



MINISTRY OF LEGAL & CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

*c/o 1 DEVON ROAD, KINGSTON 10 & 61 CONSTANT SPRING ROAD, KINGSTON 10
JAMAICA*

Telephone Nos.: (876) 927-9941-3, 929-8880-5 & 927-4101-3 (Minister & Permanent Secretary)
(876) 906-4923-31 (Legal Reform Department & Law Revision Secretariat)
(876) 906-1717 (Office of the Parliamentary Counsel)

ANY REPLY OR SUBSEQUENT REFERENCE TO THIS COMMUNICATION SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO THE PERMANENT SECRETARY

MINUTES

25th Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee (CRC)

Venue: Jamaica House Banquet Hall

Date: October 18, 2023

Time: 10:00am

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Prayer
3. National Pledge
4. Apologies for Absence/Lateness
5. Confirmation of Agenda
6. Confirmation of Minutes
 - 24th Minutes of the CRC
7. Matters Arising from the Minutes
8. Phase 1 Reform Work Programme
9. Matters for Deliberation and Recommendation (cont'd)
 - Office of the President
 - i. Type/Form of President
 - ii. Selection Process for the President
 - iii. Qualification for the Office of the President
 - iv. Powers of the President

- v. Term Limit
- vi. Disqualification of President

10. Any Other Business

- Report from the Public Engagement and Communications Sub-Committee
- **CRC Budget**

11. Date and Time of Next Meeting

12. Adjournment

***Amendments to the Agenda**

ATTENDEES:

- Honourable Marlene Malahoo Forte, KC, JP, MP (Chairman)
- Ambassador Rocky Meade, CD, JP, PhD (Co-Chairman – Office of the Prime Minister)
- Dr Derrick McKoy, CD, KC (Attorney General of Jamaica) via video link
- Senator Hon. Thomas Tavares-Finson, OJ, CD (President of the Senate and Commissioner of the Electoral Commission of Jamaica)
- Mr Anthony Hylton, CD, MP (Parliamentary Opposition – House of Representatives)
- Senator Ransford Braham, CD, KC (Government Senator)
- Dr the Hon. Lloyd Barnett, OJ (National Constitutional Law Expert)
- Mr. Hugh Small, KC (Consultant Counsel and Nominee of the Leader of the Parliamentary Opposition)
- Dr Elaine McCarthy (Chairman – Jamaica Umbrella Groups of Churches)
- Dr David Henry (Wider Society – Faith-based)
- Dr Nadeen Spence (Civil Society – Social and Political Commentator)
- Mr Sujae Boswell (Youth Advisor)
- Professor Richard Albert (International Constitutional Law Expert – University of Texas at Austin) via video link

Apologies for Absence

- Senator Donna Scott-Mottley (Parliamentary Opposition – Senate)
- Mrs Laleta Davis Mattis, CD, JP (National Council on Reparations)

Secretariat**Ministry of Legal and Constitutional Affairs**

- Mr Wayne O. Robertson, JP, Permanent Secretary
- Ms. Judith Grant, Chief Parliamentary Counsel
- Mr Christopher Harper, Senior Constitutional Reform Officer (Actg.)
- Ms Roxene Nickle, Advisor/Consultant
- Ms Nastacia McFarlane, Director, Corporate Communication and Public Relations
- Mr Makene Brown, Legal Officer

- Mr Ivan Godfrey, Legal Education Officer (Actg.)
- Mr Winston Lowe, Public Relations Officer
- Ms Shaedane Facey, Strategic Planner
- Ms Christal Parris-Campbell, Assistant Parliamentary Counsel
- Ms Georgette Campbell, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

- 1.1.** The meeting was called to order at 10:44am when a quorum was established.

2. PRAYER

- 2.1.** Prayer was offered by Dr David Henry.

3. NATIONAL PLEDGE

- 3.1.** The National Pledge was recited.

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 4.1.** Apologies for absence were received from Senator Donna Scott-Mottley and Mrs. Laleta Davis Mattis (overseas at a conference).
- 4.2.** Apologies for lateness were tendered on behalf of Mr Anthony Hylton and Ambassador Rocky Meade (before the Public Accounts Committee of Parliament (PAC)).

5. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

- 5.1.** The Chairman informed that prior to the meeting, Mr Hugh Small shared (via the CRC's WhastApp Chat Group) a news article entitled "Government to spend millions on CRC in year one" published on October 17, 2023 by Nationwide News Network and requested that it be placed on the Agenda. The Agenda was accordingly amended to include the insertion of "CRC Budget" under "Any Other Business."
- 5.2.** The amended Agenda was confirmed on a motion by Dr Elaine McCarthy and seconded by Dr David Henry.

6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

- 6.1.** The Minutes of the 24th Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee held on October 4, 2023 were corrected and confirmed on a motion by Dr Elaine McCarthy and seconded by Mr Sujae Boswell.

7. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

- 7.1.** The Chairman requested an update from the Public Engagement and Communications (PEC) Sub-Committee regarding the respective action items listed on page 17 of the Minutes.
- 7.2.** Dr Spence informed Members that the PEC met on Sunday, October 15, 2023 and discussed matters primarily related to two issues: 1) a response to the article written by Dr Henry Lewis Jr and 2) the development of a Public Relations Strategy.
- 7.3.** She stated that Members of the PEC decided that a response would be crafted to answer some of the questions raised in the article in a way that also provided information about the work undertaken by the CRC. She indicated that the response would not be directed at him, but would provide answers to the public.
- 7.4.** On the matter of the Public Relations Strategy, she stated that the PEC examined a number of issues related to the Office of the President which would be the focus of public engagement, such as the powers and the selection process, while itemising important conversations around the President. She recalled a number of strategies which could be employed, such as Town Hall meetings, inviting influencers and shapers of public opinion and inviting Members of the Constitutional Reform Committee (CRC) to write Letters to the Editor or publish articles and noted the extent to which such methods would be incorporated into social media. She also expressed how podcasts with different Members of the Committee could be created to clarify some of the matters.
- 7.5.** Mr Small, in referencing the Jamaica Information Service (JIS) Proposal, suggested that a report be prepared by the relevant officers within the Secretariat to provide Members with updates on the progress of the Public Education Campaign.
- 7.6.** Dr Spence also noted that the sub-Committee discussed the need to identify influencers who constantly engaged the public around the issues deliberated by the Committee.

- 7.7. Senator Finson expressed how happy he was to see that the Government decided to invest in the Constitutional Work Programme. He noted that the JIS, as an Agency, would require payment for the work in executing the campaign and that the budget was a sign that the Government took public education seriously.
- 7.8. Mr Boswell echoed the sentiments of Senator Finson and added that the Committee deliberated, at length, the need for a bigger budget, so the allotment which was made public gave the Committee scope to work.
- 7.9. The Chairman enquired of Mr Harper whether the ‘Attendance Register’ was prepared and shared with Members to which he informed that it was sent to all Members via electronic mail on Friday, October 6, 2023.
- 7.10. Mr Hylton expressed that in terms of the attendance, those Members of the Committee who were Parliamentarians were obligated to other Committees and noted that their absence here did not reflect a lack of commitment to the process.

8. PHASE 1 REFORM WORK PROGRAMME

- 8.1. The Chairman invited Members to recall that as a Committee, a Terms of Reference (ToR) was agreed to, which provided for phased and incremental reform of the Constitution. Phase 1 focused on the deeply entrenched provision which required the approval of the people through a referendum to change. She also recalled that the ToR was circulated in draft and Members were given the opportunity to provide feedback before it was finalised. She noted that Dr Barnett had proposed changes, most of which were accepted save for the one which required compliance with government policies. The reason for its inclusion was subsequently clarified and no further issue was raised. However, since then, she noted that there was tension around what was to be achieved, how it was to be achieved and what would be included in Phase 1, i.e. whether to write a new Constitution or amend specific provisions of the existing Constitution. She reminded Members that it was never the intention to write a new Constitution in Phase 1, but instead to amend the deeply entrenched provisions, and specifically to abolish the Monarchy and transition to a Republic, and also ‘Jamaicanise’ the Constitution.

- 8.2.** She noted the different perspectives around the process of Jamaicanising the Constitution and recalled that Dr Barnett had proposed a strategy which the Committee was yet to formally discuss. She informed Members that it was a substantive item to be discussed.
- 8.3.** While expressing that the journey had been difficult, she invited Members to remain focused on the work that fell within Phase 1 as agreed in the ToR. She also reminded Members of the deeply entrenched provisions listed at Section 49(3) of the Constitution which included:
- **Section 49** itself – alteration of the Constitution;
 - **Section 2** – effect of the Constitution;
 - **Section 34** – establishment of the Parliament of Jamaica consisting of Her Majesty (which included her heirs), a Senate and a House of Representatives;
 - **Section 35** – composition of the Senate from the Government and Opposition sides;
 - **Section 36** – disqualification from and election to the House of Representatives;
 - **Section 39** – qualification for membership in the Senate and House of Representatives, subject to disqualification and including Commonwealth citizenship, age and ordinary residence;
 - **Section 63(2)** – sessions of Parliament;
 - **Sections 64(2), (3) and (5)** – life, extension and dissolution of Parliament;
 - **Section 65** – appointment of Senators after general elections; and
 - **Section 68(1)** – vesting of the executive authority of Jamaica in the Monarch
- 8.4.** The Chairman stated that essentially, those were the provisions that would be the focus of the Committee’s work in Phase 1. She said it was clear that the public did not sufficiently understand that it would take time to work out and create the type of republic that Jamaicans wanted. Everything would not be done at once and the transition to the Republic was a work in progress.
- 8.5.** She also recalled Dr Barnett’s suggestion to deal with matters on which consensus existed even if they fell outside of the scope of the deeply entrenched provisions.
- 8.6.** The Chairman further stated that while the Committee started out intensely, the indicative timeline for tabling the Bill was side-lined because of the critiques. She indicated her desire to table a Bill in 2023, taking into account the timeframes set out in the Constitution and

what would be required to pass the Bill in the current Parliament, subject to General Elections.

- 8.7.** Mr Hylton recalled the lengthy discussions about the organisation of the work and expressed that he believed there was tension that was recognised and addressed early but stated that how it was addressed was a part of any misunderstanding which might have existed. He stated that while it was the prerogative of the Cabinet to set the policy agenda, he thought that the process was much larger than Cabinet. He recalled that once the public read about timelines and the scope of Phase 1, their understanding of it created quite a stir. He also noted that the Opposition expressed a concern that there were other issues on which the public expressed strong views, the extent of which the Committee had not addressed.
- 8.8.** The Chairman inquired about those other issues to which Mr Hylton responded, the question of accountability and how it was factored in. While understanding that those issues did not require a referendum, he expressed the view that matters with pre-existing consensus should be properly incorporated in a first phase or any other phase. He said that he believed there were other matters that concerned the public at large and expressed that the public desired assurance and satisfaction that urgent matters would be dealt with at Phase 1.
- 8.9.** Senator Finson highlighted that there was an elephant in the room, which needed to be addressed. He stated that the Leader of the Opposition said that he would not support a Bill to remove the Monarchy without the Government addressing the question of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (JCPC) simultaneously. He enquired which Government would go to the people with a referendum where the Opposition was not in support.
- 8.10.** Mr Hylton said that the Opposition had called for the Government to state its position on the Court and they have heard nothing. He advised that as Members drew closer to a discussion about tabling a Bill, the Opposition wanted to hear from the Prime Minister.
- 8.11.** Dr Henry stated that the matter needed to be resolved as a precondition to what was being done by the Committee.
- 8.12.** Senator Finson indicated that the Government's position was that the people needed to decide on whether to leave the Monarchy and whether to become a Republic, as a first step. The Leader of the Opposition said he had nothing to do with the transition unless the Court was dealt with simultaneously.

- 8.13.** Dr Henry acknowledged that the final court was an issue to be addressed as it impacted the Bill going forward. He stated that it was important to deal with the issue or at least indicate how it would be accomplished. He noted the composition of the Committee and how it sought to do the work and pointed out that its process was not only informed by the Government but also what the public wanted. He recalled where Dr Barnett described the phased approach as a mechanical division of subjects, which would be a disservice. While acknowledging the divergent views on “Jamaicanising” the Constitution, he noted that the view to abolish the Monarchy, have a President and retain a Parliamentary Democracy was agreed. He further stated that while the Government and the Opposition had their own positions, he wanted to remind Members of the existence of civil society inclusive of the church, which should be given the opportunity to share their views.
- 8.14.** Mr Boswell recalled an interview with Dr Spence and Mr Small which examined the reasons why previous attempts at constitutional reform failed. The discord between the political parties and among political factions was highlighted. He expressed the view that if the country moved towards a Parliamentary Republic as a first step, then it could look to what would come thereafter. He further expressed his frustration with an approach to take no action if the action desired was not taken first.
- 8.15.** Dr Barnett expressed distress and stated that political leaders should be leaders as well as politicians, and in this essentially national and patriotic endeavour, there should be patriotism. He opined that the attitude to destroy the entire project unless one side got what it wanted would not work and stated that Jamaica’s political leaders had a responsibility to state their positions and the reasons for them. He explained that Jamaicans, including the major political parties as well as minor political parties and civil society, have decided to remove the monarchical trappings that existed and recalled that he advocated that such could not be effectively done unless three things were achieved: 1) remove the Monarch who is Jamaica’s Head of State from that position; 2) have the Constitution in a Jamaican instrument rather than a royalist Order in Council; and 3) have a final Court of Appeal which was not the Council of the English Monarch. He expressed that he had not heard anything against the first two and that he heard nothing from the ruling political party against the third. Instead, he heard a refusal to make a commitment by the governing party

to dispense with the JCPC and accept the Caribbean Court of Justice (CCJ) as the Final Court of Appeal.

- 8.16.** He further disclosed that he worked on the establishment of the CCJ and its operation for a good segment of his life and kept in touch with and listened to what leaders had said. He had not heard specific rejection of the CCJ. Recalling a conversation he had with the former Leader of the ruling Jamaica Labour Party, Mr Edward Seaga, he said Mr Seaga indicated that he would give the Court (CCJ) five (5) years. He was yet to hear from the Jamaica Labour Party (JLP) its position on the CCJ. He believed that the Committee should, at least, pursue two of the three moves rather than lose all three.
- 8.17.** Mr Small recalled that at the first meeting of the Committee, he stated that the People's National Party (PNP) would have to decide on how it would approach the question of the CCJ if there was no consensus. He said that he listened carefully over the last six (6) months and noted that there was indeed, an elephant in the room, in that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of Government were not speaking to each other. He recalled that the Chairman indicated that the Prime Minister would speak to the question of the final appellate court in short order. He further expressed difficulty in engaging persons externally. On the question of whether he would be prepared to support a constitutional amendment that went forward without the CCJ, he said that his position developed over the years and had been stated independently.
- 8.18.** He further expressed that the intention of the Government to table a Bill this year was not practical, as realistically there were only 7 weeks left in the year. He also queried the possibility of the Bill being tabled in the House of Representatives that would include proposals discussed and agreed by Members of the Committee and proposals that demonstrated care for what was said in the public domain. He noted that such a process involved the draft legislation going to the Cabinet, the Cabinet deciding whether it would be referred to its Legislative Committee and whether such Committee would allow for the nuanced examination of the clauses that would then be submitted to Cabinet seeking its approval for the Bill to be tabled. Furthermore, he believed that to have a whole Constitution with proposed amendments to become a Republic in 7 weeks, following Dr Barnett's pronouncements, would be impossible.

- 8.19.** Dr McCarthy stated that the question of the final court was frequently raised in discussions and noted that there were mixed views as it related to the CCJ, even amidst conversations in the public domain. She opined that there needed to be a fulsome discussion while recalling the three (3) critical things highlighted by Dr Barnett as necessary in removing the monarchical trappings and further suggested that the Leader of Government and the Leader of Opposition be invited to one of the CRC meetings.
- 8.20.** Senator Braham recalled that close to the inception of the Committee, the Leader of the Opposition made a speech in Parliament which suggested twinning the issues of the abolition of the Monarchy and the removal of the JCPC. He noted that from the inception, he had queried what could be achieved from this reform process in the quickest way. He believed the removal of the Monarchy and to Jamaicanise the Constitution were fundamental and noted that the JCPC was relatively easier to do and could be dealt with after. He further noted that as more issues were being added by civil society and the Opposition, the more distant the dream of abolishing the Monarchy became and the less likely in his lifetime. He believed that given the consensus on the removal of King Charles III as Jamaica's Head of State, there should be a move to abolish the Monarchy.
- 8.21.** Dr Spence stated that the Constitution defined consensus clearly as consensus between two political parties. She noted that if the two political parties were not on the same page, constitutional reform would not be achieved. She also expressed concern that the process for amendment, as laid out in the Constitution, was never clarified in a substantive manner. She further noted a critical position emerging whereby unless the matter of the CCJ was addressed, even if the process went through, nothing would come of it because the Opposition regarded the CCJ as an important part of the reform.
- 8.22.** Following the request by the Chairman to weigh in, Professor Albert echoed some of the comments that an opportunity to achieve the low hanging fruit of transforming the system from a Monarchy to a Republic was slipping away. This he believed, following discussion with Members, was not a contentious question and had 100% agreement. As a scholar, he noted how the politicisation of constitutional making and remaking could lead to failure.

COFFEE BREAK

8.23. The Chairman expressed gratitude for the candour with which Members expressed their views and stated that in so far as Phase 1 of the work programme went, the goal was to, at a minimum, achieve two (2) objectives: 1) the abolition of the Constitutional Monarchy as the form of Government and 2) having the Constitution of Jamaica passed by the Parliament and approved by the people, which had been termed ‘Jamaicanising the Constitution’. She appealed to Members, in the interest of progress, to focus on the two goals on which there was no division in the room, especially between Government and Opposition.

9. MATTERS FOR DELIBERATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS (CONT'D)

9.1. OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

9.2. TYPE/Form OF PRESIDENT

9.2.1. The Chairman noted that some time was spent developing and refining the recommendation on the type or form of President where it was agreed that there would be a Formal Head of State who was essentially a Non-Executive President performing not only ceremonial functions but who was given specific executive powers which did not involve the daily administration of government and who was selected in a non-partisan manner. This model represented the ideals of the people for a symbol of national identity and national unity, who was above the political fray and a neutral arbiter.

9.3. SELECTION PROCESS FOR THE PRESIDENT

9.3.1. The Chairman noted that Members were to consider the inclusion of an additional step in the nomination process set out in the Constitution regarding consultation with a view to arriving at a joint nomination. There was also agreement that the two-thirds vote in Parliament would be taken separately for each House.

9.3.2. Mr Small enquired whether Members ruled out the electorate voting for their President.

9.3.3. The Chairman responded that if the form of President that had been considered for recommendation was the one closest to what the Committee believed the people were asking for then, then the Committee had to consider whether a direct vote had any practical effect or impact on what the people wanted, as the public’s primary issue was with accountability.

9.3.4. Dr Barnett indicated that the basic position taken by the Committee was that given the nature of the Office i.e. a formal President with specific executive powers designed to deal with the appointment of independent persons, there was no need for an election. He, however, invited Members to recall a document which he circulated, which outlined the idea that a process could be considered whereby if the presidential nominee achieved a majority vote in Parliament but not the stipulated two-thirds majority, then that person's nomination could be put to the electorate.

9.3.5. The Chairman asked what percentage of the electorate would be required to which Dr Barnett responded that Members could make suggestions.

LUNCH

9.3.6. The Chairman asked Senator Finson to weigh in on what the vote of the people would look like in his capacity as a Commissioner of the Electoral Commission of Jamaica (ECJ). Senator Finson responded that he had no issue with the Prime Minister making the decision in consultation with the Leader of the Opposition. He highlighted that the history of the country suggested that that mechanism worked reasonably well.

9.3.7. The Chairman enquired what would happen if Parliament did not yield the two thirds vote, to which he expressed that he did not believe it needed to get there as Jamaica did not have a history of that sort of non-compliance.

9.3.8. Ambassador Meade expressed that although there was comfort that a process would work, it was for the Committee to consider what arrangements needed to be put in place if a Parliamentary confirmation did not yield the required vote.

9.3.9. Dr Barnett highlighted that when writing a constitution, it should be written for generations as what was experienced in the last 60 years may not be the experience of the next 15 years. He made reference to the experience of the United States and encouraged Members to consider that although things worked, alternative provisions should be made in case they did not.

9.3.10. Mr Boswell indicated that people wanted to be a part of the process which was critical and queried whether there would be an embedded ratification by the people.

- 9.3.11.** The Chairman wondered whether Parliamentarians should be obliged to meet with their constituents to share their views and suggested that explicit in the process could be a requirement for Members of Parliament to do something to ensure that the views of their constituents were accounted for directly in their official capacity.
- 9.3.12.** Mr Hylton suggested that if a majority was not achieved in the Parliament and the matter put to the public, it would break down into a partisan **decision**.
- 9.3.13.** Senator Finson asked how the present Governor-General was appointed, to which Dr Barnett responded by Constitutional Convention whereby the Prime Minister advised and in his discretion informed the Leader of the Opposition.
- 9.3.14.** Mr Hylton then noted that his understanding was that historically, they managed to sort it out. What was to be responded to was the request by civil society which reflected a good part of the public's position that they wanted to be a part of the process. He expressed concern that if the matter was brought before the House and unable to secure the two-thirds vote, whomever was against it in the House would campaign against it. That he believed had the prospect of undermining the objectives set.
- 9.3.15.** The Chairman expressed that she saw the danger in something well intentioned creating greater harm. She queried whether there was another method that could be used that involved the people directly or whether having regard to the form of President being considered, the work of the Committee would be to sensitize the public that a direct vote would not be required to hold the office to account as the suite of powers exercised would be different from that of the Leader of Government.
- 9.3.16.** Professor Albert, in addressing the desire to involve non-parliamentarians, suggested that the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition could convene a Committee of Leaders in society and well-respected groups from different spaces, who would come together and agree on a nominee or a list of nominees that reflected the preferences of their constituents from which the Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition would choose. While not a direct vote of the people, they would be involved in a meaningful way.

- 9.3.17.** Dr McKoy noted that the political representatives have gone through a process and were representatives of the people and to say that civil society had a better view and pursue that route suggested a depreciation of the institution of Parliament.
- 9.3.18.** Dr Spence expressed that Members latched on to voter participation and noted how democracies were behaving globally. She queried whether persons found political parties relevant and suggested that Jamaica was not the only country navigating this reality. She further suggested that Members engage in wider deliberation on the issue of democracy and whether the Committee needed to look at how democracies engaged people, the role of political parties and how they organized and modernized themselves.
- 9.3.19.** Dr Barnett stated that the Formal Head of State did not exercise powers which were the subject of any intense public interest, controversy or debate. He reiterated that such a person was symbolic of Jamaica and represented national unity. He also stated that no one deserved to be the President who could not attract the support of a majority of the elected representatives of the people. He expressed that it was not realistic to believe that a person who attracted the support of the majority of the two parties would be opposed by a majority of persons in Parliament. He further expressed that in the event of a failure to achieve the necessary special parliamentary majority, in order to give credence to the status of that person and to the national acceptability of such person, he/she should not become the Head of State.
- 9.3.20.** The Chairman indicated that it was unlikely that someone who did not receive the required vote in Parliament but only the majority of the vote from the ruling party would be favourably considered by the people. Already, we had seen and heard unfavourable narratives about a government using its majority to pass laws, even though the Constitution of Jamaica provided for it. She doubted a utility of a process, in the Jamaican context, of putting forward a candidate who fell below the required parliamentary vote threshold. Mr Hylton interjected that to put forward such a candidate would do more damage, from a practical consideration.
- 9.3.21.** The Chairman then summarised the two proposals whereby people could be involved: 1) at the nomination stage, or 2) at the confirmation stage.

9.3.22. Dr McCarthy stated that if a pool was identified to submit a list of nominees, there would be no bar on leaders to pull from it a nominee. Even if not voting, the public would have a say.

9.3.23. Mr Hylton cautioned Members by stating that there was a need to guard against the view that if one was not of a certain ilk or level in society, then one would have no say. That raised concerns about civil society and who they spoke for. There was a need to be careful about what was being said about involving the people in the process, and who participated in it. While he would not bar professional organisations, concerns about the exclusion of persons risked raising issues surrounding the process' legitimacy.

9.3.24. Dr McCarthy expressed that Jamaica has matured politically, matured in their thinking, have come of age and wanted to have a say.

9.4. POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

9.4.1. Senator Braham informed Members that the Sub-Committee on State Affairs concluded its work and the Secretariat was in the process of putting together a draft of the report.

9.5. The Chairman informed Members that the remaining matters would be set for discussion at the next meeting as many Members indicated that they had other commitments for the day. She invited everyone to reflect on the discussion on how to meaningfully include the people in order to conclude on the recommendations for the Office of President, to allow for the second goal of Jamaicanising to be dealt with.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10.1. REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

10.1.1. The matter was taken under Matters Arising from the Minutes

10.2. Mr Robertson informed Members that the Norman Manley Law School and Hugh Wooding Law Schools' Graduating Classes of 1997 with support from the CCJ Academy and MonaLaw would be hosting a Public Reasoning about the Caribbean Court of Justice entitled "In Search of Deeper Regional Integration, as the Circle of Independence Continues to

Close,” on Thursday, October 19, 2023, beginning at 4:30pm. He advised that the Chairman would bring remarks.

11. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

11.1. The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, October 25, 2023.

12. ADJOURNMENT

12.1. There being no other business, the meeting was terminated at 3:31pm on a motion by Dr Nadeen Spence and seconded by Dr Elaine McCarthy.