



## 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

#### 45<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee (CRC)

Venue: Ministry of Legal and Constitutional Affairs

Date: July 24, 2024

Time: 11:00am

### AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Prayer
3. National Pledge
4. Apologies for Absence/Lateness
5. Confirmation of Agenda
6. Confirmation of Outstanding Minutes of CRC Meetings
7. Matters Arising
- 7A. Cabinet Decision
- 7B. Response to the Comments of the Leader of the Opposition
8. Drafting Strategy
  - Constitutional Reform Imperatives
  - Preparation of Constitutional Reform Bill(s)
9. Public Education and Engagement
  - Kingston and St Andrew Town Hall
10. Any Other Business
11. Date and Time of Next Meeting
12. Adjournment

\*Amendments in red

**ATTENDEES:**

- Honourable Marlene Malahoo Forte, KC, JP, MP (Chairman)
- Ambassador Rocky Meade, CD, JP, PhD (Co-Chairman – Office of the Prime Minister) *via video link*
- Dr Derrick McKoy, CD, KC (Attorney General of Jamaica)
- Dr the Hon. Lloyd Barnett, OJ (National Constitutional Law Expert)
- Mr Hugh Small, KC (Consultant Counsel and Nominee of the Leader of the Opposition)
- Dr Nadeen Spence (Civil Society – Social and Political Commentator)
- Dr Elaine McCarthy (Jamaica Umbrella Groups of Churches)
- Mrs Laleta Davis-Mattis, CD, JP (National Council on Reparations)
- Mr Sujae Boswell (Youth Advisor)
- 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 Judith Grant, Chief Parliamentary Counsel *via video link*
- Ms Nadine Wilkins, Director, Legal Reform *via video link*
- Ms Nastacia McFarlane, Director, Corporate Communication and Public Relations
- Mr Christopher Harper, Senior Constitutional Reform Officer
- Mr Makene Brown, Legal Officer
- Mrs Shawna-Kaye Taylor Reid, Administrative Assistant (Actg.)
- Ms Cedri-Ann Brown, Legal Intern

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

- 1.1.** The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, the Honourable Marlene Malahoo Forte at 11:12am. She stated that decisions would be reserved until quorum was achieved.

**2. PRAYER**

- 2.1.** The Prayer was led by Dr Lloyd Barnett.

**3. NATIONAL PLEDGE**

- 3.1.** The National Pledge was recited.

#### **4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/LATENESS**

- 4.1. Apologies for absence were received from Dr David Henry and Ambassador Rocky Meade.
- 4.2. Apologies for lateness were tendered on behalf of Mr Anthony Hylton, Mrs Laleta Davis Mattis, Dr Elaine McCarthy and Mr Sujae Boswell.

#### **5. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA**

- 5.1. The Chairman stated that there were two substantive items for discussion set out at items 8 and 9 of the Agenda. Dr Barnett proposed that the matter of the Cabinet Decision and the response to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition be added. The Chairman suggested that they be listed as items 7A and 7B respectively as an extension of matters arising.
- 5.2. The amended Agenda was confirmed on a motion by Dr Derrick McKoy and seconded by Dr Lloyd Barnett.

*Dr Spence arrived at 11:36am*

*Meeting quorate at 11:36am*

#### **6. CONFIRMATION OF OUTSTANDING MINUTES OF CRC MEETINGS**

- 6.1. The Minutes of the 37<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee held on April 26, 2024 were corrected and confirmed on a motion by Dr Lloyd Barnett and seconded by Dr Derrick McKoy.
- 6.2. The Minutes of the 38<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee held on May 1, 2024 were corrected and confirmed on a motion by Dr Lloyd Barnett and seconded by Dr Derrick McKoy.
- 6.3. The Minutes of the 39<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee held on May 3, 2024 were corrected and confirmed on a motion by Dr Lloyd Barnett and seconded by Dr Derrick McKoy.

*Dr McCarthy arrived at 11:46am*

- 6.4. The Minutes of the 40<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee held on May 8, 2024 were corrected and confirmed on a motion by Dr Nadeen Spence and seconded by Dr Elaine McCarthy.
- 6.5. The Minutes of the 41<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Constitutional Reform Committee held on May 17, 2024 were corrected and confirmed on a motion by Dr Lloyd Barnett and seconded by Dr Nadeen Spence.

*Mrs Laleta Davis Mattis arrived at 12:11pm*

- 6.6. Review of the Minutes of the 42<sup>nd</sup> to 44<sup>th</sup> Meetings of the Constitutional Reform Committee were deferred until the next meeting.

## **7. MATTERS ARISING**

### **7.1. CABINET DECISION**

**7.1.1.** The Chairman advised that the decision of the Cabinet in respect of the Report of the Constitutional Reform Committee was contained in Cabinet Decision 16/24 dated May 20, 2024.

**7.1.2.** She indicated that while she did not have the full Decision [before her], she was able to advise that the Cabinet agreed that the Report would be tabled in Parliament on Tuesday, 21 May 2024 and a Statement would be provided at the post-Cabinet press briefing on Wednesday, 22 May 2024.

**7.1.3.** She also advised Members that after consideration, the Cabinet gave approval for:

- (I)** The tabling in Parliament of the Report of the Constitutional Reform Committee on the Transition to the Republic of Jamaica and other matters on Tuesday 21 May 2024, as a Ministry Paper;
- (II)** The enactment of legislation to:
  - a) Revoke the Jamaica (Constitution) Order in Council, 1962 and save the Second Schedule (The Constitution of Jamaica) to effect the patriation of the Constitution;
  - b) Abolish the British Monarch as the Head of State and replace that with the Office of President for the Republic of Jamaica;
  - c) Retain the Parliamentary Cabinet System;
  - d) Amend other related deeply entrenched provisions of the Constitution for which a referendum is required to amend;
  - e) Amend the Jamaica Independence Act 1962;
  - f) Amend any other associated legislation that may require consequential amendment;
- (III)** The enactment of a Referendum Law to prescribe the procedure to obtain the approval of electors qualified to vote for the election of members of the House of Representatives; and
- (IV)** The issuing of drafting instructions to the Chief Parliamentary Counsel to prepare the legislation required to establish the Republic of Jamaica and other matters.

**7.1.4.** Mr Small enquired whether he should assume that the wording of the Cabinet Decision covered the recommendations made by the Committee. The Chairman, in response, stated that the

approval given by Cabinet was given in respect of proceeding with the deeply entrenched provisions, having regard with the phased approach of the work.

- 7.1.5.** Mr Small highlighted that the Committee spent a lot of time examining issues that were not deeply entrenched. He stated that without having an opportunity to examine the entire document from a legal perspective, it appeared that the Cabinet Decision was not wide enough to include those matters on which there was consensus but not deeply entrenched.
- 7.1.6.** Dr Barnett recalled his previous request for a copy of the Cabinet Decision. He stated that it was not fair that the Committee did not know whether its recommendations were accepted or rejected by the Cabinet. Having regard to the section of the Decision shared by the Chairman, Dr Barnett said that the language of saving the schedule was very offensive to the principles on which the Committee proceeded. He opined that to save something was an entirely different construct from a re-enactment and that the Committee proceeded on the basis that the Constitution would be re-enacted in a Jamaican instrument rather than saving the imperial one.
- 7.1.7.** The Chairman noted that she spent some time reflecting on the divergence in perspectives on the approach to be taken in pursuing the goal of Jamaicanising the Constitution. At the end of the day, the goal pursued was to ensure that the Constitution as amended, currently contained in a schedule to an Order in Council, was enacted by the Parliament and approved by the people. She stated that others were not as sensitive to the nuance as Dr Barnett was. Nevertheless, Cabinet gave its approval for the Constitution to be taken out of its current form.
- 7.1.8.** Dr Barnett, in response, stated that the language of the Cabinet Decision, as shared by the Chairman, would create problems [contention] with the Chief Parliamentary Counsel (CPC). He opined that if he understood the terminology used by the Cabinet Decision, what was approved by the Cabinet was contrary to what the Committee recommended.
- 7.1.9.** The Chairman stated that the dispute concerned the form that would be used to achieve the substance. Dr Barnett, in response, stated that the substance, in this particular case, was the form. He further stated that it was undesirable for the Constitution to be in an imperial instrument so there was no need to *save* the imperial instrument.
- 7.1.10.** Dr Barnett then advised Members that the CPC drafted Bills on the basis of the Cabinet Decision. He opined that the terminology of the Decision highlighted was inconsistent with the terminology used deliberately in the recommendations of the Committee. He then suggested that there was reason to believe that this difference was causing a divergence in approach.
- 7.1.11.** Mr Small then suggested that the CPC be given time to reflect on the discussion and re-examine the Drafting Instructions and the Cabinet Decision to see where the gap existed and how best the issue could be addressed.

- 7.1.12.** Dr Barnett reiterated that the CPC proceeded on the basis of what was contained in the Cabinet Decision. This was the basis for which he enquired whether Cabinet rejected or varied the recommendations of the Committee. He stated that where the recommendations were accepted by the Cabinet, it was clear what approach was to be taken.
- 7.1.13.** The CPC, having regard to the recommendation of the Committee to repeal and replace the present imperial instrument with a Jamaican instrument, asked for clarity on what was envisioned to be the replacement instrument.
- 7.1.14.** The Chairman, based on her understanding of Dr Barnett's position, stated that he was of the view that the entire Constitution would have to be presented to the Parliament for enactment and to the people of Jamaica for approval rather than legislation proposing amendments only.
- 7.1.15.** Mr Small stated that it went beyond that. The CPC recalled the lengthy discussion surrounding the phasing of the work and whether placing the entire Constitution before the Parliament for enactment was consistent with a phased approach. She stated that the approach proposed was similar to that which was taken in Barbados where the Order in Council was repealed and the Constitution, as contained in the Second Schedule, was saved.
- 7.1.16.** Dr Barnett, in response, opined that many Commonwealth countries which retained the basic provisions of the pre-republican Constitution in the republican form did not purport or present the new Constitution as a saving of the imperial instrument. He highlighted that those countries presented their Constitution noting the provisions enacted in the new Constitution.
- 7.1.17.** Mr Small asked that the issue be considered as a substantive issue at the next meeting of the Committee. The Chairman, in response, stated that it would be better to use the time productively as there was need for progress on the work to be done. She advised Members that her instructions were to proceed with a view to introduce a Bill in the House of Representatives.
- 7.1.18.** Mr Small enquired whether the Cabinet Decision covered every aspect of the Committee's recommendations. The Chairman, while regarding Mr Small's query to be a different point, stated that the issue being considered concerned the process of having the Constitution reenacted by the Parliament and approved by the People.
- 7.1.19.** Dr McCarthy enquired whether it was possible for the Cabinet to indicate which of the Committee's recommendations it accepted. The Chairman stated that Cabinet approved the Report and gave instructions on the next steps for implementation, mindful that not everything could be done at once.
- 7.1.20.** Dr Spence also sought clarity by requesting an explanation of the steps subsequent to the submission of the Report rather than the methodology. She stated that there was a need for some clarity on what would happen subsequent to the Report of the Committee being

considered by the Cabinet. She noted the Chairman's statement that the Report was accepted and invited Members to focus on the relevant strategy that would be required, at that juncture.

**7.1.21.** Dr McKoy stated that Cabinet made decisions by consensus. He advised that the Cabinet Decision was exactly as the Chairman presented. He then informed Members that Cabinet would not call a vote on each item as once there was consensus, and a decision was made, it would authorise the continuation of the work.

**7.1.22.** Dr Barnett reiterated that it was important to know whether Cabinet accepted the recommendations of the Committee in the terms in which those recommendations were made. The CPC stated that she could only act in respect of the reference made in the Cabinet Decision noting the sum of its consideration of the Report was that it be tabled as a Ministry Paper.

*Sujae Boswell arrived at 1:04pm*

**7.1.23.** The Chairman opined that there was a divergence in perspectives on how to achieve the goal of Jamaicanising. She summarised Dr Barnett's submission that if the Constitution, as contained in a schedule to the Order in Council, was saved, the goal would not be achieved as the approach of saving would retain an imperial instrument. She noted that when the matter was discussed, there was an understanding that the Constitution was prepared in Jamaica and deliberated in the Parliament. The Constitution, however, came into effect through an Order in Council made pursuant to the *West Indies Act*. She stated that Dr Barnett's knowledge and expertise influenced his perspectives and commentary in a technical way. She then stated that it was never her understanding that saving the Constitution would amount to a saving of the imperial instrument. The intention rather was to preserve the Constitution with the relevant amendments to achieve the goals being pursued.

**7.1.24.** She opined that the substantive issue being considered by the Committee concerned a legal technical question of whether the goal of Jamaicanising required the saving of the Constitution, as amended, or a whole new instrument reflecting changes being put to the Parliament and people of Jamaica. She opined that even if the Constitution was preserved, any amendment to it would still see a new instrument because it would come into effect through a different process.

**7.1.25.** Dr Barnett opined that there was a difference between the terms "new" and "revised" that could only be recognised by lawyers. He then invited Members to consider a brochure prepared and circulated by the Ministry, which stated that the Jamaicansation of the Constitution would result in a reformed Constitution, through the enactment of the Constitution of Jamaica (with amendments) as an Act of the Parliament of Jamaica and approved by the People of Jamaica,

in Jamaica, reflecting among other things, an appreciation and understanding of Jamaica's cultural heritage. He said that such a submission was contrary to the approach of saving the second schedule to the Order in Council. Having regard to the importance of asserting Jamaican heritage, it should be made clear that the approach of Jamaicansing was to result in a Jamaican instrument rather than the perpetuation of the restoration of the old colonial instrument.

**7.1.26.** Mrs Davis Mattis asked what would be required to enact a new instrument in accordance with the submission made by Dr Barnett. She also enquired whether the amendments proposed would eventually be incorporated into a single instrument.

**7.1.27.** The Chairman stated that an analogy about cloaking and decloaking came to mind having listened to the conversation. She opined that the local instrument, i.e. the Constitution, was cloaked imperially because of the process in which it came into force. This process of constitutional reform sought to decloak it by severing it from the Order in Council.

**7.1.28.** Dr Spence stated that the methodologies being considered should be articulated for the historic records. She noted that while the CPC and Dr Barnett proposed different methodologies, there was a need to determine which of the two would get the job done. She then stated that the terminology of "saving" the Constitution conveyed the act of perpetuating or preserving which suggested that the process would not see Jamaica moving beyond its colonial relationship. She then noted the need to clearly articulate that the Constitution was an emancipatory document and suggested identifying an alternative word to "save".

**7.1.29.** The Chairman opined that there was no doubt about the goal of Jamaicanising. The challenge was how to achieve it having regard to the framework and timeline. She stated that while Dr Barnett's approach was the purest and ideal, there were some practical considerations to bear in mind. Therefore, the Committee needed to determine how the goal could be achieved without using *the ideal*.

**7.1.30.** Dr Barnett, in response, reiterated that in approaching the public, it should be made unequivocally clear that the Constitution was to be a Jamaican instrument made by the Parliament and people of Jamaica. He opined that saving the Constitution was not an appropriate response to the issue.

**7.1.31.** The CPC stated that she did not understand why Members were discussing a new instrument having regard to the phased approach set out in the Terms of Reference. She recounted that a new instrument would come at the end of the proposed three phases.

**7.1.32.** Dr Barnett stated that the three phases set out in the Terms of Reference were irrational and conflicting having referenced the process of Jamaicanising at phase one. He opined that where the intention was to remove the vestiges of colonialism, the process should begin with a truly



Jamaican instrument. Therefore, the process of “saving” meant to preserve and it was not the intention to preserve the imperial instrument.

- 7.1.33.** Ms Wilkins invited everyone to consider some general language used in the Cabinet Decision which reflected what was in the Cabinet Submission. She recalled that it made reference to the revoking of the Order in Council and the saving of the Second Schedule of Order in Council to effect the patriation of the Constitution. She noted that the use of the term patriation was very general and subject to whatever was believed as constituting such patriation. She further stated that the general sentiment in the Cabinet Submission was that patriation included the process of Jamaicanisation. She opined that it was possible to meet halfway.
- 7.1.34.** Mrs Davis Mattis enquired whether the presentation of an entire new Constitution at this phase would relegate phase 2 and 3.
- 7.1.35.** The Chairman stated that while she appreciated the points raised thus far, there were practical realities to be faced. She compared the process of traveling from one destination to another and the multiple routes that were available. Ultimately, regardless of the route taken, the destination remained the same. She enquired whether it would make it illegitimate to pursue one route over the other.
- 7.1.36.** Dr Barnett invited Members to recall the recommendation in the Report of the Committee which stated that the Constitutional Reform Programme should begin with the Jamaicanisation of the Constitution by repealing and replacing the present imperial instrument with a Jamaican instrument made by the Parliament and approved by the People of Jamaica, in Jamaica. He noted that this was what he had been advocating for.
- 7.1.37.** The Chairman asked Dr Barnett to provide insight on what he believed to be the imperial instrument to which he responded, the Order in Council. She then stated that the intention was to unhinge the Constitution from the Order in Council to which he opined was a reversal of the recommendation which was in clear language.
- 7.1.38.** Dr Spence, interjected by opining that a Constitution was not *only* a legal instrument and should be relevant to the people who depend on its protection above anything. She stated that if it always needed lawyers to interpret it, it lost its significance. She also noted that the conversation should not be confined only to those who were legally trained.
- 7.1.39.** Dr Barnett stated that he has expressed things in the simplest form. Dr Spence, in response, stated that what he was articulating was frustration and asked him to outline the process that he was proposing.

*Lunch at 1:37pm*

*Meeting resumed at 2:09pm*

- 7.1.40.** The Chairman enquired whether Professor Albert had anything to add. In response, Professor Albert stated that he had been following the conversation noting that the matter to be resolved was a matter of legal technicality. He stated that the Members should be guided by the CPC and Director of Legal Reform in so far as they are closest in proximity to the technical requirements needed to effect the changes being proposed. He further noted the discussion around whether the sequencing in the Terms of Reference was being adhered to. He explained that it was important to honour those terms, only if they did not stand in the way of making progress.
- 7.1.41.** The Chairman expressed her gratitude for his contribution and enquired of him the technical requirements of achieving the goal of Jamaicanising the Constitution. Professor Albert, in response, stated that the process required strict adherence to the relevant procedure as prescribed by the Constitution. This, he believed, would prevent a court from deeming a Bill to effect the desired changes to the Constitution, unconstitutional. The Chairman stated that there was a need to distinguish preferences from the actual technical requirements.
- 7.1.42.** Dr Barnett opined that there was absolutely no legal basis for doubting that the Constitution could be amended as the word used at section 49 was ‘alter’ which included to amend and replace amongst other things. He stated that he had been advocating for a new Constitution. This, he stated, did not mean new provisions in the Constitutional instrument, but a new Constitution which contained the existing provisions and the changes for which consensus had been obtained.
- 7.1.43.** The Chairman recalled the suggestion to use the term “reformed” constitution rather than “new” constitution which was agreed among Members of the Committee. She stated that the focus should shift to how to achieve the goal of Jamaicanising the Constitution. She opined that it was clear that the Order in Council would be revoked. What was unclear, however, was whether the Order in Council, which was described as the imperial instrument, included the Constitution. She opined that the Constitution was cloaked by the Order in Council and that this process would seek to uncloak it. She further stated that the Constitution would be retained with certain alterations. She noted that there were many issues raised that were yet to be deliberated on by Members of the Committee.
- 7.1.44.** She then reported to the Committee that the CPC prepared two draft Bills. The first was a Bill entitled An Act to repeal the Jamaica (Constitution) Order in Council 1962 and to provide for the legal recognition and operation of the Constitution of Jamaica notwithstanding the repeal of that Order in Council; to amend the Constitution of Jamaica to provide for a non-monarchical

Head of State; to make other amendments in respect of certain provisions of the Constitution of Jamaica; and for connected matters. The second was a Bill entitled An Act to provide for the votes of electors to be taken with respect of any amendment of the Constitution of Jamaica, required to be submitted to electors pursuant to section 49(3) of that Constitution (commonly known as a referendum).

**7.1.45.** She then advised that the Drafting Strategy Sub-Committee met and spent some time discussing the goals being pursued. She also noted that clarity was sought on the direction of public engagement and education. She indicated that further to the approval given by the Cabinet, there were two imperatives being pursued, namely the Jamaicanisation of the Constitution and the abolition of the Monarchy. She stated that the depth and breadth of the process would be determined by the political environment, especially having regard to impending focus on General Elections. She then advised that a Report of the Drafting Strategy Sub-Committee would be submitted to Members for their consideration. While she noted that the methodology to achieve the goal of Jamaicansing could not be resolved at the meeting, she came to the table with an open mind. She stated that her focus was on ensuring that the goal could be achieved. She explained that she was not concerned with the “how” save and except for the fact that it must be a lawful process that the Constitution itself allowed for. She recalled that Dr Barnett suggested one approach and the CPC suggested another.

**7.1.46.** Dr Barnett requested that copies of the respective Bills be circulated among Members although details would be hammered out by the sub-committee.

**7.1.47.** The Chairman, in response, said that she would seek advice on that as the practice was not to circulate Bills widely. She further stated that a sub-committee was established for the purpose of reviewing the Bills. She opined that it may be better for the Bills to be kept at the level of the sub-committee until the issues were addressed.

**7.1.48.** Dr Spence endorsed the approach of resolving issues at the level of the sub-committee before bringing it to the attention of the wider committee. Mr Boswell and Dr McCarthy also indicated their endorsement of the approach.

## **8. DRAFTING STRATEGY**

8.1. The Chairman noted that this was addressed at length in the previous Agenda item.

## **9. PUBLIC EDUCATION AND ENGAGEMENT**

**9.1.** Mr Robertson suggested that the forum be used to identify which Members of the Committee would be participating in the Town Hall scheduled for July 25, 2024. He recalled Dr Spence indicating a

challenge and Dr Barnett's position that he would not be making any public statement at the time. He noted that Dr McCarthy had confirmed that she would be offering prayer. He also stated that Mrs Davis Mattis indicated that she would make herself available.

- 9.2. Mr Robertson then advised that the Town Hall would be held at the Emancipation Park and would commence at 7pm. He advised that parking arrangements were made at the National Housing Trust multistorey car park. He further advised that the Ministry received approval from the St Andrew Central Division for the event to be held and that public liability insurance was also secured. He stated that Dr Christopher Malcom was confirmed as moderator and the services of additional security guards were secured. He also stated that the Jamaica Information Service (JIS) was engaged to provide live streaming and a PA system, amongst other things. A videographer and photographer were engaged to ensure the adequate documentation of the event. He then advised that a decorator was contracted to ensure that the stage area was properly decorated and that chairs would be rented, in addition to those provided by Emancipation Park.
- 9.3. Mr Small stated that he recently visited Emancipation Park and observed that based on the activities that took place in the Park at the time proposed, the Town Hall would face a number of challenges.
- 9.4. Dr Barnett asked whether the target audience was identified.
- 9.5. Mr Robertson stated that provision was made for 350 people and that invitations were sent to the custos and deputy custos for the parish of St Andrew, the Member of Parliament for St Andrew South Eastern, Julian Robinson and His Worship Mayor Andrew Swaby. She also stated that Minister was to advise how many of her colleagues were expected to be in attendance.
- 9.6. As it relates to promotion of the event, Mr Robertson advised that a flyer was created and circulated across the Ministry's social media platform and a video created and boosted to reach more people. He also stated that a radio ad was prepared to sensitise persons and broadcast across eight (8) stations. Members of the technical team also participated in a number of radio and television interviews to inform persons of the Town hall. Messages were also sent out via WhatsApp.
- 9.7. Mrs Davis Mattis enquired whether a schedule of activities was prepared. Mr Robertson, in response, stated that there was a working draft which was yet to be ratified.

## **10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 10.1. There was no other business.

## **11. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETINGS**

- 11.1. The Chairman advised that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Wednesday, July 31, 2024 at 10:30am.

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

**12.1.** There being no other business, the meeting was terminated at 3:22pm on a motion by Mrs Davis Mattis and seconded by Dr Elaine McCarthy.