Uganda, deploying a multidisciplinary theoretical architecture that integrates Agency Theory, Resource Dependence Theory, Stakeholder Theory, Catholic Social Teaching, and the African philosophical tradition of Ubuntu.

His broader scholarly competencies span public administration, institutional governance, human resource management, and the intersection of contractual and covenantal governance logics in public and faith-based organizations. Fr. Oyo's academic formation encompasses philosophy, theology, public administration and management, and human resource specialization, equipping him with an integrated perspective on the constitutional, governance, ethical, and social dimensions of the legislative matter addressed in this Petition.

Fr. Oyo is a member of the Rotary Club of Kabarole and an active participant in civic, academic, and ecclesiastical life in the Rwenzori Region and nationally. As a citizen, governance scholar, faith leader, and resident of the Rwenzori Region directly affected by the implications of the proposed legislation, the Petitioner possesses direct, legitimate, and substantial standing to raise the constitutional, governance, and human rights concerns articulated herein.

This Petition addresses the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 (Bill No. 13 of 2026) (hereinafter 'the Bill'), gazetted on 13 April 2026 and tabled in Parliament for first reading on 15 April 2026. The Petitioner respectfully urges the addressees to withdraw the Bill in its entirety, or, in the alternative, to subject it to fundamental



amendments that bring it into conformity with the Constitution, international human rights standards, and the principles of good governance.

II. DEFINITIONAL FRAMEWORK: KEY CONSTRUCTS

To ensure conceptual clarity, this Petition proceeds from the following definitional foundations, which are drawn from constitutional law, governance theory, and international normative frameworks.

A. Sovereignty

In the constitutional order of the Republic of Uganda, sovereignty is not a governmental prerogative but a popular right. Article 1(1) of the Constitution provides that 'all power belongs to the people who shall exercise their sovereignty in accordance with this Constitution.' Sovereignty, therefore, resides in the citizenry and is exercised through constitutional mechanisms including elections, referenda, and civic participation. The Bill's title appropriates the concept of sovereignty but redefines it, in substance, as executive authority over civil society, thereby inverting the constitutional meaning of the term.

B. Agent of a Foreigner

Under Clause 1 of the Bill, an 'agent of a foreigner' is defined as any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, or servant of a foreigner, or any person whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized by a foreigner. This definition is so expansive that it encompasses virtually every Ugandan organization or individual with any connection to foreign funding, foreign employers, diaspora remittances, international research collaborations, or multilateral development programmes.

C. Foreigner

Under the same Clause, a 'foreigner' includes not only non-Ugandan citizens, but also Ugandan citizens residing outside Uganda, foreign governments, embassies, international organizations, entities registered outside Uganda, and any person or body the Minister of Internal Affairs may declare to be a foreigner by statutory instrument. This definition treats members of the Ugandan diaspora as aliens in their own constitutional order, thereby contradicting Articles 10 and 15 of the Constitution, which guarantee citizenship by birth and recognize dual citizenship.

D. Good Governance

Good governance, as understood in this Petition, denotes the exercise of political, economic, and administrative authority through transparent, accountable, participatory, and rule-bound processes. It is anchored in the principles of the rule of law, separation of powers, subsidiarity, participation, equity, and responsiveness. The National Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy of the Constitution expressly commit Uganda to democratic governance, protection of human rights, and accountability of public institutions.



E. Environmental and Social Standards

Environmental and Social Standards (ESS) refer to the normative frameworks adopted by international development institutions, national governments, and private sector actors to ensure that economic activities respect human rights, protect the environment, and promote inclusive development. Uganda's National Environment Act, 2019, and the country's commitments under the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, and the Paris Agreement all reflect adherence to these standards. The Bill's sweeping restrictions on foreign-funded environmental and social programmes directly undermine Uganda's capacity to honour these obligations.

III. ACKNOWLEDGED POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF THE BILL

The Petitioner acknowledges that sovereign nations have a legitimate interest in regulating foreign influence within their borders. In principle, a well-crafted legal framework governing foreign engagement could yield the following benefits:

- A. Transparency of Foreign Funding Sources.** A proportionate registration and disclosure regime could enhance public awareness of the sources and purposes of foreign funding flowing into Ugandan institutions, thereby promoting accountability.
- B. Protection of Electoral Integrity.** Narrowly tailored provisions restricting direct foreign financing of political campaigns and electoral manipulation could safeguard democratic processes from covert external interference.
- C. National Security.** Targeted measures addressing genuine threats of espionage, clandestine influence operations, and subversive activities by hostile foreign state actors could strengthen Uganda's security architecture.
- D. Sovereign Policy Autonomy.** A framework ensuring that national policy is formulated through domestic democratic processes rather than externally imposed conditionalities could reinforce policy independence.

However, the Bill as currently drafted does not achieve these objectives. Instead, it employs vague and overbroad definitions, disproportionate penalties, and unchecked executive discretion to create a regime that extends far beyond the regulation of foreign interference into the suppression of constitutionally protected rights, the criminalization of ordinary civic and economic activity, and the concentration of arbitrary power in a single Ministry.

IV. RISKS TO THE STATUS AND RIGHTS OF CITIZENS

A. Violation of Freedom of Expression and the Press (Article 29(1)(a))

Clause 13 of the Bill criminalizes the publication of information or participation in any activity that 'weakens or damages the economic system or viability of Uganda.' This provision does not require proof of intent, falsity, or actual harm. Under this formulation, investigative journalists exposing corruption, economists



publishing critical fiscal analyses, civil society organizations reporting on poverty indicators, and academic researchers presenting unfavourable data could all face prosecution and imprisonment of up to twenty years. This constitutes a direct and disproportionate interference with freedom of expression and freedom of the press as guaranteed under Article 29(1)(a) of the Constitution.

B. Violation of Freedom of Association (Article 29(1)(e))

The mandatory registration regime under Clauses 14 to 17, combined with the intrusive suitability inquiries including into the mental and physical health of applicants, the two-year certificate validity period, and the criminal penalties of up to ten years' imprisonment for acting without registration, effectively subjects the right to free association to prior executive approval. This transforms a constitutional right into a government-granted privilege, reversible at Ministerial discretion.

C. Violation of the Right to Civic Participation (Article 38)

Clauses 7 and 8 of the Bill require Cabinet-level authorization for any policy advocacy, any effort to influence government policy, and any activity related to government policy implementation. The criminalization of policy engagement without Cabinet approval, with penalties of up to twenty years' imprisonment, strikes at the heart of Article 38, which guarantees every Ugandan citizen the right to participate in the affairs of government individually or through civic organizations. Policy advocacy is the lifeblood of democratic governance; its criminalization is incompatible with constitutional democracy.

D. Violation of the Right to Property (Article 26)

The forfeiture provisions under Clauses 22(3) and 23(2) empower courts to confiscate foreign-sourced funds upon conviction without any requirement to demonstrate tangible harm to Uganda's national interests and without adequate procedural safeguards. This constitutes an arbitrary deprivation of property contrary to Article 26 of the Constitution, which provides that no person shall be compulsorily deprived of property except in accordance with the law and upon prompt payment of fair and adequate compensation.

E. Criminalization of the Ugandan Diaspora

By defining a 'foreigner' to include any Ugandan citizen residing outside Uganda, the Bill effectively strips millions of Ugandans in the diaspora of their civic identity and transforms their families, churches, and communities at home into potential criminal defendants. A mother receiving remittances from her son in the United States, a parish receiving tithes from congregants in the United Kingdom, and a university receiving research funding from a Ugandan scholar abroad would all be exposed to criminal liability. This provision contradicts Articles 10, 12, and 15 of the Constitution and violates the fundamental bond between the Ugandan state and its citizens.

F. Impact on Faith-Based Organizations

Uganda's religious institutions, including churches, mosques, and faith-based development organizations, receive substantial financial support from international affiliates, diaspora congregations, and global mission bodies. The



Bill's definitions would classify these institutions as 'agents of foreigners,' subjecting their clergy, staff, and volunteers to mandatory registration, funding caps, public disclosure obligations, and criminal exposure. The Inter-Religious Council of Uganda has rightly warned that the Bill threatens the operational viability of religious institutions that deliver essential services in health, education, and social welfare across the country.

V. RISKS TO THE NATIONAL INTEREST

A. Economic Disruption

Uganda's economy is deeply integrated into the global financial system. Foreign direct investment, development assistance, diaspora remittances, international trade financing, correspondent banking relationships, and multilateral lending all depend on stable, predictable, and rights-respecting legal frameworks. The Bill's requirements that banks refuse to disburse funds to any 'agent of a foreigner' without Ministerial authorization (Clause 25), combined with fines of up to UGX 4 billion for non-compliant financial institutions, would introduce systemic uncertainty into the financial sector and risk triggering capital flight, credit downgrades, and the withdrawal of correspondent banking lines.

B. Breach of International Obligations

Uganda is a State Party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (Banjul Charter), and numerous bilateral and multilateral development cooperation agreements. The Bill's restrictions on expression, association, and civic participation fall below the thresholds of necessity and proportionality required under Article 19 of the ICCPR and Articles 9 and 10 of the Banjul Charter. Furthermore, by failing to exempt entities operating under government-to-government development agreements, the Bill creates direct conflicts with Uganda's obligations under the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

C. Reputational Damage and International Isolation

The European Court of Human Rights, in *Ecodefence and Others v. Russia* (2022) and *Kobaliya and Others v. Russia* (2024), condemned Russia's substantially similar Foreign Agents Act as arbitrary, disproportionate, and bearing the hallmarks of a totalitarian regime. The Uganda Law Society has described the Bill as 'not protection, but a constitutional coup.' Enactment of this Bill in its present form would associate Uganda with the most repressive governance practices on the global stage and jeopardize the country's standing within the African Union, the East African Community, the Commonwealth, and the broader international community.

D. Undermining Development Cooperation

Uganda relies heavily on development cooperation for health service delivery (including HIV/AIDS programmes, malaria control, and immunization), education infrastructure, agricultural extension, climate adaptation, and governance reform. The Bill's requirement that all foreign funding above UGX



400 million per annum receive prior Ministerial approval would create administrative bottlenecks capable of paralyzing programme implementation, with devastating consequences for the most vulnerable populations who depend on these services.

VI. LEGISLATIVE REDUNDANCY: THE EXISTING LEGAL FRAMEWORK

A critical objection to the Bill is that the legislative objectives it purports to serve are already addressed by existing Ugandan law. The Bill does not fill a genuine legal vacuum; rather, it duplicates, contradicts, and destabilizes established regulatory frameworks. The following statutes already provide comprehensive mechanisms for addressing the matters the Bill seeks to regulate:

- (i) **The Non-Governmental Organizations (Amendment) Act, 2024** (formerly the NGO Act, 2016), which establishes the National Bureau for NGOs with powers to register, regulate, coordinate, monitor, and if necessary, suspend or revoke the permits of all NGOs operating in Uganda, and which already imposes obligations on NGOs not to engage in activities prejudicial to the security or interests of Uganda.
- (ii) **The Anti-Terrorism Act, 2002 (as amended)**, which provides comprehensive provisions against terrorist financing, including powers to freeze assets, investigate suspicious transactions, and prosecute persons involved in financing terrorism.
- (iii) **The Anti-Money Laundering Act, 2013 (as amended)**, which requires financial institutions to conduct due diligence on customers, report suspicious transactions, and maintain records of all significant financial flows, including those involving foreign sources.
- (iv) **The Computer Misuse Act, 2011 (as amended)**, which addresses the publication of false or malicious information through electronic media.
- (v) **The Political Parties and Organizations Act, 2005 (as amended)**, which already regulates the financing of political parties and restricts foreign contributions to political activities.
- (vi) **The Uganda Citizenship and Immigration Control Act, 1999 (as amended)**, which defines citizenship and provides mechanisms for regulating the entry, residence, and activities of foreign nationals in Uganda.
- (vii) **The Access to Information Act, 2005**, which provides a framework for transparency and public accountability in government operations.
- (viii) **The Financial Institutions Act, 2004 (as amended)**, which regulates banking operations, capital requirements, and the prudential supervision of financial institutions, including their relationships with foreign correspondents and investors.

The duplication of regulatory authority across these existing statutes and the proposed Bill would not strengthen governance but would instead create jurisdictional conflicts, regulatory confusion, increased compliance costs for lawful organizations, and expanded opportunities for bureaucratic rent-seeking and corruption.



VII. IRRATIONALITY AND DISPROPORTIONALITY

The Bill fails the tests of rationality and proportionality that the Constitutional Court of Uganda and international human rights jurisprudence apply to restrictions on fundamental rights. The following elements demonstrate manifest irrationality:

A. Vagueness of Criminal Offences

Uganda's Constitutional Court and Supreme Court have consistently held that criminal offences must be defined with sufficient precision to enable citizens to understand what conduct is prohibited, in accordance with Article 28(12) of the Constitution. The Bill's offences are so broadly and imprecisely drafted as to render compliance impossible. Clause 5, which prohibits any act that promotes the interests of a foreigner 'against the interests of Uganda,' nowhere defines what constitutes the 'interests of Uganda,' leaving citizens at the mercy of executive interpretation. Clause 13, which criminalizes any information that 'weakens or damages the economic system,' provides no objective criteria for determining when economic commentary becomes a criminal act.

B. Disproportionate Penalties

The penalties prescribed by the Bill, including imprisonment of up to twenty years and fines of up to UGX 4 billion, are grossly disproportionate to the administrative and regulatory nature of the conduct being criminalized. For comparison, the NGO Act, 2016, imposed a maximum penalty of three years' imprisonment for engaging in acts prejudicial to Uganda's security or interests. The Bill escalates this to twenty years for substantially similar conduct, without any demonstrated justification grounded in public safety or national security evidence.

C. Unchecked Executive Discretion

The Bill concentrates extraordinary powers in the Minister of Internal Affairs, including the power to declare any person or body a 'foreigner' by statutory instrument (Clause 1), to grant or withhold registration certificates based on subjective suitability assessments (Clauses 14-17), to approve or deny foreign funding applications (Clause 22), and to authorize warrantless inspections of premises (noted in the Bill's enforcement provisions). These powers are exercisable without judicial oversight, without Parliamentary approval, and without meaningful appeal mechanisms. Such concentration of unreviewable executive power is incompatible with the principle of separation of powers and the rule of law as enshrined in Articles 1, 2, and 79 of the Constitution.

D. Overbreadth

The Bill's definitions sweep far beyond any rational nexus with the protection of sovereignty. Under the Bill, a Ugandan doctor employed by an international health organization, a teacher at a school receiving foreign scholarships, a farmer participating in an externally funded agricultural extension programme, a bank with foreign correspondent lines, and a church receiving diaspora tithes would all be classified as 'agents of foreigners' and subjected to criminal regulation. This breadth bears no rational relationship to the stated objective of



protecting Uganda from foreign interference and instead criminalizes the ordinary fabric of economic, social, and spiritual life.

VIII. THE QUESTION OF AGENCY: WHOSE SOVEREIGNTY?

Article 1(1) of the Constitution is unambiguous: all power belongs to the people. Sovereignty, in the Ugandan constitutional order, is not the property of the government, the Executive, or any Ministry; it is the birthright of the citizenry. The Bill, however, systematically transfers the exercise of sovereign authority from the people to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. By requiring Ministerial approval for civic participation, policy advocacy, the receipt of funding, and the conduct of ordinary economic activity, the Bill does not protect sovereignty; it confiscates it.

The Uganda Law Society has aptly characterized this dynamic, observing that the Bill reallocates sovereign authority from the people to government authorities by granting sweeping powers to determine 'government interests' and to penalize dissent. As Vice-President Anthony Asiimwe of the ULS has argued, any legislation that alters the structure or locus of sovereignty must be subjected to a national referendum as required under Article 260(2) of the Constitution. The Bill's failure to meet this threshold renders it constitutionally suspect.

Furthermore, the timing of the Bill's introduction, during the final weeks of the 11th Parliament's term, with members who have already lost their seats being asked to enact legislation of profound constitutional significance, raises serious questions of democratic legitimacy. A law that will govern the civic life of forty-five million Ugandans for generations should not be enacted by a departing legislature under time pressure and without meaningful public consultation.

IX. INCOMPATIBILITY WITH PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

The Bill contravenes the foundational principles of good governance as articulated in the National Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy of the Constitution, the African Union's African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance (2007), the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), and established governance scholarship.

A. The Rule of Law

Good governance requires that laws be clear, predictable, publicly accessible, and applied equally. The Bill's vague offences, unchecked ministerial discretion, and selective application potential violate the rule of law at its foundation. The power of the Minister to declare any entity a 'foreigner' by statutory instrument, without Parliamentary debate or judicial review, is the antithesis of rule-bound governance.

B. Accountability and Transparency

While the Bill imposes extensive disclosure obligations on citizens and organizations, it creates no reciprocal accountability for the exercise of the vast



powers it confers upon the Ministry of Internal Affairs. There is no requirement that the Minister provide reasons for refusing registration, no independent oversight of the approval process for foreign funding, no Parliamentary reporting obligation, and no effective judicial review mechanism. Accountability, in good governance, is bidirectional; the Bill makes it unidirectional.

C. Participation and Subsidiarity

The Bill was introduced without public consultation, without a Regulatory Impact Assessment, and without the broad stakeholder engagement that the National Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy contemplate. National Objective II commits Uganda to democratic principles in which the people participate in their governance. The Bill's requirement that civic engagement, policy advocacy, and organizational activity receive prior executive approval is the negation of participatory governance.

D. Proportionality and Necessity

International human rights law, including the ICCPR and the Banjul Charter, permits restrictions on fundamental rights only when they are prescribed by law, pursue a legitimate aim, and are necessary and proportionate in a democratic society. The UN Human Rights Committee's General Comment No. 34 establishes that necessity requires the demonstration that less restrictive means are insufficient. The Bill fails this test comprehensively: existing Ugandan laws already provide adequate mechanisms for regulating foreign influence, and the Bill's criminal penalties and sweeping definitions far exceed what any legitimate regulatory objective could justify.

X. INCOMPATIBILITY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL STANDARDS

Uganda has committed to a range of environmental and social standards through national legislation, regional instruments, and international agreements. The Bill threatens compliance with these commitments in several respects.

A. Climate and Environmental Programmes.

Uganda's climate adaptation, biodiversity conservation, and environmental monitoring programmes are substantially funded through international cooperation. The Green Climate Fund, the Global Environment Facility, and bilateral climate financing mechanisms channel resources through NGOs, research institutions, and government agencies that would, under the Bill, be classified as 'agents of foreigners.' The Bill's funding caps and registration requirements would disrupt these programmes at a time when Uganda faces accelerating climate risks.

B. Social Protection and Human Development.

International funding supports orphan care, disability services, maternal and child health, HIV/AIDS treatment, refugee assistance, education for girls, and gender-based violence prevention across Uganda. The organizations delivering these services would face criminal exposure under the Bill for receiving foreign funding without Ministerial approval. The potential withdrawal



or suspension of these programmes would constitute a social catastrophe for the most vulnerable populations.

C. Sustainable Development Goals.

Uganda's Voluntary National Review process and its commitments under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development depend on civil society participation, independent data collection, and international development cooperation. The Bill would compromise Uganda's capacity to achieve its SDG targets by criminalizing the institutional infrastructure through which these goals are pursued.

D. Agricultural Development and Food Security.

The Rwenzori Region and other rural areas depend heavily on internationally funded agricultural extension programmes, cooperative development initiatives, and market access projects. Farmers, cooperatives, and local NGOs participating in these programmes would be exposed to criminal liability as 'agents of foreigners,' threatening the livelihoods of millions of rural Ugandans.

XI. SPECIFIC CONCERNS FOR THE RWENZORI REGION

The Petitioner addresses the Members of Parliament of the Rwenzori Region with particular urgency. The constituencies of Fort Portal City, Kasese, Kabarole, Bundibugyo, Ntoroko, Bunyangabu, Kamwenge, and Kyegegwa are home to communities that depend significantly on international development cooperation for health services, education, agricultural development, tourism infrastructure, wildlife conservation, and post-conflict recovery and peacebuilding programmes.

The region's churches, schools, hospitals, cooperative societies, women's groups, and youth organizations receive funding from international partners, diaspora communities, and multilateral agencies. Under the Bill, these institutions and their personnel would be classified as 'agents of foreigners' and subjected to criminal regulation. The Members of Parliament of the Rwenzori Region have a constitutional duty under Article 79 of the Constitution to legislate in the interests of their constituents. This Petition respectfully submits that a vote in favour of the Bill, in its current form, would be a vote against the interests and welfare of the people of the Rwenzori Region.

XII. PRAYER

In light of the foregoing constitutional, governance, legal, and practical objections, the Petitioner respectfully prays that the addressees take the following actions:

- A. That the Rt. Hon. Speaker of Parliament** exercise the constitutional authority vested in that office to ensure that the Bill is not rushed through Parliament without adequate public consultation, Regulatory Impact Assessment, and comprehensive committee scrutiny, and that the 45-day scrutiny period required by Parliamentary procedure be strictly observed.



- B. That the Hon. Attorney General** provide Parliament with an independent and comprehensive legal opinion on the Bill's compatibility with the Constitution, particularly Articles 1, 2, 10, 15, 26, 28(12), 29, 38, 43, 79, and 260(2), and with Uganda's obligations under the ICCPR, the Banjul Charter, and the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.
- C. That the Hon. Minister of Internal Affairs** withdraw the Bill in its entirety for comprehensive public consultation and stakeholder engagement, and that any future legislative initiative addressing foreign influence be narrowly tailored to address genuine threats to national security and electoral integrity, with full respect for constitutional rights, proportionate penalties, and adequate judicial oversight.
- D. That the Members of Parliament representing the Rwenzori Region** oppose the Bill in its current form, engage their constituents in public dialogue on its implications, and insist that any legislation affecting the civic, economic, and spiritual life of their communities be subjected to rigorous constitutional scrutiny and broad democratic deliberation.
- E. In the alternative**, should the Bill proceed to Second Reading, that the Parliamentary Committee on Defence and Internal Affairs and the Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Committee recommend fundamental amendments to: (i) narrow the definitions of 'foreigner' and 'agent of a foreigner' to exclude Ugandan citizens, faith-based organizations, academic institutions, and entities operating under government-to-government agreements; (ii) remove the criminalization of policy advocacy and the publication of economic information; (iii) subject all Ministerial decisions under the Act to independent judicial review; (iv) reduce penalties to levels proportionate to the administrative nature of the regulated conduct; and (v) include sunset clauses and mandatory Parliamentary review mechanisms.
- F. That the Hon. Chief Justice** take judicial notice of this Petition as an expression of citizen concern regarding the constitutionality of the proposed legislation, and that the Judiciary remain vigilant in its constitutional role as the guardian of fundamental rights and freedoms should any provisions of the Bill, if enacted, be brought before the courts for constitutional review.
- G. That the Uganda Human Rights Commission** exercise its mandate under Article 51 of the Constitution to monitor, investigate, and report on the human rights implications of the Bill, and to advise Parliament and the Government on the compatibility of the proposed legislation with Uganda's constitutional and international human rights obligations.
- H. That the Inter-Religious Council of Uganda (IRCU)** continue to exercise its moral authority and its role as a trusted national institution by coordinating faith-based advocacy against the Bill's provisions that threaten the operational integrity, financial viability, and pastoral mission of religious institutions across Uganda, and by engaging Parliament and Government in constructive dialogue on the protection of religious freedom and the autonomy of faith-based organizations.



Filed this 24th day of April 2026.

Respectfully submitted,



**FR. CHARLES OYO, BA (Phil.), BA (Theol.), MA (Theol.), MA (Pub. Admin. & Mgmt.),
Cert. HRM, PhD**

Student of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Governance and Peace Studies

Specialization: Board Governance

Governance Scholar and Researcher

Uganda Martyrs University

Directorate of Graduate Studies, Research, and Education (DGSRE)

Department of Governance, Religion, and Ethics

Diocesan Priest, Catholic Diocese of Fort Portal

Member, Rotary Club of Kabarole

Fort Portal City, Uganda