

**PARLIAMENT OF UGANDA**

**OFFICE OF THE  
LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION**

**MINORITY REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DEFENCE  
AND INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AND PARLIAMENTARY  
AFFAIRS ON THE PROTECTION OF SOVEREIGNTY BILL, 2026**

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK TO PARLIAMENT  
PARLIAMENT BUILDING  
KAMPALA-UGANDA**

**MAY 2026**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This is a Minority report in substantial dissent of the majority report of the Joint Committee of the Committee of Defence and Internal Affairs and the Committee on Legal and Parliamentary Affairs on the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026. This minority report is brought **under Rule 215 of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament of the Republic of Uganda.**

## 2. OPEN REMARKS

In critical moments such as today, when a draconian Bill is presented to Parliament for enactment into law, the Minority is persuaded by some of the most memorable speeches in the political history of Uganda. Honourable members, please pay attention to the contents of this speech, attributed to one Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, President of Uganda at the time, in the early 1990s.

***“Depending on the nature of the state in a given society, law can be an instrument of oppression and exploitation, or of social justice and progress. Law is not synonymous with justice, is not always synonymous with justice. It can be, but it may not be. What is legal is not necessarily what is just. Law can be used by the strong against the weak, by the rich against the poor, by the minority against the majority.***

***Historically, law has been used by the oppressor against the oppressed. During the slave period, enslaved people were owned and disposed-off like chattels, and it was perfectly legal to own a slave. The NRM government is strongly opposed to having laws on our statute books which serve the interest of the minority against the majority of our people or which in any way promote to serve injustice or advance backward interest in our society’***

The minority shall, where necessary, refer to the speech above, for the purpose of reminding ourselves as Legislators and fellow Ugandans, the far we have come



and the apparent U-turns and reversals that are being made for whatever reasons being advanced, which reasons have no place in shaping the Sovereignty of the people of Uganda.

### **3. AREAS OF DISSENT AND STATEMENT OF REASON FOR DISSENT**

#### **3.1 VIOLATIONS OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURES OF PARLIAMENT**

During the consideration of the Protection of Sovereignty Bill 2026, the Co-Chairpersons violated several provisions of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament of Uganda. **Rule 135 of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament** is instructive on Reference of a Bill to the Committee as follows:

- (1) Whenever the Bill is read for the first time in the House, the Bill shall be referred to the appropriate Committee appointed under these Rules.
- (2) The Committee shall examine the bill in detail and make all such inquiries in relation to the bill as the Committee considers expedient or necessary and report to the House within forty-five working days from the date the bill is referred to the Committee
- (3) Except in the cases of very minor amendments, and subject to rule 138, all proposed amendments to a bill referred to the Committee shall be presented to the Committee by the person proposing the amendment, and the Committee shall scrutinize the amendment together with the Bill
- (4) The Committee may propose and accept proposed amendments in the bill as the Committee considers necessary, if the amendments, including new clauses and new schedules, are relevant to the subject matter of the Bill.

The Minority observes that the Committee violated **Sub-rules (2) and (3)**, in as far as it did not EXAMINE the Bill in detail and further did not make ALL SUCH INQUIRIES in relation to the Bill. In the view of the Minority, the decision of the Committee through a vote on a motion by Hon. Odoi Fox Oywelowo for an omni-bus



adoption of all clauses of the Bill and the amendments by the Learned Attorney General without **examination** and inquiry violated **Rule 135 (supra)**.

The Minority also observed that the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 was proposed by the Minister of Internal Affairs, Maj. Gen. (Rtd) Kahinda Otafiire. **Sub rule (3)** restricts the latitude to propose substantial amendments to only the Mover of the Bill—to wit Minister of Internal Affairs. Only minor amendments maybe proposed by any other person, who is not the Proposer of the Bill.

With all due respect, the Learned Attorney General proposed 18 amendments, all quite substantial in nature, which amendments the majority unilaterally adopted and relied on, to pass the Bill in the committee. The Committee ought to have rejected the substantial amendments proposed by the Learned Attorney General outrightly. To even make it worse, the new amendments were laid before the Committee in form of a new Bill. **Rule 135 (1)** confines the Committee to a Bill read for the first time in the House and referred to the Committee. The Committee is estopped from directly receiving Bills not read in the House and referred to it. By fraudulently by-passing the House and smuggling an amended version of a Bill to the Committee, an illegality that goes to the root of Parliamentary procedure and practice was committed and can not be cured by any explanation at all.

The Minority further observes that no sooner had the Learned Attorney General, purported to present the amended Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 to the Committee at about 12:00 noon on Thursday 30<sup>th</sup> April, 2026, than H.E the President, through his address to Ugandan at about 4pm on the same day, withdraw instructions from the Learned Attorney General.

Instead, President publicly assigned Hon. Obua Hamson to ensure that the Bill concentrates of what he called sovereignty of policy-decision making. In the practice of law, there is nothing as professionally humiliating, as a client withdrawing instructions from you and sharing it outright with the public. No



wonder, since then, neither the Learned Attorney General not the Minister of Internal Affairs ever again attempted to appear before the Committee. The House must therefore not entertain the two on anything to do with the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 since the President withdrew any vote of confidence in them.

The Minority formed the view that Hon. Hamson Obua, having been given fresh instructions as per the written expressions of President Museveni, ought to have immediately sought audience with the Committee to present the instructions given to him. Was it an instruction to withdraw the Bill or what was it? Despite the insistence of the Minority to invite the Hon. Obua Hamson under Rule 135(2) “...**MAKE ALL SUCH INQUIRIES IN RELATION TO THE BILL...**” as this was the most expedient, the Co-Chairpersons Hon. Kajwenje Wilson and Hon. Baka Mugabi Stephen, without putting to a vote summarily decided that nothing should stand in their way to deliver a committee report in support of this unpopular Bill.

The examination and inquiries envisaged under **Rule 135 (2)** is through debate on the Bill in the Committee. The Minority was suffocated, deprived, violated and denied any meaningful debate in the Committee. The Co- Chairpersons Hon. Kawjenje Wilson and Hon. Baka Mugabi Stephen were evidently partial, hostile and continuously switched off the microphones of members they perceived to be against the Bill. Contrary to established practices of availing physical copies of submissions of all stakeholders to members for consideration at the retreat in Munyonyo, members were instead told that physical copies could not be availed since Parliament doesn't work on weekends. Views of selected stakeholders were instead sent to members on WhatsApp to read on their phones! Members who were not on WhatsApp or whose phones could not open the WhatsApp were effectively denied access to critical documents.

The privileges of the members were violated to extent that members were some keen member of the committee had to jump on boda-boda to travel to Nasser



Road to print the stakeholder documents at their own costs. A passionate plea for the committee to adjourn until Monday when Parliament is open for purpose of printing or photocopying the documents was turned down the Co-chairpersons.

This gross abuse of authority, with utmost impunity laced with shameless sycophancy is highly condemned. Presiding Officers in the Committee and indeed plenary must be impartial, patient and respect the Constitutional rights of an MP to represent their constituencies without undue partiality and interruptions. I must also add, that the Co-Chairpersons of the Committee appeared not to have addressed their minds to the rules of Procedure of Parliament and opted for personal whims to decide substantial points of law as well as procedural matters that arose in the Committee.

## **FINDING**

- (1) The proceedings of the Committee were held in complete violations of the **Rule 135 of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament.**
- (2) The Co-Chairpersons exhibited gross incompetence, lack of tolerance for divergent views and stifled all avenues of debate during consideration of the Bill.

## **RECCOMENDATION**

This Minority recommends to Parliament to reject the Majority Committee report and instead refer the Bill back to the executive, or in the alternative but with prejudice, be please to appoint another Committee to EXAMINE THE BILL IN DETAIL AND MAKE SUCH INQUIRIES IN RELATION TO THE BILL in full compliance with Rule the Rules of Procedure of Parliament.

## **3.2 DEFECTIVE CERTIFICATE OF FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**



The Minority observed that the Certificate of Financial Implications by Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development does not comply with Section 76 of the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) and Rule 124 of the Rules of Procedure of the Parliament of Uganda.

Section 76 of the PFMA and Rule 124 of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament are at par on certificate of financial implications of a Bills as follows; -

- (1) Every Bill introduced in Parliament shall be accompanied by a certificate of financial implications issued by the Minister.
- (2) The certificate of financial implications issued under subsection (10) shall indicate the estimates of revenue and expenditure over a period of not less than two years after coming into effect of the Bill when passed.
- (3) In addition to the requirements under subsection (2) the certificate of financial implications shall indicate the impact of the Bill on the economy
- (4) Notwithstanding sub sections (1), (2) and (3), a certificate of financial implications shall be deemed to have been issued after 60 days from the date of request for the certificate.

The Minority examined the certificate of financial implications issued on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2026 by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development signed by Amos Lugolobi (MP), MINISTER OF STATE FOR FINANCE, and PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

In the certificate, under paragraph 5 on IMPACT TO THE ECONOMY, Hon. Lugoolobi Amos states; -

**The Proposed Bill is expected to strengthen Uganda's policy autonomy and national security architecture, improved coherence in the management of foreign aid and foreign-funded activities and support stability in governance and public order. These outcomes are expected to contribute to a more secure**



## **environment for implementation of Government programmes and long term national development'**

The Minority draws the attention of Honorable Members to sad realities that has befallen this Country. That the entire Ministry responsible for Finance, Planning and Economic development does not know what constitutes an ECONOMY OF A COUNTRY called Uganda, and therefore are unable to articulate the impact of the Bill to the Economy of Uganda.

The Minority observes that instead of assessing the impact of the Bill against well known parameters such as; -Gross Domestic Products (GDP), Sovereign debts (Debt to GDP ratio), Balance of Payments (BoP), Central Bank Reserves, Interest Rates, Inflation, Exchange Rates, Rate of growth, and etc., alien parameters formed the basis of the assessment. The observation by the Majority report that the certificate of financial implication met the statutory standard by mere fact that is was issued can not hold.

In 2025, the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development published guidelines for financial clearance which listed the following obligations; -

- Statement of Financial Implications (SFI) submitted at least 60 days before Cabinet/Parliament.
- Four-part assessments (Budget, socio-economics, distribution and Risks)
- Fiscal Risk Assessment Clearance by Committee at the MDA, Programme Working Group and MoFPED.

The Minority observed that the Certificate of Financial Implication issued in respect of the Protection of Sovereignty Bill 2026 does not provide Parliament with the full multi-year financial and economic analysis required for a sound decision making. The Certificate does not fully illustrate the real economic vulnerabilities (rising stock of public debt, increased domestic borrowing, dependence on external support, unemployment, poverty, GDP, investor confidence etc..)



Hon. Lugoolobi Amos and the well-paid stock of 'ECONOMISTS' at Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development instead decided to invent and redefine the Uganda Economy as being; NATIONAL SECURITY, PUBLIC ORDER, GOVERNANCE, FOREIGN AID AND FOREIGN FUNDED ACTIVITIES. The Minority does not in any way downplay the significance of National Security, Public Order, Governance etc., but is rather of the considered opinion that those are unrelated to the requirements on the impact of the Economy envisaged **under S.76 of the PFMA and Rule 124.**

Such gross negligence and just maybe incompetence as well by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development should not be mere massaged by Parliament. It ought to be condemned, rejected and dismissed straight away. The Minority is dismissive of the random figure of 29.029 Billion estimated by the Certificate of Financial Implication for the Bill to cover the four broad areas of; - Administration, Technological and Infrastructure set up, Capacity Building and development of new regulations and lastly enforcement mechanisms including judicial processes.

To implement such a law, the requirements such as Digital Platform, Content Monitoring and Online Surveillance is a must. A simple market inquiry shows that a Deep Packet Inspection (DPI) infrastructure cost in excess of UGX 50bn, Content Filtering System UGX 20bn and Data Management System for Foreign Agent monitoring is UGX 7bn at the bare minimums. These prices do not include amounts in corruption which is deeply rooted in Government procurement systems.

The total amount estimated is clearly, by miles, way higher than the 29bn stated in the certificate of financial implication. Some one is clearly taking Parliament for granted, perhaps misled by the narrative in the public domain of the House being composed of S.6 Drop-outs! No estimates of revenues is in the certificate of financial implication yet registration, fines and confiscation of funds are all foreseeable in the Bill.



The Hon. Members can surely put this narrative to doubt today, by dismissing the Certificate of Financial Implications and directing Ministers of Finance to start being SERIOUS with the trust that the President has put in them to avoid causing him the need to protect his ears from the 'rwaari, kelele,'.

The Minority is deeply indebted to Bank of Uganda (Governor and his team) who informed the committee of grave consequences on the economy of Uganda if the Bill is passed. They exhibited a very high level of professionalism and restored confidence in ECONOMICS as a profession. Other professionals, especially LAWYERS and ECONOMISTS here in Parliament must stay clear of sycophancy, boot-licking and accepting inducements and comprises at the risks of raising doubts on their claimed professions.

The BoU pointed out some of the immediate implication of the Bill, according as follows:

- (a) Uganda's Balance of Payments (BoP) will be destabilized on the basis of reduction in Foreign Direct Investments amounting to USD 3.4 Billion and Portfolio Investments amount of USD 2.1 billion.
- (b) Reduction of Remittances of USD 1.5 billion by Workers abroad and NGOs at USD 420.8 million.
- (c) Reduction of foreign exchange liquidity which will mount pressure on Uganda shillings.
- (d) Increased cost of imports as direct implication of weakened Uganda currency and spiking demand for foreign currencies
- (e) Sudden capital flight of the 12% investments in government securities such as Treasury Bonds, Bills.
- (f) Increased national debt burden from the already burdensome USD 128 billion as consequence of demand by investors of uncertainty premiums.



The economic implications listed by the Governor Bank of Uganda paints a worrying picture of the state of Uganda's economy should the Bill pass. An economy is not something to toy with especially in regard to regulation of the supply of money.

This is perhaps, the main reason why MONETARY POLICIES are placed under exclusive mandate of the CENTRAL BANKS which is independent of the Political influence. Politicians, if they wish are instead left with some latitude on fiscal policies such as TAXATION decisions for obvious reasons (funding the luxury of Politicians and favoring Relatives, Friends and In-laws with tax waivers) and burdening ordinary citizens of Uganda who are toiling for survival.

The Uganda Bankers Association is comprised of the following;

1. ABC Capital Bank
2. ABSA Bank
3. Afrexim Bank
4. Bank of Africa
5. Bank of Baroda
6. Bank of India
7. Brac Uganda Bank
8. Cairo Bank
9. Centenary Bank (Ugandan)
10. Citi Bank
11. Diamond Trust Bank
12. DFCU Bank
13. Ecobank
14. Equity Bank
15. Exim Bank
16. East African Development Bank
17. Finance Trust Bank

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the initials 'DB' or similar, written in a cursive style.

18. FINCA Uganda
19. Guaranty Trust Bank
20. Housing Finance Bank (Ugandan)
21. I&M Bank
22. KCB
23. NCBA Bank
24. Opportunity Bank
25. Pearl Bank (Uganda)
26. Pride Bank (Ugandan)
27. Salaam Bank
28. Stanbic Bank
29. Standard Chartered Bank
30. Tropical bank
31. Ugafode Microfinance Ltd (Ugandan)
32. United Bank of Africa
33. Uganda Development Bank
34. Yako Bank

The Minority reproduces excerpts of the submissions of the Uganda bankers Association below for the kind benefit of Hon. Members,

***“The Bill poses a critical threat to Uganda’s Tenfold Growth Strategy, an ambitious plan to grow the economy from USD 50 billion to USD 500bn by 2040. To support the government plan, the banking sector has committed to mobilizing UGX 490 trillion in private sector credit, a goal that relies heavily on international partnerships and capital. The legal and reputational results of the bill if passed into law would trigger mass divestment as global entities flee, the capital flight would create a catastrophic liquidity vacuum undermining the Central Bank’s effort to bolster economic resilience and potentially triggering a systemic collapse of Uganda financial sector. The credit vacuum would starve “ATMS’ sectors of***



***necessary funding, effectively staling national growth and derailing Uganda's path towards its 2040 economic transformation***

The Committee was informed by the American Chamber of Commerce, the British Chamber of Commerce, French Chamber of Commerce, Netherland-Uganda Trade and Investment Platform that the Protection of Sovereignty Bill 2026 subjects every significant capital inflow, including routine inter company transfers, investment tranches, loan drawdowns and trade finance transactions to open-ended ministerial approval, which ministry has no INVESTMENT FUNCTION, sends a signal about Uganda's investment environment and that no ministerial statement can correct. They further submitted that Uganda's reputation as an investment destination begins from the moment the Bill is enacted—not when an approval is refused.

The Minority is of the view that despite ill-fated amendments proposed by the Learned Attorney General, on which the Majority report purports to rely on to misguide this House, the Committee was under duty to invite these same stakeholders to submit views confirming the consequences, if any still, that the proposed amendments would cause to the ECONOMY.

The request by the Minority to invite Bank of Uganda, Economic Policy Research Center (Makerere), National Planning Authority etc. was denied by the Co-Chairpersons of the Joint Committee who both figuratively behaved like pythons hurrying back into their hide outs after swallowing a fat lamb.

**FINDING**

The Minority finds the Certificate of financial implications accompanying the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 is incurably defective and therefore invalid, and leaves the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 without any leg to stand, the only conclusion being the Bill is now rendered NULL AND VOID ABNITIO-it must collapse.



## RECCOMENDATION

- (i) Reject the certificate of financial implication accompanying the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026.
- (ii) Refer the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 to the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development for proper scrutiny of the impact on the economy.
- (iii) Economist at the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development responsible for issuance of Certificate of Financial Implications be subjected to competency test and offered a refresher course.

### 3.3 FRAUDULENT SMUGGLING OF EXTRENOUS MATTERS INTO THE BILL

During the consideration of the Bill, it emerged through a Press Release under the social media handle of President Museveni, the same also widely circulated on the X handles of State House and Newvision (Government owned Newspaper) on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2026, that, President took note of the concerns of the stakeholders on the Bill. For the benefit of the House, the Minority reproduces the press release as here, under;

**“Fellow Ugandans, especially the Bazzukulu. Habari. Greetings to you.**

**Of recent, I have noticed a lot of orwaari (noise, kelele), regarding the Sovereignty Bill. Which Sovereignty Bill the rwaari about? The one I initiated in the Cabinet or another one? The Bill will stop FDIs (Foreign Direct Investments), support for religious bodies from abroad, Remittances from Ugandans working abroad, etc., etc. really!! That is not the Bill I initiated.**

**The Bill I initiated, was about what we fought for and what the whole of Africa fought for ever since 1900 when the whole of Africa, except for Ethiopia, have been shamefully colonized after 400 year of slave trade because of our**



egocentric Kings that were spending more energy causing wars among us than uniting us to defend ourselves.

Starting with the Afro-American Pan-Africanists such as Marcus Garvey and the ANC founded in 1912, the African Resistance, assisted by some other factors such as the support of the Socialist Countries of the USSR and China, finally defeated the colonial invasion with the freedom of South Africa in 1994. A whole century spent on that effort for survival as a free People.

It is the sovereignty that we were fighting for. Sovereignty in what? In policy decision-making. Policy decision-making on what issues? Policy decision = making on political issues (e.g., special women representation in Parliament or UPDF representation in Parliament); social issues (e.g., promotion of homosexuality or not); economic issues (e.g., privatization or not, return of Asian properties or not); diplomatic issues (e.g., taking sides on the issues of Ukraine-Russian war or remaining neutral); etc., etc.

As Mwalimu once said, Independence means the right to make our own mistakes if necessary and learn from them. Sovereignty means: "Please, mutuleke (leave us alone), so that we make our own decisions," Do not fund groups to influence our decisions as a country. As our Constitution covered it, we exercise our sovereignty regularly through elections and referendum (Article 1(4), Article 59 and 68 of the Constitution).

To all and sundry, please do not interfere by word, action or money in that effort. Policy and ideological decisions can make or break countries. Uganda had become a failed state because of the politics of identity (tribe, religion, gender-chauvinism) as opposed to politics of interest-(e.g., markets for products of the wealth creators).

The NRM and Ugandans have made choices on Politics, social issues, diplomatic issues, and economic issues over the last 40 years. None of them



**says: Do not send to Uganda or take out of Uganda money you have earned legally anywhere in World; do not receive or send out remittances from Ugandans working abroad. We run a free economy. Forex is bought and sold in private run Forex bureaus.**


**This is the strength of the Uganda economy. The freedom of the Private Sector compensates for the obstructions of the corrupt or non-patriotic public servants and political opportunities passing for Politicians.**

**With some traditional cattle keepers, I privately defended and resurrected the precious Ankole Cattle that the so-called experts of the neo-colonialism and colonialism, had said was "neither good for the beef or for milk". The Ankole cattle are now a big hit in the World. I salute H.E Ramaphosa for assisting us in promoting the Ankole cattle when he bought (took for nearly free) 43 cows from Kisozi.**

**Therefore, the NRM cannot countenance the interference with the freedom of movement of capital and money into or out of Uganda because that is our insurance against the corrupt public servants and politicians and our main instrument for growth and social-economic transformation. Uganda has thrived in spite of those traitors because of that policy.**

**I have talked to Hon. Hamson Obua and the Chairpersons of the relevant Parliamentary Committees to make the bill concentrate on the Sovereignty of policy-decisions and not meander in the areas of the freedom of Private enterprise transfers or private money transfers or church donations.**

**With regard to those who want to influence others, go back to Jesus. He said, in the Book of Mathew chapter 5 verse 16 that let your light so shine before men, that they see your good deeds and praise your Father in Heaven. Influence people by example and not by coercion or manipulation.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the name 'Omu' or similar, written in a cursive style.

**Long lice Africa.**

**Signed:**

**Yoweri K. Museveni**

**Ssaabalwany**

The Minority observed that the President, who is the Chairperson of Cabinet (Art..) wondered what happened to the Bill he initiated. In short, the President informed Ugandans that someone fraudulently inserted their own ideas into the Protection of Sovereignty Bill 2026. Clearly, the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 curtails Foreign Direct Investments, Support to Religious Bodies from abroad, Remittances from Ugandans working abroad, etc., etc.,

The submissions by BoU, Global Forum of Ugandans in Diaspora, Inter-Religious Council of Uganda, International Chamber of Commerce (American, British, French and Netherlands-Uganda Trade Investment Forum), Uganda Bankers Association clearly demonstrated that the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 curtails FDIs, support to Religious Bodies and Remittances from Ugandans working abroad.

The Minority proposal in the Committee to seek clarifications from the President on the Bill, in light of the press release was turned down. The Co-Chairpersons of the joint Committee instead ruled that the Committee does not take instructions from the President but rather from Parliament who referred the Bill to the Committee under **Rule 135** of the Rules of Procedure of Parliament.

In their ruling, the Co-Chairpersons of the joint committee decided that the Committee ignores and disregards the views of President, on the basis that the President didn't address his views to the Clerk to Parliament/Committee like the rest of the stakeholders.



The Minority observes that the ruling by the Co-Chairpersons of the Joint Committees are quite disturbing, for the reason that the Chairpersons are appointees of NRM to lead Committees in Parliament. Secondly, the President mentioned in the press release having spoken to the Chairpersons of the relevant Committees of Parliament on how to make the Bill concentrate on "Sovereignty of policy decision-making", whatever that means. Their blatant refusal to admit the guidance of the Head of State, Chairman of NRM and President of Uganda for the nearly 40 years and an elder of 82 years old, with a documented experience of undermining Sovereignty of Uganda with the help of foreigners between 1980-1986 denied the Committee an opportunity to appreciate the background and mischief that the proposed Bill is intended to address.

The Minority notes that the concerns of the President, to the extent that he questions the content of the Bill presented to Parliament is a matter of grave concern, which Parliament should not treat lightly. The Speaker of Parliament and the Joint Committee ought to have halted the processing of the Bill with immediate effect and formally referred it back to the President and his Cabinet to sort out their in-house issues on the Bill. Be that as it may, it is not yet late, Parliament, even in the midst of the reading of this report can halt any further proceedings with the Bill for the second reading.

The Minority recall a similar scenario in the financial year 2019/2020, where a Supplementary Budget on COVID-19 was presented to Parliament. It had an item of **UGX 10bn** for payments to MPs in the 10<sup>th</sup> Parliament. It was stated then, by the Ministry of Finance, Report of Budget Committee and Rt. Hon Speaker Rebecca Kadaga then that the President had cleared the payments. Hon. Karuhanga Gerald of Ntungamo Municipality and Hon Odur Jonathan of Erute County South (as they were then) objected during plenary debate, in a similar

manner as it is being done now but were not even allowed to, with a question put to defeat Minority report and further debate at the time.

The President then, who is still the President today and is due to be sworn-in for another term in a few days from now-Congratulations, came out openly and distanced himself from the authorizing the item to pay MPs UGX 20m each. Just like on the Sovereignty Bill 2026, he then stated that he initiated the supplementary which did not have the pay for the MPs. He wondered why the Parliament could not, if needed consulted him for any 'assistance". The rest is now history.

The Minority observes that no formal record has been availed to the Committee to warrant proceeding on a Bill that is tainted with questions marks from the President. In whose interest is Parliament now proceeding on this Bill? What explanations will Parliament/MPs give to the voters for proceeding on a Bill which has been questioned by the President? Is there any attempt to finish off, the legacy, if any is still left of the 11<sup>th</sup> Parliament in order to give the 12<sup>th</sup> Parliament a cleaner start?

Let us not fall into this obviously clear trap, Parliament is not going anywhere, only the memberships change and the new ones are here next week, eager to work for Uganda; they have all the time, in the world to decided on this Bill without any timeframe pressures.

Where such serious allegations, as those insinuated in the letter of the President is made, that a BILL different from one passed in cabinet was instead read in Parliament, any serious Parliament/Committee would STOP. A formal inquiry by the relevant authorities on the Bill would be the most logical course of action, that is, if the authorities have any logic at all.

## **FINDING**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'O. M.', is written in a cursive style.

- (I) The Minority finds that the Protection of Sovereignty Bill 2026 currently before Parliament is tainted with extraneous illegalities and fraud.
- (II) The Protection of Sovereignty Bill 2026 was drafted outside the scope and intentions of cabinet.

### **RECCOMENDATION**

- The minority recommends that Parliament refers back to Cabinet, the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026.
- Investigations be commenced to identify and prosecute the persons behind the fraudulent alterations to the Bill.

### **3.4 SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE OF UGANDA.**

The Minority observes that the Protection of Sovereignty Bill 2026 is premised on the Sovereignty of the People of Uganda.

**Article 1 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda** is conclusive on the Sovereignty of the People.

**Art. 1 (1)** ALL power belongs to the People who shall exercise their sovereignty in accordance with this constitution.

**Art 1(2)** Without limiting the effect of clause (1) of this Article, all authority in the State emanates from the people of Uganda and the people shall be governed through their will and consent.

**Art. 1(3)** All power and authority of Government and its organs derive from this Constitution, which in turn derives its authority from the people who consent to be governed in accordance with this Constitution

**Art. 1(4)** The people shall express their will and consent on who shall govern and how they should be govern, through regular, free and fair elections of their



representatives or through referenda. (**Refer to the release by President Yoweri Museveni on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2026**).

It is therefore clear that **Sovereignty** is about the people expressing their **WILL** and **CONSENT** on **WHO** (NRM for now) and **HOW** (Manifestos) and **THROUGH** (Elections 2026, 2031, 2036...). This is what Ugandans, through the Constitution decided already. If anyone has news ideas on the need to introduce or enlarge the scope or any other aspects of Sovereignty, the proper procedure is to amend, through a Bill the Constitution to expand the scope to cover such new ideas like Sovereignty of policy decision-making with full participation of the people of Uganda.

The concerns that Political Parties maybe influenced by Foreigners to interfere with the Sovereignty of the People of Uganda is superfluous. Such influences are still subject to the **WILL AND CONSENT** of Ugandans through their VOTE (elections). Hypothetically, assuming National Unity Platform (NUP), Forum for Democratic Change (FDC), Alliance for National Transformation (ANT) and the other parties that field contested in the 2026 general elections received funding from foreigners for purpose of influencing the Sovereignty of the People of Uganda and the NRM did or did not!, it can be presumed, that Foreign Influence did not have any effect on the WILL and CONSENT of the people of Uganda. Unless, there is an admission that the WINNER of the 2026 elections was different from the NRM as declared by the Electoral Commission.

Therefore, the Minority observes that Sovereignty is a right protected by the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda. There is no power conferred upon the Government to interfere by way of grant or denial, that inherent right of the people of Uganda. The Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 is a disguised and misguided attempt to develop a new playing ground for politics in Uganda. That intention, if any to settle political dissent and close any space for exercise of

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the initials 'DM' or similar, located at the bottom right of the page.

political, civic, economic rights and freedoms must not be accepted in order to preserve the current multi-party dispensation protected by the Constitution.

### **Finding**

The Minority is of the view that any legislation purporting to operationalize Chapter 1 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda-to wit Articles 1, 2 and 3 by Parliament alone, without the participation of the people of Uganda is prohibited under Article 260 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda.

The majority report relied on the authority of **Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. (1841-1932), a renown American jurist** who interpreted sovereignty as the ultimate practical power of the state to govern and maintain order grounded in historical and societal necessity for survival.

The majority report has inflicted an injury on themselves. Why get persuaded by an idea of an American, Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., a foreigner? Isn't this the very spirit of the Protection of Sovereignty is purportedly fighting, "foreign influence"? Uganda already defined what their Sovereignty of the People entails in **Article 1 of the Constitution.**

The fact that the majority committee seeks to rely on external influence to persuade Parliament to agree that Sovereignty can be tampered with, demonstrates that the world is now a global village and it maybe more reasonable for Government to inculcate the desired safeguards against foreign influence by; - educating all Uganda here in Uganda, stopping politicians and public servants from stealing public funds to buy properties in America, Europe or investing abroad, prohibiting treatment abroad on tax public funds, hosting foreigners in State House on daily basis amongst others.

If the NRM Government is serious about true sovereignty, why accept Pinneti, a foreigner to have influence over Uganda tax payer's money. Why allow Uganda



to fall into the influence of a one Terrance Howard about some '**Chemical Engineering**', **inconsistency with the math, grand unified equation and putting it into geometry, putting props and invention of new form of flights into Uganda to replace the drones, helicopters, planes; all summarized as GEOMETRY OF HYDROGEN.... defend the Sovereignty of a peaceful place? What a joke of the concept of Sovereignty?**

Is Uganda even sovereign when sensitive data of its citizens can be given away to foreigners by a stroke of pen? What about a foreign country dumping unwanted persons in their Country and hardcore criminals into Uganda without Parliamentary approval? Was there a referendum on the same or some few people usurped the Sovereignty and now wants to formalize it through this the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026?

### **Recommendation**

The Minority recommends to Parliament to reject the disguised unconstitutional amendments to Article 1 of the Constitution of the republic of Uganda through the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026. The mischief of restricting foreign funding to Political Parties, NGOs and Activists for political activities can be adequately regulated through the existing pieces of legislations.

### **3.5 TOTAL REJECTION OF THE BILL BY STAKEHOLDERS**

During the consideration of the Bill by the Joint Committee, 3 days of public hearings too place at Parliament. In the 3 days, stakeholders including those from within Government appeared before the Committee. An overwhelming majority of the stakeholders rejected the Bill, and were unanimous in their view that the existing pieces of legislation, if well implemented even without amendments is capable of solving the worries of the Executive. The stakeholders were of the view that, where any gaps exist, then specific amendments to those laws would suffice. The Minority takes note and attaches serious weight to the submissions of Bank of



Uganda, Uganda Human Rights Commission, Financial Intelligence Authority, National Planning Authority. Also, of serious weight, are submission of Ugandans who appeared in their individual capacities, them being direct target of the Protection of Sovereignty Bill.

Only two stakeholders, appeared and indicated their full support to the Bill. Prominent amongst the supporter of this Bill in the public hearing was Hon. Nsibambi Yusuf, Member of Parliament, Mawokota County South Constituency. The Hon. Nsibambi stated;

***"Mr. Chairman and Honorable Members, except for the areas highlighted in this memorandum as not adopted I do associate myself with the bill in its entirety without modification. I also do associate myself specifically with the Attorney General's memorandum presented before this committee except where I defer in this memorandum"***

The Minority observed that Hon. Nsibambi listed 6 general areas for the Committee to look at.

- (i) Powers of the Minister to make regulations
- (ii) The Cabinet on issues of approvals, consents
- (iii) What Constitutes Government policy and access to the policy
- (iv) The social media freedoms and the Computer Age
- (v) Diaspora involvement, influence and stakeholders and the informal money in-flows and issues of privacy.
- (vi) Regulations of initiators, influences of subservient information.

The Minority observed that the Hon. Nsibambi having associated himself fully with the Bill in its entirety, and having failed to highlight the areas not adopted demonstrated double standards by turning around to list not 1 but 6 areas for the Committee to look at. In fact, the earlier energy and vigilance exhibited by the Hon. Nsibambi in exercising his rights an MP to sit in the Committee proceedings



abruptly withered away slowly as stakeholder after stakeholder poured cold water on the Bill. The Committee was lucky that the power supply to the Conference room A where the public hearings took place was not connected by the Hon. Nsibambi.

“The Minority has captured some of eye-catching concluding remarks by the underlisted stakeholders.

NO	STAKEHOLDER	CONCLUDING REMARKS
01	Bank of Uganda	True national sovereignty is built on economic strength and financial independence. While the goal of protecting national interest is legitimate, the Protection of sovereignty Bill 2026, as currently drafted, risks reversing three decades of successful financial development through liberalization. By adopting these technical refinements, Parliament can safe guard the nation.
02	Uganda Human Rights Commission	Parliament is urged to reconsider and amend the Bill to ensure that it achieves its objective without compromising human rights and democratic principles
03	National Planning Authority	The bill will directly affect the implementation of NDP IV, the remaining Vision 2040 milestones and the ten-fold growth strategy.
04	Financial Intelligence Authority	The bill will cause unintended consequences that shall increase informal and illegal channels, reduction of remittances, economic



		disruption, overlapping regulation and de-risking financial exclusion.
05	Law Development Center	The bill undermines legal certainty, weakens popular sovereignty under Article 1 and disrupts economic flows and investment.
06	International Center for Religious Advocacy and Development	The bill in its current form is inconsistent with the constitution.
07	Payment Systems Providers Association	The bill affects the financial future and livelihood of millions of citizens.
08	National Christian Students Association	The bill is unconstitutional for lack of clarity and compliance with the constitution.
09	Kyeeyo Association Uganda	The bill may facilitate increased human trafficking, money laundering, corruption, unemployment, decreased entrepreneurship, deteriorating labor migration sector and misalignment of Uganda citizenship status.
10	Federation of All Uganda Migrant Workers' Association	The bill may facilitate increased human trafficking, money laundering, corruption, unemployment, decreased entrepreneurship, deteriorating labor migration sector and misalignment of Uganda citizenship status.
11	Foundation of Ugandan Joint Migrant Workers	The bill may facilitate increased human trafficking, money laundering, corruption, unemployment, decreased entrepreneurship,



		deteriorating labor migration sector and misalignment of Uganda citizenship status.
12	ALTX East Africa	The bill should obtain further reclassification from other regulatory agencies i.e Capital Markets Authority.
13	Quinto Ojok (An Advocate)	The bill is constitutionally vulnerable and democratically hazardous that it would attract successful constitutional challenge.
14	Sebanja & Co Advocates	That the bill is unconstitutional.
15	Innovation Village Hub	The bill enable environment for enterprise development.
16	Ryan Feta Esiku	The bill should clearly define "agent of foreign influence", protect legitimate diaspora engagements, transparency in oversight and ensure structure consultations with diaspora.
17	Uganda Small Scale Industries Association	The Bill needs more consultations.
18	Center for Policy Analysis	Total rejection of the bill and recommend strengthening coordination and enforcement of the existing laws.
19	Association of Uganda Tour Operators Ltd	The bill should be balanced with sustaining economic growth, preserving investor confidence and maintaining constructive engagement with international community.

20	Leader of Opposition	Total rejection of the bill in its entirety.
21	Alliance for National Transformation	Rejection of the bill completely.
22	Uganda Global Forum	Rejects the Bill but if not, request for 6 amendments be considered.
23	Inter-Religious Council of Uganda	Reject the Bill in its current form due to possible Constitutional violations.
24	National Organization of Trade Unions	The Bill in its current form poses serious risk to labor rights, social dialogue and economic development, exempt trade union work
25	Yvonne Mpambara	The Bill represents a draconian and unconstitutional leap towards state controlled intellectual and economic life and should be withdrawn
26	International NGOs Country Director Network for Uganda	Recommend Bill is withdrawn or consideration be effective in implementing existing legal frameworks.
27	American Chambers of Commerce Uganda	Adopt 10 amendments proposed.
28	British Chamber of Commerce Uganda	Adopt 10 amendments proposed.
29	French Chamber of Commerce Uganda	Adopt 10 amendments proposed.



30	Netherlands-Uganda Trade and Investment Platform	Adopt 10 amendments proposed.
31	Women's Probono Initiative	Parliament should halt and withdraw the Bill.
32	National Unity Platform	We accordingly call upon the committee to reject the Bill in its entirety and recommend withdrawal to the House.
33	Immam Ibban Iddih Kasozi (on behalf of 24 Uganda Muslim Associations)	The Bill must be withdrawn and reconsidered to reflect the unique religious realities.
34	Uganda Medical Association	Application of this Bill to the medical fraternity is unconstitutional, misappropriate and contrary to public interest.
35	Network of Women in Politics	We therefore humbly request the committee to Bin the Bill
36	Public Affairs Center – Teso sub Region	We therefore respectfully urge Parliament to decline the Bill.
37	Hon. Dr. Miria Matembe	Respectfully urge you Honorable Members of Parliament to REJECT THIS BILL AND END YOUR TENURE WELL ON THE SIDE OF THE CONSTITUTION AND PEOPLE.

38	National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda	Considering the catastrophic effects of the Bill to persons with disabilities, we recommend the Bill be put aside and consultations continue.
39	Citizens from Bunyoro sub Region	The Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 is unconstitutional.
40	Defenders Protection Initiative	Either reject or subject the it to rigorous constitutional scrutiny and reforms proposed herein before any further progress.
41	Kayingi Muddu Yisito & Others (Citizens and Stakeholders of the Buganda Region	The Bill is withdrawn for further stakeholder consultation to replace to rephrase vague provisions.
42	People's Front for Freedom	We do submit that the most honorable thing Maj. Gen. (Rtd) Kahinda Otafiire, Minister of Internal Affairs should do to save Government and Uganda from embarrassment is to withdraw this draconian Bill.
43	Hon. Nsibambi Yusuf	Associate with the Bill in its entirety.
44	United Nations Uganda	The UNCT remains available to provide technical input, comparative perspective, and dialogue aimed at ensuring that Uganda's so
45	Citizens (30) from Bugisu	We therefor urge policymakers to reconsider the bill and prioritize the interest rights and welfare of all Ugandans.

46	Fr. Charles Oyo	That the Rt. Hon Speaker of Parliament exercises the constitutional authority vested in that office to ensure that the Bill is not rushed through Parliament without adequate public consultations, Regulatory Impact assessment and comprehensive committee scrutiny.
47	Uganda Bankers Association	We recommend that the Sovereignty Bill be reconsidered and that the time for better and wider consultations is given.
48	Uganda People's Congress	Our considered view is that the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 is unnecessary and should be withdrawn.
49	Women's Movement and the Wider Civil Society Fraternity in Uganda (Patricia Munabi Babiha)	On this basis, we strongly recommend that this Bill be withdrawn as it fails to meet basic constitutional standards and professional legislative drafting requirements.
50	Centre for Constitutional Governance	Our prayers: that Honorable Members of Parliament reject this Bill in totality.
51	Hon. Dr. Eunice Otuko Apio (on behalf of the section of Lango sub Region)	The combined effect of clauses 1 and 11 may significantly alter the practical enjoyment of the Constitutional provisions on Citizenship and Political rights.



52	Civic Advisory Hub	For the reason above, and as elaborated in the attached legal analysis, we urge this Honorable Joint Committee to recommend the complete withdrawal of the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026.
53	FIDA Uganda	On a whole, we recommend that the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 be withdrawn, and that focus be placed on implementing existing laws.
54	Creative Industry Coalition (Hon. Racheal Magoola)	The Bill's current drafting inadvertently captures Uganda's entire creative and cultural sector...producing consequences that Parliament did not intend.
55	National Association of Broadcasters	Reject the Bill in its entirety for being unconstitutional, fundamentally incompatible with free press and democratic governance.
56	Action for Liberty and Economic Development	The bill is a threat to the stability, prosperity and constitutional order in Uganda.
57	Uganda Network of AIDS Service Organization	The bill is unconstitutional, undermines freedoms, public health imperatives and development realities.
58	Kampala Arcaders Traders Association (KATA)	That the business community views the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 as an



		economic sabotage bill that prioritizes absolute control over national prosperity.
59	Association of Microfinances in Uganda	The bill should consider the potential impact on financial inclusion, investment flows, and continued growth of microfinance sector.
60	Financial Technology Service Providers Association	The bill criminalizes ordinary operations of licensed Fintechs, obstruct cross-border payment infrastructure and deter foreign investment.

The report of the Majority conveniently left out views of many stakeholders who submitted memorandum on the Bill. In fact, the Minority unsuccessfully requested for the full list of stakeholders, including who did not appear for the public hearings. From the above summary, the Minority observed that the BILL has been rejected by Ugandans. The question therefore is, in whose is the Protection of Sovereignty Bill being rushed?

**4 Unconstitutionality-Articles 21, 26, 27, 28,29,38, 40,43, 44, 59**

Article 26 of the constitution provides for right to own property either as an individual or in association. The minority observes that this bill takes away the right to own property and the right to protest mandatory takeover of personal property disguised as disrupting government policy. If an individual has their land and government wants to donate the land to an investor, the owner who resists may be termed as one disrupting government policy, where the government policy is to donate land to foreign investors.

The minority observes that the bill intends to prohibit ownership of property in association by creating another layer on registration as an agent of foreigner.

The minority observes that Article 29 of the constitution provides for freedom of thought, conscience and belief. The provision of the constitution protects the freedom of expression, assembly, and association.

## **5. Uganda's International Legal Obligations and Commitment**

### **Applicable International Instruments**

Uganda is a State Party to a number of international instruments that are directly relevant to the scope and implementation of the Bill, including:

1. Charter of the United Nations (1945)
2. Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations (1946) and the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialised Agencies (1947)
3. Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees (1967)
4. International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (1966)
5. International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)
6. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969)

Under these instruments, Uganda has undertaken binding obligations, including to:

- i. Perform its treaty obligations in good faith and refrain from invoking provisions of domestic law as justification for failure to perform a treaty obligation (Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, Article 26, 27, and 46)
- ii. Reaffirm that cooperation among States is consistent with sovereign equality and non-intervention when based on consent and mutual agreement (UN General Assembly Resolution 2625(V) – Declaration on friendly Relations, 1970)



- iii. Respect the principles of equality and non-discrimination and enable freedoms of expression, association, and participation in public affairs, subject only to restrictions that are lawful, necessary, and proportionate (International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, Articles 2, 19, 22, 25 and 26)

## **6. International Obligations Relating to Civic Space**

### **a) Freedom of Association, Expression, and Participation**

Under international human rights law, the right to freedom of association includes the ability of associations to seek, receive, and use financial and other resources. This principle is recognized under Article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and affirmed in authoritative standards such as the 1998 United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Defenders.

Any restriction on freedoms of expression or association must satisfy the cumulative requirements of legality, legitimate aim, and necessity and proportionality in a democratic society, as set out in Articles 19(3) and 22(2) of the ICCPR.

b) The right to participate in public affairs, guaranteed in Article 25 of the ICCPR, cannot be considered in a vacuum. The effective exercise of this right requires an environment where all human rights, in particular the rights to equality and non-discrimination, freedom of expression and association are fully respected and enjoyed by all individuals.

### **c) Differential Treatment Based on Source of Funding**

Article 26 of the ICCPR guarantees equality before the law and prohibits discrimination unless differential treatment pursues a legitimate aim and is reasonable and proportionate.



The Bill introduces differentiated regulatory burdens based primarily on the foreign origin of funding, without clear demonstration of necessity or proportionality. In practice, this may disproportionately impact organizations engaged in human rights, governance, public health, and humanitarian work, many of which operate under arrangements agreed with Government institutions.

#### **d) Right to Privacy and Protection of Personal Data**

Article 17 of the ICCPR protects the right to privacy. Interference with this right must pursue a legitimate objective, and be necessary and proportionate.

The Bill permits the processing and disclosure of sensitive personal and financial information, including through monthly reporting and public disclosure mechanisms, while not providing for consent mechanisms, notification to data subjects, or limitation to the use of data once collected. In the absence of clear safeguards, this may constitute an impermissible interference with privacy rights.

The Minority observes that **Article 38 of the Constitution** provides for civil rights and activities. Every Uganda has a right to participate in government affairs by themselves or through his or her representative. The Article further provides for Ugandans participate in influencing government policies. Therefore, the bill seeks to infringe the participation of Ugandans in government affairs in the disguise of creating an agent of a foreigner in contravention of Article 38. What happens if a Ugandan appoints a non-citizen as their representative to influence government policies? Therefore, why condition a Uganda through prohibitive registration process? Does non-registration over-ride the constitution provision under Article? The minority asserts that the bill is intended to overthrow this provision of the constitution.

#### **Contravention International treaties**



**Article 123 of the Constitution of Uganda** provides for entering into international treaties between Uganda and any international organization or body, in respect of any matter. Therefore, Uganda has gone ahead to have bilateral investment and trading partners that collectively account for a substantial of foreign direct investment, trade finance and development capital presently at work in Uganda's economy.

The bill potentially affects the already existing treaties, conversions and agreements with international entities or bodies, namely;

The American Chamber of Commerce Uganda (AmCham Uganda) – The body represents American and international businesses operating in Uganda, with membership operating in different sectors like financial services, energy, agribusiness, technology, healthcare, and professional services.

The British Chamber of Commerce Uganda (BCC Uganda); The body represents British and international businesses in Uganda with major focus on trade, investment and bilateral commercial and development relationships between Uganda and Britain. They informed the committee that they have a bilateral investment treaty with Uganda that provides specific legal protections for British investors in Uganda. That the legal protections in the treat include fair and equitable treatment and access to investor-state arbitration.

The French Chamber of Commerce Uganda (FCC Uganda); The committee was informed that this is an international body operating within the legal framework of the **Uganda-European Union Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA)**. That the FCC Uganda represents French and Francophone business operating in Uganda.

The Netherlands – Uganda Trade and Investment Platform (NUTIP); The representatives of NUTIP informed the committee that the Netherlands is among Uganda's most significant bilateral investment partners a framework that is strengthened under the Netherlands-Uganda Bilateral Investment Treaty.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the initials 'An' or similar, located at the bottom right of the page.

They further informed the committee that The Netherlands Development Finance Company (FMO) is one of the most active development finance institutions in Uganda's private sector.

The Creative Industry Coalition informed the committee that Uganda is party to the **Universal Copyright Convention (UCC)**, which under **Article III** prohibits requiring formalities as a condition of copyright protection for literary works. The committee was informed by the Defenders Protection initiative that Uganda is signatory to the **African Charter on Human and People's Rights** that restrictions on civil society funding must be necessary, proportionate and non-discriminatory and therefore, the state should ensure an enabling environment for civil society organizations as a component of democratic governance.

The members of the International Chambers of Commerce from different countries informed the committee of the potential challenges and what would be at stake if this Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 is considered. The Bill affects significant capital inflow, inter-company transfers, investment tranches, loan drawdowns, and trade finance transactions.

The Minority is alive to the practical experiences of ordinary Ugandans when dealing with bureaucracies. Except for Uganda Driving Licensing System, Uganda Registration Services Bureau and a few others, the hell of time Ugandans spent on chasing for certifications, approvals, licenses etc., and feedback generally is too frustrating.

The Minority observes an attempt, through revision of the Bill, disguised as amendments to purport to target only Agents of Foreigners. It is deceptive for the Majority Committee to ignore plain and obvious facts about the private sector set up of Uganda. The big players in the private spaces are all foreign owned and therefore, while appearing to be exempted, in their corporate personalities, any Ugandan working for them is potentially a foreign agent.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be a stylized 'A' followed by a flourish.

What happens to that Ugandan, working for a foreign company who, in their own right and spaces participates in politics, direct or indirectly? What happens to a Uganda, who donates his hard-earned money from his/her employment in a foreign company? These and many more are the very reasons why the rushed to pass the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026, without proper assessment and studies is ill-fate

## **CONCLUSION**


This Minority report conclude that the Protection of Sovereignty Bill, 2026 has been rushed for presentation in Parliament and is tainted with Unconstitutional provisions, dire economic, social and political consequences. The Minority recommends that Parliament be pleased to refer back the Bill to the Executive for purpose of property assessments and consultations.

Without prejudice to the recommendations proposed above, should Parliament insist on proceeding on the on the bill, the Minority shall propose amendments at the committee stage for consideration by the House.

I beg to report

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the initials 'A' followed by a flourish.

**SIGNATURE SHEET FOR THE MINORITY REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON DEFENCE AND INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL  
AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS ON THE PROTECTION OF SOVEREIGNTY BILL, 2026.**

NO.	NAME	CONSTITUENCY	SIGNATURE
1	G D UR Jambhan	EROTE SOUTH	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

## **Key issues from the committee report**

### **Introduction**

The committee misses out on a number of issues and here are some of the key issues

### **Commencement clause**

The Bill and the committee report do not have the commencement clause. This creates uncertainty as to when this will commence. As a custom, when this parliament creates a law it provides for when and how it will commence

### **Recommendation**

Introduce a commencement clause to read as follows

1. This Act shall commence on a date as the minister shall be statutory instrument declare

### **Justification**

To create certainty when the Bill will come into force.

### **Definition of disruptive activities**

In the definition of disruptive activities, the Committee did not consider the fact that the words "acts prejudicial or threatening" to the security of Uganda under paragraph (a) is vague and do not provide legal clarity.

The Minority report proposes that acts prejudicial to, or threatening the security of, Uganda be defined.

### **Recommendation**

We recommend that a new definition of acts prejudicial or acts that threaten the security of Uganda be included, to read as follows

***Acts prejudicial to security or acts threatening the security of Uganda include;***

- (a) The physical or digital impairment of military installations, equipment, or national defense communications.***
- (b) The unauthorized acquisition or dissemination of classified intelligence that endangers national territorial integrity.***
- (c) Participation in political campaigns by a foreigner or a foreign entity in Uganda – refer to the political parties and organizations***

### **Justification**

1. To align the Bill with the Constitution
2. For clarity

### **Introduction of the definition of government policy**

The committee introduces a definition of government policy which provides that **"Government policy" means a statement, decision or actions of government on how a sector is regulated or governed, issued in accordance with the Constitution and laws of Uganda.**

The definition is broad and vague. It can be used to make any statement by a minister or government official; this goes beyond what Article 111(2) envisages as a government



policy. Article 111 limits the policy making role to the cabinet, and only the cabinet can make a policy.

#### **Recommendation**

Replace the meaning of government policy with the following

***“Government Policy” means government plans, principles, guidelines, or rules adopted or approved by the Cabinet as policy to guide the management of a particular sector in the country***

#### **Justification**

To align the Bill with the Constitution and ensure clarity

#### **Introduction of the definition of the interest of Uganda**

The committee introduces a definition of "interest of Uganda," which is defined as the interests of Uganda; the definition is vague since the interests of Ugandans are not universal and cannot be the same, and not every interest of Uganda can be said to be an interest of the country. For example, the interests of robbers, thieves, and criminals, though they remain Ugandans, their interests cannot be said to be the interests of Uganda

#### **Recommendation**

Delete the definition of “interest of Uganda”

#### **Justification**

To remove ambiguity

#### **Prohibition on the development of policy**

The committee in Clause 7(4) provides a prohibition for an agent of a foreigner to develop a policy without cabinet approval. The Bill does not define the word policy and only attempts to define the words “Government Policy”. If this clause is referring to policy generally, it would be considered ambiguous since private entities, such as companies, tend to develop policies to enable them to operate. If the clause is referring to the development of a government policy, it will still be vague because, by definition, a government policy is one that has been developed and approved by the cabinet in line with Article 111 of the Constitution. For any document to be called a government policy, such a document has to have been approved by the cabinet. It is therefore not possible for a private individual to develop a government policy without cabinet approval. This makes the clause redundant

#### **Recommendation**

Delete sub clause (4) since it is redundant

#### **Justification**

For clarity

#### **The Minister’s power to make regulations for the development of government policy**

Sub clause (5) of clause 7 gives the minister powers to develop regulations and procedures for developing government policy. Under clause 1, the minister is the minister responsible for internal affairs. This creates some sort of “super minister” who has taken over the role of the Prime Minister in coordinating government agencies. The development of such guidelines should ideally be a responsibility of the Prime Minister



**Recommendation**

Delete sub clause (5)

**Justification**

To ensure harmony in roles of different cabinet ministers and head of government business who is the prime minister

**Offence of hindering, frustrating or disrupting government programs**

Under sub clause (3) of clause 8, the committee recommends an offence that prohibits an agent of a foreigner from hindering, frustrating, or disrupting the implementation of a government policy. The provision is vague insofar as it creates an offence without prescribing what acts or omissions amount to hindering, frustrating or disrupting the implementation of government programs. The provision may also hinder genuine citizen challenges to government programs. For example, a citizen who goes to court to oppose the construction of a road through his land without compensation can be considered to be hindering a government program, and yet such a citizen is exercising his or her right under the Constitution.

The committee and the minister have not demonstrated that it has been possible for a person to hinder or frustrate the government in implementing its projects.

In sub clause (4), the Bill prohibits an agent of a foreigner from implementing a government policy unless he or she has received approval. It should be remembered that agents of foreigners under this Act are actually citizens who have represented foreigners. The clause, therefore, denies citizens the right to implement their own government policies. The clause is also likely to affect persons who benefit from projects such as schools or hospitals constructed by religious groups, individuals, or NGOs with support from outside Uganda.

**Recommendation**

Delete sub clauses (3) and (4)

**Justification**

1. For clarity
2. To align the Bill with the Constitution

**Promotion of foreign policy**

Sub clause (4) of 9 provides that an agent of a foreigner shall not promote any foreign policy that contravenes subsection (1). Under clause 1, a foreigner includes an individual, a company or NGOs incorporated outside Uganda. This means the clause presupposes that an individual or a company can have a "foreign policy". This creates ambiguity since it is unlikely anyone other than a government can have a foreign policy. The Bill seems to be banning any form of policy, private or government, developed by a foreigner. This creates ambiguity and may be difficult to enforce.

Under sub clause (5) the Minister shall make regulations on how the government will adopt foreign policies. This is a role preserved for the cabinet under Article 111 of the Constitution and the Prime Minister as leader of government business under Article 108A.

**Recommendation**

Delete sub clauses (4) and (5)



### **Justification**

1. To align the Bill with the Constitution
2. To remove ambiguity

### **Soliciting of funds to promote policy**

Clause 10(2) prohibits an agent of a foreigner from soliciting funds to engage in activities that aim at promoting a foreign policy unless such a policy has been adopted by the cabinet. The provision of the Bill undermines research and academic freedom provided for under Article 29 of the Constitution. Ideally, all policies are promoted through research and later adopted by the country after research and engagement of stakeholders. This will undermine citizen discussion of any form of policy reforms that may be good for the country

### **Recommendation**

Delete sub clause (2)

### **Justification**

To align the clause with the Constitution

### **Interference with elections**

Clause 11 prohibits interference with elections in Uganda. In sub clause (3), the committee proposes that an agent of a foreigner who influences the election process commits a crime. It should be noted that the definition of agent of a foreigner includes Ugandans who work for or on behalf of a foreigner. This means the clause suspends the right of these Ugandans to participate in elections. This violates Article 59 of the Constitution, which provides that a citizen of Uganda has a right to vote and be voted for; it also violates Article 38 of the Constitution, which gives a citizen the right to take actions to influence governance, and Article 1(2), which provides for the sovereignty of the people who exercise it through elections.

### **Recommendation**

Delete sub clause (3) of clause 11

### **Justification**

To align the Bill with the Constitution

### **Economic sabotage**

Clause 13 on the prohibition of economic sabotage, whereas the committee introduces an important aspect of knowledge, it leaves out the important aspect of intention. Offences such as economic sabotage require *mens rea*, which is the criminal intent. The person must carry out an act or omission with the knowledge and intention that such an act will result in damage to the economy.

The Bill is also vague insofar as it does not define what amounts to weakening, undermining or causing economic disruption. These acts need to be on a big scale to be able to affect the economy as a whole and not individual acts.

The prohibition of publication undermines freedom of speech guaranteed under Article 29 of the Constitution. This right was confirmed in Charles Onyango Obbo & Andrew Mujuni



Mwenda v. Attorney General (2004). Generally, the world has moved from criminalizing speech to civil punishment where speech is involved.

### **Recommendation**

Replace clause 13 with the following

#### **13. Economic sabotage**

- (i) An agent of a foreigner who, with the intent to undermine the economic stability or financial security of the Republic of Uganda, performs any act or omission that results in significant injury to the national economy commits a crime known as economic sabotage.**
  
- (ii) For purposes of this section, the following acts or omissions shall be considered economic sabotage;**
  - (a) Coordinated acts intended to disrupt the generation, transmission, or distribution of electricity, water, or fuel, thereby paralyzing industrial and commercial activity.**
  - (b) The dissemination of false information or the execution of fraudulent transactions that result in a collapse in the national banking system or the securities exchange.**
  - (c) The deliberate withholding of food, water, electricity, medicine, or fuel from the market to create artificial scarcity, inflate prices, or incite public unrest that results in economic paralysis.**
  - (d) Orchestrated cyber-attacks on national tax administration systems, customs databases, or electronic payment gateways to prevent the collection of public revenue.**

### **Justification**

1. To align the Bill with the Constitution
2. For clarity

### **Payment to agents of a foreigner**

The majority report substitutes sub clause (1) of clause 25 with the following text

(1) A supervised institution shall not pay out any money to an agent of a foreigner without the agent of a foreigner –

- (a) declaring the source of funds; and
- (b) submitting proof of declaration of funds.

The committee goes ahead and replaces sub clause (3) with the following

“A supervised institution that contravenes subsection (1), commits an offence and is liable, on conviction, to a fine not exceeding two hundred thousand currency points.

The above provisions do not require *mens rea* or any wrongdoing on the part of the institution. Practically, it is difficult for a supervised institution to know who an agent of a foreigner is, this is because they do not have access to registered agents of a foreigner and cannot tell who is and who is not, unless the person volunteers the information. This will make it difficult for financial institutions to operate



Issues related to suspicious financing are already provided for under S. 9 of the Anti Money Laundering Act, 2013. There is no need to repeat this provision

**Recommendation**

Delete sub clauses (3) and (4)

**Justification**

It is difficult to enforce, and the issues are already provided for under the Anti Money Laundering Act.

**Transition clause**

The Bill and the Majority report do not have a transition clause. This creates uncertainty, especially for transactions that have happened before the coming into force of this Act. Introduce a new clause 31 to read as follows

**31. Transition**

***Notwithstanding the commencement of this Act, any contract, financial transaction, investment agreement, or commercial obligation validly entered into by a Foreigner or a Foreign Agent prior to the date of the coming into force of this Act shall:***

- (1) Remain in force and effect according to its original terms and conditions;***
- (2) Continue to be governed by the laws in place at the time of its execution; and***
- (3) Not be deemed a prohibited solely by virtue of the enactment of this Act.***

**Justification**

For clarity and to ensure a smooth transition

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the initials 'Ow' or similar, located at the bottom of the page.