



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

26th Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee (CRC)

Venue: Jamaica House Banquet Hall

Date: October 25, 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
 - a. 25th Meeting of the CRC
7. Matters Arising from the Minutes
8. Matters for Deliberation and Recommendations (cont'd)
 - a. Office of the President
 - i. Selection Process for the President
 - ii. Qualification for the Office of the President
 - iii. Term Limit
 - iv. Disqualification of President
9. Report of the State Affairs Sub-Committee
10. Any Other Business
11. Date and Time of Next Meeting

12. Adjournment

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)
- Senator Hon Thomas Tavares-Finson, OJ, CD (President of the Senate and Commissioner of the Electoral Commission of Jamaica)
- Senator Donna Scott-Mottley (Parliamentary Opposition – Senate)
- Mr Anthony Hylton (Parliamentary Opposition - House of Representatives)
- Mr Hugh Small, KC (Consultant Counsel and Nominee of the Leader of the Parliamentary Opposition)
- Dr the Hon. Lloyd Barnett, OJ (National Constitutional Law Expert)
- 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)
- Mrs Laleta Davis Mattis, CD, JP (National Council on Reparations) via video link
- Mr Sujae Boswell (Youth Advisor) via video link
- Professor Richard Albert (International Constitutional Law Expert – University of Texas at Austin) via video link

Secretariat

Ministry of Legal and Constitutional Affairs

- Mr Wayne O. Robertson, JP (Permanent Secretary)
- Ms Nadine Wilkins, Director, Legal Reform Department
- Mr Christopher Harper, Senior Constitutional Reform Officer
- Ms Julia Wedderburn, Senior Legal Education Officer via video link
- Ms Roxene Nickle, Advisor/Consultant
- Ms Yaniek Douglas, Legal Education Officer (Actg.)
- Mr Makene Brown, Legal Officer
- Mr Winston Lowe, Public Relations Officer
- Ms Georgette Campbell, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

- 1.1. The meeting was called to order at 10:54am by the Chairman, the Hon. Marlene Malahoo Forte when quorum was achieved.

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/LATENESS

- 4.1. Apologies for lateness were tendered on behalf of Senator Donna Scott-Mottley, Dr Elaine McCarthy, Dr Nadeen Spence, Mrs Laleta Davis-Mattis, Senator Thomas Tavares-Finson, Mr Hugh Small and Ambassador Rocky Meade.

5. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

- 5.1. The Agenda was confirmed without amendments on a motion by Dr Derrick McKoy and seconded by Dr David Henry.

6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

- 6.1. The Minutes of the 25th Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee held on October 18, 2023 were corrected and confirmed on a motion by Dr Lloyd Barnett and seconded by Dr David Henry.

7. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

- 7.1. There were no matters arising from the Minutes.

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

8.1. OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

- 8.2. The Chairman noted that the Form of the President was not on the agenda because the Committee concluded on it. It was agreed that there would be a President who would be the Formal Head of state and essentially a Non-Executive President performing not only ceremonial functions but specific executive powers which would not involve the daily administration of government and would be selected in a non-partisan manner. It was

also noted that while the calls for accountability in the public domain would not be impacted by the office, the Committee needed to acknowledge them.

8.3. **SELECTION PROCESS FOR THE PRESIDENT**

8.3.1. The Chairman invited the Committee to consider how the desire of the people to have a say in the selection process of the President could be accommodated. It was agreed that the candidate for President would be nominated by the Prime Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition, and then confirmed by the Parliament. The consultation by the Prime Minister with the Leader of the Opposition was to be done with a view to arrive at consensus on the nominee. The nomination would be sent in writing by the Prime Minister to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate. Confirmation by Parliament would take place at a joint sitting of both Houses, symbolic of unity of the Legislature. The prescribed vote would be a two-thirds majority of each House.

8.3.2. Senator Finson invited Members to recall concerns previously shared by Dr Barnett where despite seamless processes of the past, a situation may arise where there was no consensus and the Committee would decide whether to put forward a mechanism that resolved such an issue.

8.3.3. Dr Barnett stated that from the experiences of other countries, processes which had worked failed for a variety of reasons, as seen in the United States. He said that there should be some sort of escape as one could not predict how people would behave.

8.3.4. Dr McKoy stated that it was ideal to have consensus between both political parties but recognition should be given to the fact that such may not always work. In Trinidad, there was almost 50 years of agreement until an occasion where there was none. He recommended that the Committee arrange for such an occasion.

8.3.5. Mr Hylton stated that if the political parties disagreed then the matter could be taken to the public to which the Chairman reminded him that during last week's session, he indicated that putting the decision to the public would be an invitation for a partisan vote as they would take their cue from their elected representatives. Mr Hylton acknowledged the statement attributed to him by the Chairman but said he had reflected on this position.

- 8.3.6. Dr Barnett stated that if the nominee did not get the special majority, a special endorsement could be obtained from the people which made up for the parliamentary deficiency.
- 8.3.7. The Chairman invited Members to consider how other jurisdictions which transitioned from a Constitutional Monarchy provided for the selection of the President.
- 8.3.8. **Section 32 of the Constitution of Barbados** provided that:
- (1) *Whenever the office of President is vacant, or if the term of office of the President is due to expire within not more than ninety days, the Prime Minister shall consult with the Leader of the Opposition with a view to their joint nomination of a candidate for election as President.*
 - (2) *“If the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition make in writing to the Speaker a Joint nomination of a qualified candidate for election as President, being a nomination to which that candidate has consented, the Speaker shall notify both Houses of the joint nomination and, at a joint meeting of both Houses, shall ask the members whether any member has an objection to the candidate being declared duly elected, if no member objects thereto, the Speaker shall declare the Candidate duly elected.*
 - (3) *If there is an objection under subsection (2) the Speaker shall not declare the Candidate duly elected but shall suspend the joint meeting*
 - (4) *The members of each House shall, immediately following the suspension resume in their respective House and the presiding officer of each House shall put the question referred to in subsection (2) to a vote*
 - (5) *Immediately upon announcing the result of the vote in each House, the joint sitting shall resume and the President of the Senate and the Speaker shall each announce the result of the vote.*
 - (6) *If the candidate receives not less than two-thirds of the votes cast in each House, the Speaker shall then declare the candidate duly elected.”*
- 8.3.9. **Section 29 of the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago** stated that *the President shall be elected by the Electoral College voting by secret ballot.*
- 8.3.10. It further provided at Section 28 that:
- (1) *There shall be an Electoral College for the purposes of this Chapter which shall be a unicameral body consisting of all the members of the Senate and all the members of the House of Representatives assembled together.*
 - (2) *The Electoral College shall be convened by the Speaker*

- (3) *The Speaker shall preside as Chairman over the proceedings of the Electoral College and have an original vote*
- (4) *Subject to this Chapter, the Electoral College may regulate its own procedure and may make provision for the postponement or adjournment of its meeting and such other provisions as may be necessary to deal with the difficulties that may arise in carrying out the elections under this Chapter*
- 8.3.11. Section 30 stipulated that “*a person shall not be a candidate for election as President unless he is nominated for election by a nomination paper which –*
- (a) *Is signed by him and by twelve or more members of the House of Representatives; and*
- (b) *Is delivered to the Speaker at least seven days before the election”*
- 8.3.12. **Section 62 of the Constitution of Nepal** provided that:
- (1) *The President shall be elected by an electoral college composed of the members of the Federal Parliament and of the State Assemblies. The voting weightage of the members of the Federal Parliament and of the State Assemblies shall vary as provided for in Federal Law*
- (2) ...
- (3) *A person who secures a majority of the then existing total votes of the electoral college under clause (1) shall be elected as the President*
- (4) *If none of the candidates secures a majority under clause (3) there shall be voting between the two candidates who have secured the highest number of votes, and a candidate who secures more than fifty percent of the total votes in such a voting shall be elected as the President*
- (5) *If none of the candidates secures more than fifty percent of the total votes even in the voting under clause (4), re-voting shall be held. A candidate who secures a majority of the total valid votes cast in such voting shall be elected as the President*
- 8.3.13. The Chairman noted that in many of the examples shared, voting was done using a simple majority and having had conversations with others, it appeared that in some places, by convention, deference would be given to the government of the day for a choice of presidential candidate. She stated that while the goal was to arrive at consensus, depending on the nature of the disagreement, it was understood that the government of the day would be given the advantage.
- 8.3.14. Dr McKoy stated that how a President was elected did not defeat the type of President. Having regard to the non-executive form of president, he indicated that the major question was how to get the President in Office. He expressed favour towards the electoral college system as it had a nice symbolism. He further stated that the

Committee should be concerned about establishing a system that did not create a deadlock.

- 8.3.15. Mr Hylton noted that constitutions addressed the particularities of society and were often regarded as living and breathing documents that reflected the aspirations of a society. He stated that Jamaican society expressed a desire to have a say beyond what the political parties were doing. While noting the difficulty in coming up with a solution, he encouraged Members to be innovative.
- 8.3.16. Senator Finson suggested that Members should focus on the process of arriving at consensus.
- 8.3.17. Dr Henry enquired whether 50% of the population voting for their non-executive President would create a challenge, to which Senator Finson responded that it would politicize the selection. In response, Dr Henry stated that it would already be politicized if there was no consensus and asked what harm would come from the people participating.
- 8.3.18. Dr Barnett stated that the ideal would be to achieve consensus at the first stage. He noted that it could not be guaranteed despite the present political climate and history where it had been achieved. Nevertheless, the Committee was planning for the future. As such, he stated that if the Prime Minister took the initiative to nominate someone and believed that the public was in favour of such person, he should be given the opportunity to take it to the people. The alternative would be to withdraw the unsuccessful candidate and nominate someone else. An opportunity to be approved by the electorate was one test that would represent the national interests of the people.
- 8.3.19. Dr Henry, in following up on Dr Barnett's comment, noted that if the ultimate choice was what the people wanted, they should be allowed to vote for the President.
- 8.3.20. The Chairman questioned whether the call by the people to participate in the process of determining who led the country related to the Head of Government, who was in charge of managing the day to day affairs.
- 8.3.21. Having gone through the views expressed in the public domain, the Chairman also stated that the public wanted their voices to be heard. At the same time she anticipated that the Cabinet would be concerned about the associated costs of holding an election for the office of a non-executive President. Mr Small requested clarification on the point about Cabinet's concerns, to which the Chairman responded that the financial implication of implementing all proposed legislation was a routine matter for consideration by the Cabinet.

COFFEE BREAK

- 8.3.22. Mr Small enquired how the Committee would take financial considerations into account when contemplating constitutional making and noted that the restraint in the current Constitution limiting the size of the House of Representatives to 63 was something that should be examined. That was to ensure that in establishing future governments, the Executive would not have such a heavy hand within the Legislature so as to dominate the Lower House. He opined that there was no parliamentary experience in which the persons elected understood or performed their duties in such a way that they exercised their power without being in awe of the executive branch.
- 8.3.23. The Chairman stated that one of the goals of the reform process was to consider the balance of power to ensure that there were appropriate checks and balances. That, she explained, was part of the policy approach to constitutional reform. She also noted that people being in awe was a result of human nature. She asked Members to consider how office holders would better understand what was required of them and stated that the Committee should be concerned about how institutions were designed and the balancing of power dynamics.
- 8.3.24. Mr Small stated that the executive members of Government who were in Parliament should not have such a numeric strength that the elected members in the Lower House did not have enough strength to hold the executive to account. The Chairman pointed out that quantitatively, numeric strength was not with the Executive.
- 8.3.25. Mr Hylton, in addressing a point raised by Senator Finson, recalled the Constitution of Barbados and noted that it spoke to an agreement in the first instance. He suggested that the process should endeavour to have agreement, but where such was not forthcoming after it was sought Members should consider involving the people. He also suggested that the Committee consider the nomination process and reminded Members of the approach whereby the public could participate in the creation of a pool of candidates from which the nominee would be drawn, and on which consensus could be developed or the public could validate.
- 8.3.26. Dr Barnett, in recalling an email he circulated among Members earlier, stated that the first principle on which the Committee was agreed was that there would be a Head of State who commanded the respect and admiration of the people and represented national unity. He explained that in order to achieve that objective, a special majority of Parliament would decide. He, however, noted that there may be an instance where such person was unable to secure the special majority in Parliament, but had the support of the majority of the people. He therefore suggested that the person who nominated the candidate should be able to decide whether to put the matter to the people, which would satisfy the public's desire to be involved in the process.

- 8.3.27. Professor Albert stated that there seemed to be an impulse to involve the people in some way and a reluctance to give them a direct vote in determining the President. He invited Members to consider three separate occasions: 1) the pre-selection; 2) the actual selection; and 3) the post selection. Having regard to the actual selection, he stated that if it was the view to involve the people in the actual selection, such entailed a direct vote of the people and gave rise to cost concerns, logistical concerns and theoretical concerns. In the pre-selection stage i.e. before a vote was taken, he stated that it was possible to involve the people as nominations could be received from the public. He expressed that it could entail conducting nationwide consultations about the persons the public wished to see nominated. At the stage of post selection, he suggested that the public could be given the responsibility of ratifying the choice made by Parliament. He also suggested that a public hearing could be convened to introduce the President-elect to the people and to provide him or her with an opportunity to share his or her background and plans, among other things.
- 8.3.28. The Chairman enquired whether the pre-selection stage was the nomination stage to which Professor Albert responded affirmatively. Mr Hylton added that the Constitution should be designed in a way that avoided gridlock.
- 8.3.29. The Chairman recalled a view shared previously whereby if the nominee failed to obtain the prescribed majority in the first round, a simple majority could be pursued in the second round. She expressed that if there were a selection without controversy, a post selection process may not be necessary. She then enquired of Senator Finson his perspective to which he responded that he was in favour of the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition seeking consensus. He also urged Members to concentrate on consensus building.
- 8.3.30. The Chairman indicated that on a previous occasion, Members agreed to insert another stage/round in the current consultation process between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, as outlined in the Constitution. Essentially, a third round of consultation would take place to ensure that a nomination with consensus was achieved.
- 8.3.31. Senator Finson remarked that from a practical perspective, if consensus was not achieved in the first round, it was unlikely to be achieved at any other round.
- 8.3.32. The Chairman then recalled Dr Barnett's proposal for the person nominating the presidential candidate (the Prime Minister) to be able to take the matter to the people to fill the parliamentary deficit when the nominee failed to obtain the special majority in Parliament. She advised that the Constitution currently made provision for Bills which failed to obtain the required special majority in the Senate to go to the people and queried how using that route would be viewed, given the criticism levied against

the government by some, including the Parliamentary Opposition, about ramming things down the throat of the people in the absence of agreement.

- 8.3.33. Mr Hylton enquired whether it would be at the instance of the nominator to exercise the option to go to the people if he or she felt strongly about it or whether he or she would choose another nominee. Dr Barnett responded that it would be at the instance of the nominator.
- 8.3.34. The Chairman reiterated that, in principle, there was a desire for the Prime Minister to consult with the Leader of the Opposition to arrive at consensus on who should be nominated.
- 8.3.35. Senator Finson stated that consultation meant different things to different Prime Ministers, as some sat down with the Leader of the Opposition whereas others simply wrote.
- 8.3.36. The Chairman then invited Members to consider other examples of selection processes.
- 8.3.37. **Section 54 of the Constitution of India** provided that *“the President shall be elected by the members of an electoral college consisting of –*
(a) The elected members of both Houses of Parliament; and
(b) The elected members of the Legislative Assemblies of the States”
- 8.3.38. Section 55(3) stated that *“the election of the President shall be held in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferrable vote and the voting at such election shall be by secret ballot.”*
- 8.3.39. **The Constitution of Ethiopia** at Section 70(1) provided that *“the House of People’s Representative shall nominate the candidate for President”* and Section 70(2) provided that *“the nominee shall be elected President if a joint session of the House of the People’s Representative and the House of the Federation approves his candidacy by a two-third majority vote.”*
- 8.3.40. **Section 19 of the Constitution of Dominica** stated that –
(1) Whenever the office of President is vacant or the term of office of the President is due to expire within not more than ninety days, the Prime Minister shall consult with the Leader of the Opposition as to their joint nomination of a suitable candidate for election as President.
(2) If the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition submit to the Speaker by writing under their hands a joint nomination of a candidate for election as President to which that candidate has consented, the Speaker shall inform the House of the nomination, and declare the candidate to have been duly elected without putting the question to the vote.
(3) If the Prime Minister is unable to agree with the Leader of the Opposition as to their joint nomination of a candidate for election as President, he shall

notify the Speaker to that effect and the Speaker shall inform the House accordingly.

- (4) The Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition or any three members of the House may, during the period expiring fourteen days after the day on which the House has been so informed, submit to the Speaker by writing under their hands nominations of candidates for election as President and the Speaker shall at the first meeting of the House after the expiration of that period and before the House proceeds to any other business inform the House of the nominations he has received and to which the candidates concerned have consented.*
- (5) An election of the President at which the candidates shall be those of whose nomination the House has been informed by the Speaker, shall thereafter be held at the meeting of the House referred to in subsection (4) of this section and the Speaker shall declare the candidate who has at that election received the votes of a majority of all members of the House to have been duly elected: Provided that when the question of the election of the President is put to the vote, the votes shall be given by ballot in such manner as not to disclose how any particular member of the House votes.*
- (6) Where the only candidate for election under subsection (5) of this section does not receive the votes of a majority of all the members of the House, the Speaker shall inform the House accordingly a new election shall be held to which the provisions of subsections (4) and (5) shall, mutatis mutandis, apply.*

The Co-Chair Ambassador Meade joined the meeting about this point

- 8.3.41. **Section 48 of the Constitution of Malta** stated that “*there shall be a President of Malta who shall be appointed by Resolution supported by the votes of not less than two-thirds of all the members of the House: provided that notwithstanding the provisions of sub-article (3)(a), if the Resolution is not supported by the votes of not less than two-thirds of all the members of the House, the person occupying the office of the President of Malta shall, in any circumstances, remain in office until the Resolution is supported by the votes of not less than two-thirds of all the members of the House.*”
- 8.3.42. **Section 28 of the Constitution of Mauritius** provided that “*the President shall be elected by the Assembly on a motion made by the Prime Minister and supported by the votes of a majority of all the members of the Assembly.*”

- 8.3.43. The Chairman then enquired whether Members were minded to go with a confirmation by the people in the event there was a failure to achieve a vote in Parliament.
- 8.3.44. Senator Finson dissented for reasons stated before and reinforced his perspective that such would politicize the office.
- 8.3.45. Dr Barnett stated that while it was desirable to get the two-thirds majority vote, a solution was needed if that was not achieved.
- 8.3.46. The Chairman expressed that some may view the act of seeking the vote of the people for a candidate that failed to obtain the specified vote in Parliament as an abuse by the majority. Such a nominee who was put to the people would also be subjected to comments that the ruling party was trying to impose a candidate on the people.
- 8.3.47. Dr McCarthy stated that if there was failure to achieve consensus in Parliament and the candidate was subsequently put to the people, there could be some discomfort among the public given that there was no initial agreement at the highest level. She then suggested that the Committee put forward a proposal that involved the public at the initial stage whereby prospective candidates could be recommended from which the selection would ultimately be made.
- 8.3.48. Senator Scott-Mottley enquired whether there were any practical examples of where arriving at a consensus failed. She asked Members to consider how putting a President, rejected by the Parliament, to the people in a divided society would work.
- 8.3.49. The Chairman explained that according to Dr Barnett's proposal, the parliamentary deficit was not viewed as a rejection.
- 8.3.50. Dr McKoy said all the examples provided for some form of backstop and indicated his preference for faith in the institutions and in the people elected to represent citizens in Parliament. He also stated that the Committee needed to determine something that would work.
- 8.3.51. Senator Scott-Mottley further asked for a practical example of failure to achieve consensus to which Dr McKoy gave the example of Trinidad whereby candidates in the past were never contested and that the process worked until it no longer did.

LUNCH

- 8.3.52. The Chairman stated that one option was put forward whereby if the nominee did not get the special majority in Parliament, then the nomination would go to the people for their vote. She expressed that having had a few sidebar conversations, she noted that the suggestion did not preclude a Prime Minister and a Leader of the Opposition from going back to the nomination table to consider another candidate.
- 8.3.53. Dr Barnett, in agreeing with the Chairman, stated that if they could agree, they could resubmit to the Parliament which may then result in the specified majority. He also stated that if a candidate received a majority vote but not the specified majority, the

Leader of the Opposition would be able to ask that it be submitted to the people. Where there was failure to arrive at a joint nomination, more than one candidates could be put forward and whomever received the majority could be put to the people. If a nominee put to the people received the prescribed vote, then that would conclude the process.

- 8.3.54. Mr Small stated that while he appreciated Dr Barnett's perspective, he believed that the Committee should not rush to adopt a perspective during the 26th sitting of the Committee. He also expressed that he was doubtful whether the proposed procedure cleared the hurdle of the Head of State being a symbol of national unity. He then invited Members to consider a scenario whereby a person who was never involved in party politics was now subject to campaigning and the traditions of politics. He subsequently asked for additional time to think about the matter.
- 8.3.55. The Chairman stated that she appreciated the need for time, as while the Committee discussed the matter, it was yet to concretize a recommendation.
- 8.3.56. Mr Hylton stated that persons needed to see that the Committee heard them and while there was no agreement, it was working to establish something different from that which existed.
- 8.3.57. The Chairman further expressed the view that someone drawn from a partisan background could represent national unity as had been demonstrated from past examples. She also stated that there have been examples where persons rose to the occasion and carried out the functions of the office, noting that those antecedents were grounds for learning.
- 8.3.58. Mr Hylton stated that there was the matter of qualification and noted that whosoever came to the office should demonstrate a sound understanding of national issues and issues of governance. While it did not require one to be a former politician, it required an appreciation of systems and institutions of governance which could not preclude practicing politicians.
- 8.3.59. The Chairman surmised that the Committee was at a point of considering a possible three stage process:
1. A nomination with two possible options – A straight nomination by a Prime Minister after consulting with the Leader of the Opposition with a view to arriving at consensus and even a joint nomination, or a nomination by the Prime Minister after Consultation with the Leader of the Opposition having considered a pool of candidates nominated by a body to be determined, supported by a number of proposals. Where members of the public made nominations the Committee would have to consider the qualifications for the person nominated. She noted a third possible option whereby in the absence of consensus between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, each could put forward a nominee.

2. Nomination would be made in writing, via the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, to Parliament formally.
3. Joint sitting of the two Houses, symbolic of the unity of the legislature and the vote taken by secret ballot. The confirmation of the nominee would be by way of a two-thirds majority vote in each House, taken separately. She noted that some jurisdictions proceeded on the basis of asking for an objection and opined that if there were views against an objection approach, the policy rationale would state that it would be undesirable to subject the nominee to the embarrassment of an objection.

8.3.60. If there were more than one nominees, whosoever received the prescribed vote would emerge the winner. If the prescribed vote was not obtained, the person who received the majority vote would proceed to the people if the nominator so requested, or the process could be recommenced, by going back to the initial stage of consultation to achieve consensus or a joint nomination.

8.4. POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

- 8.4.1. The Chairman stated that deliberations on the powers to be exercised by the President would follow the report to the Committee by the State Affairs sub-Committee.
- 8.5. The Chairman noted that at the next meeting the Committee would focus on qualification and disqualification of the President and concretize its recommendation on term limits.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 9.1. The Permanent Secretary informed Members that a request was received from the Jamaica Coalition for a Healthy Society, through Dr David Henry, for audience with the Committee. The request outlined a number of concerns and response was prepared and sent to Dr Wayne West. He further enquired whether the request could be accommodated at the next session of the Committee.
- 9.2. The Chairman indicated that the Committee would strive to accommodate a presentation after it concluded its proposals for recommendation on the listed matters.

10. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

- 10.1. The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, November 1, 2023.

11. ADJOURNMENT

- 11.1. There being no other business, the meeting was terminated at 2:49pm on a motion by Dr David Henry and seconded by Dr Nadeen Spence.