Ministry of JUSTICE

THE USE OF BILINGUAL (ENGLISH AND WELSH-SPEAKING) JURIES IN CERTAIN CRIMINAL TRIALS IN WALES

Response to Consultation

CP(R) 08/10

9 March 2010

OFFICE FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Criminal Justice System: working together for the public

THE USE OF BILINGUAL (ENGLISH AND WELSH-SPEAKING) JURIES IN CERTAIN CRIMINAL TRIALS IN WALES

Response to consultation carried out by Office for Criminal Justice Reform, part of the Ministry of Justice.

OFFICE FOR
CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM
Criminal Justice System: working together for the public

About this consultation

To:	This consultation was aimed at members of the public with an interest in the criminal law and in the role of the Welsh language.
Duration:	From 19 December 2005 to 31 March 2006

Contents

Introduction and contact details	2
Background	3
Summary of responses	4
Responses to specific questions	5
Conclusion and next steps	17
The consultation criteria	22
Annex A – List of respondents	23

Introduction and contact details

This document is the post-consultation report for the consultation paper, “The Use Of Bilingual (English And Welsh-Speaking) Juries In Certain Criminal Trials In Wales”.

It will cover:

- the background to the report
- a summary of the responses to the report
- a detailed response to the specific questions raised in the report
- the next steps following this consultation.

Copies of the consultation paper and alternative format versions of this report can be obtained by contacting Guy Wilson at the address below:

Better Trials Unit
Office for Criminal Justice Reform
Ministry of Justice
102 Petty France
London SW1H 9AJ
Telephone: 020 3334 6072
Email: guy.wilson@justice.gsi.gov.uk

Background

The consultation paper “The Use of Bilingual (English and Welsh-speaking) Juries in Certain Criminal Trials in Wales” was published on 19 December 2005. It invited comments on the desirability of selecting juries in certain criminal trials in Wales, all of whose members would be bilingual in Welsh and English.

The Welsh Language Act 1993 requires that in the conduct of public business and the administration of justice in Wales, English and Welsh are to be treated on the basis of equality, so far as is appropriate in the circumstances and reasonably practicable. There is, however, no provision for selecting a jury, all of whose members can speak both Welsh and English.

The paper made it clear that the Government had not decided if bilingual juries were desirable in principle, and would not consider this further until after the consultation period was over. By “bilingual” the paper meant having a sound grasp of both Welsh and English.

A total of 5 questions were asked in the paper. These questions were intended to gauge the support for the use of bilingual juries and to see what the preferred options were for the different procedures that might be used to select and appoint them in criminal trials.

The consultation period closed on 31 March 2006 and this report summarises the responses, including how the consultation process influenced the final shape/further development of the policy/proposal consulted upon.

A list of respondents is at Annex A.

Summary of responses

1. There were 24 responses to the consultation. The judiciary and other members of the legal profession submitted a substantial number of the responses. A total of 8 came from individual members of the judiciary. There were also a number of responses from bodies with an interest in the use of the Welsh language.

2. The responses were analysed in particular for possible new approaches to the central question of the interference of bilingual juries with the principle of random selection of juries.

3. Most of the respondents were in favour of bilingual juries in principle and the Government has taken account of this fact in preparing its response. Two main arguments were provided as to why the principle of random selection should be overridden in the case of bilingual juries. The first was that the present legal prohibition on selecting a bilingual jury in Wales was inconsistent with legislation which gives participants in trials in Wales the right to use Welsh in court. The second was that bilingual juries would enable best evidence to be given, in that a witness or other speaker using Welsh or English would always be understood directly by the jury, rather than through an interpreter.

4. In addition, the respondents provided a range of views on how bilingual juries would work in practice.

Responses to specific questions

Question 1: Taking account of the factors described in Parts 3 and 4 of this paper, would the introduction of bilingual juries in appropriate cases in Wales be justified in principle?

Most respondents commented on this question. A large majority of respondents who commented (19 out of 22) took the view that bilingual juries were justified in principle. Three disagreed. Of the other two respondents, one adopted a neutral position on this issue and the other expressed no view.

The primary argument put forward by respondents in favour of bilingual juries was that they were justified by the statutory equality of English and Welsh in the courts of Wales. The view was also expressed that the lack of bilingual juries meant that the two languages were not treated on a true basis of equality at present.

A second argument was also encountered on a number of occasions. Many of those who supported the principle of bilingual juries thought that the current situation meant that witnesses giving their evidence in Welsh were at a disadvantage when their evidence was not directly understood by the jury but via a translator. They considered that the English speaker had the right to be understood directly, with a statutory mechanism in section 10 Juries Act 1974 to ensure an adequate command of English amongst jurors.

The Lord Chancellor's Standing Committee on the Welsh Language as well as making the above points saw a lack of symmetry whereby cases which did not require a jury, such as those in the magistrates' courts, could be arranged so that the tribunal was genuinely bilingual, whilst jury trials could not be genuinely bilingual in practice because the process of random selection would invariably result in the selection of at least one monoglot English speaker.

Those who disagreed with the idea of bilingual juries were all members of the judiciary. However, most members of the judiciary who responded to the consultation considered bilingual juries were right in principle.

The Council of HM Circuit Judges, whilst recognising the equal status of English and Welsh, stressed in their response that there was a divided view on the subject of bilingual juries in the Council.

The Criminal Bar Association responded supporting the principle, but qualified its view by the assertion that this was subject to satisfying the demands of random selection, fairness, practicality and reasonable cost. In particular, it advanced a suggestion that a bilingual jury should only be appointed where the parties agreed, with the prosecution and the defence both having the right of veto.

Opinions among judges were mixed. Judge Dafydd Hughes commented that bilingual juries were consistent with the “Overriding Objective” set out in the Criminal Procedure Rules that criminal cases are dealt with justly. However, Judge John Rogers considered that bilingual juries addressed a problem which did not exist. He considered that interpreters were sufficient and no appeal applications had ever alleged misinterpretation as a grounds for appeal.

Another view was that the number of Welsh speakers that were actually competent enough to follow criminal proceedings was overestimated. However, others took the view that the need for interpreters did not enable justice to be done, and felt that the number of Welsh speakers with sufficient knowledge of the language was unlikely to be a problem.

Question 2: Can the proposal for bilingual juries be reconciled with the principle of random selection?

Again most respondents commented on this question. Of the 20 who commented, 15 considered that the proposal could be reconciled with random selection and 4 disagreed. One respondent expressed no view either way.

Most respondents who were in favour of bilingual juries in principle accepted that the principle of random selection would be infringed to some extent in cases where a bilingual jury was appointed. They noted that selection had never been completely random, and suggested that the real question was whether selection would remain sufficiently random under a bilingual jury scheme, and whether the reduction in the degree of random selection was justified by the benefits that would accrue, notably in the form of the jury's improved understanding of evidence.

The Bar of the Wales and Chester Circuit accepted that bilingual juries would impinge upon random selection but thought that it would be to an acceptable degree.

The Lord Chancellor's Standing Committee on the Welsh Language argued that the principle of random selection was already restricted by section 10 of the Juries Act 1974, which required jurors to be excluded if they could not understand English sufficiently well. The Committee also commented that no jurors were summoned from sparsely populated areas which were not in close proximity to a Crown Court. Thus restrictions were already placed on the principle of random selection because of the perceived benefits that accrued. The Committee's view was that the benefit of the introduction of bilingual juries outweighed the cost of the diminution of the principle of random selection.

Some respondents took the view that there were sufficient Welsh speakers to prevent there being any serious diminution of the principle of random selection but thought that issues might arise in the more Anglophone areas. It was suggested that those trials could be moved to areas where there was a larger pool of Welsh speakers to summon.

Those who were of the opinion that bilingual juries were wrong in principle also took the view that bilingual juries were irreconcilable with the principle of random selection.

One concern mentioned by the Council of Circuit Judges and others was the possible knock-on effect of bilingual Welsh-English juries for other minority languages. It was suggested that the reaction of other groups of non-English language speakers might be to ask for similar treatment in criminal trials, on the same grounds that better evidence would be given if given directly, without the need for an interpreter. However, the contrary view was argued that other languages did not have the statutory standing of the Welsh language, and so bilingual juries would not lead to other language groups being granted similar treatment.

Question 3: How should the power to order a bilingual jury be exercised, at what stage and by whom? Which of the options given or combinations of options are preferred? Are there any other viable options?

There was a wide variety of responses to this question.

With regard to the **criteria** for appointing a bilingual jury, most of the respondents who commented (19) took the view that what was required was a combination of the options in the paper. There was no outright majority view.

Eight respondents favoured none of the options. However, these fell into two groups, at the opposite poles of the argument. The first group considered that a bilingual jury should be appointed in effect automatically, so that there was no need to consider any criteria beforehand.

Welsh language interest groups tended to favour either an absolute right or a strong presumption in favour of a bilingual jury if an application was made. Some respondents argued that in accordance with the Welsh Language Act 1993 there should be an unconditional right to have a bilingual jury available to all parties.

On the other hand, those who were opposed to the principle of bilingual juries were also likely to indicate that as a result of their basic position, they did not favour any of the options.

Of those who favoured particular options, the majority (5) favoured Option 2 which would enable a bilingual jury to be appointed if it was in the interests of justice. In one case, this was combined with a preference for Option 1 (a test that key or substantial evidence would be given in Welsh) and in another case, it was combined with a preference for Option 4 (a test based on the language of the defendant as in Canada). An argument put forward was that the interests of justice test was established and familiar.

The Bar of the Wales and Chester Circuit took the view that the interests of justice test would in any case require the other options to be taken account of by the judge as part of an overall balancing exercise in deciding whether to

appoint a bilingual jury. The view was also expressed that there should be a presumption in favour of allowing an application for a bilingual jury unless it went against the interests of justice.

Three respondents favoured a combination of all four options.

Only one respondent favoured Option 1 (the evidential test) on its own. One respondent, a member of the judiciary, thought the simple fact that evidence was to be given in Welsh was all that was required and rejected the use of a test where the evidence was 'important' or 'significant'.

Only one respondent favoured Option 4 (the defendant test) on its own, and one other favoured it when combined with Option 3 (a test based on the language of the victim).

Turning to the **procedure** for appointing a bilingual jury, again views were mixed. Of the 18 respondents who commented, most (6) favoured a combination of Option 2 (bilingual jury to be appointed on a prosecution application) and Option 3 (bilingual jury to be appointed on a defence application). This combination would implicitly reject Option 3 in the paper, a power for the judge to appoint a bilingual jury of his or her own motion.

A significant number of respondents (5) favoured a combination of all three options, including the power of the judge to appoint a bilingual jury of his or her own motion.

Four respondents favoured none of the options, views here being mixed. As with the responses discussed above on the criteria for appointing a bilingual jury, this group included those who considered a bilingual jury should be appointed in effect automatically, which would exclude the need for an application to a judge, whilst those who rejected bilingual juries in principle also rejected all the options suggested in the paper for appointing one.

One respondent favoured bilingual juries only being appointed on the judge's own motion, and one other favoured only the defence being able to apply, not the prosecution.

Another issue raised by this question was, when should a bilingual jury be appointed. Over half the respondents (13) commented on this. There was much support for the issue to be dealt with at the Plea and Case Management Hearing. There were also those who, whilst they referred to the PCMH, felt that the issue should be dealt with before then if possible, or that the judge should be allowed a discretion to appoint a bilingual jury at a later date.

An important issue commented on by a number of respondents was, whether there should be a right of appeal against the judge's decision. Those who opposed an appeal right tended to think the judge's decision should be final in the interests of keeping the procedure simple, and considered that a bilingual jury favoured neither party. On the other hand, the view was expressed that the issue was important enough to justify a right of appeal.

A number of respondents compared the decision being made by the judge in this context with the existing procedure for introducing "special measures" at trial for vulnerable or intimidated witnesses (e.g. the ability to give evidence on video).

Question 4: Do you consider that the appointment of bilingual juries might have wider implications for Crown Court trials in Wales? If so, what are they?

Nineteen (19) respondents commented on this issue. The largest group (9) considered that the change would have wider implications. Two others disagreed that there would be wider implications, whilst one felt it was unlikely.

A further seven restricted their comments to the effect of the change on the recording of the trial. Some pointed out that the use of bilingual juries would not eliminate the need for simultaneous translation services. These would still be needed for any individuals who were English-only speakers involved in the trial, or members of the public in the courtroom.

Respondents differed on what the wider implications would be, the extent of any implications and whether it would predominantly beneficial or negative. The comments made are summarised below.

Dr Catrin Fflur Huws felt that the effect would be a greater status for the Welsh language in the courts. The Bar of the Wales and Chester Circuit mentioned the increased use of Welsh by witnesses, and the Crown Prosecution Service its greater use by young victims. The Welsh Language Board thought of bilingual juries as a catalyst for the further improvement of standards of Welsh services by the courts.

Dr Huws felt that there would be savings on interpretation but that there could be an increase in costs if it was necessary to sever a multi-handed case where one defendant was bilingual and another only spoke English.. The Crown Prosecution Service similarly mentioned the speeding up of the trial process by avoiding simultaneous translation.

Two judges, HH Judge Merfyn Hughes and HH Judge John Rogers, were concerned about a shortage of bilingual judges. Judge Hughes felt that this would cause delay in the administration of justice in Wales.

The view was also expressed that there would be implications for other languages outside Wales, with speakers of minority languages also asking for

bilingual juries. The point was made by Judge Roger Dutton and mentioned in the response of the Council of Circuit Judges. Others argued, however, that there were no such implications because of the special status of Welsh.

Both the Bar of the Wales and Chester Circuit and the Crown Prosecution Service mentioned a greater need to transfer cases away from the court to which the accused had been committed, in areas where bilingual speakers formed a small minority of the population. However, it was also argued that even in these areas, there would be sufficient speakers.

Both the Law Society and the Crown Prosecution Service considered that there would be a general need for more participants in the trial process to be bilingual.

Question 5: Which of the options given in Part 7 of the paper would be the preferred procedure for summoning a bilingual jury? What are their relative strengths and weaknesses? Are there any other viable options?

19 out of the 24 respondents commented on this question. Of these, most (9) favoured Option 2 (use of the juror summoning form to select a bilingual jury) and seven favoured Option 4 (use of the electoral register).

It was accepted by some respondents who selected the most popular Option (2) that there would be difficulties in areas where there were few Welsh speakers. Suggested solutions were to move trials that required a bilingual jury to an area with a larger Welsh speaking population, creating larger catchment areas for summoning and allowing more time for the summoning process.

Those who favoured Option 4 saw it as a cheap and expedient method of identifying bilingual jurors. They did not think it was inappropriate to collect non-electoral information as a question was already included in the form about jurors' English language competence.

However, although it did not indicate a preference for any of the other three options, Option 4 was opposed by the Electoral Commission, mainly on the grounds that it would further complicate the electoral registration form with material unrelated to electoral registration, and so could deter the public from registering. A similar position was taken by SOLACE Wales (the (Society of Local Authority Chief Executives and Senior Managers).

The Bar of the Wales and Chester Circuit also opposed Option 4. It regarded the use of the electoral register as undermining the principle of random selection. It commented: "It is one thing to establish, once jurors have been randomly selected from the electoral register, whether they are or are not bilingual. It is quite another to pre-determine the random selection of the pool only to those who are bilingual."

Only one respondent supported Option 1 (selection from a larger panel than at present); when a reason was given for not supporting this option it was often the impracticality and inconvenience of calling very large panels. Also some respondents cited the increased expense of this option.

Nor did any respondent fully support Option 3 (using pre-selection to identify Welsh speakers), although it was suggested by one respondent that some combination of all the options might be workable. Option 3 was also criticised by others, for example on the grounds that it was more costly and not linked to the need for a bilingual jury at a particular time and place.

Other matters raised

In the consultation paper, comparisons were drawn with overseas jurisdictions. In the responses, attention was also drawn to the position in the Republic of Ireland. Under the Irish constitution, the Irish language took precedence over English, but was spoken by a minority of the population. However, unlike in Canada where bilingual juries were possible, the Irish Supreme Court had determined that there was no right to trial before an Irish speaking jury under Irish law . Mr Gwynedd Parry in his response commented:

"The issue of bilingual juries in Ireland was confronted head-on in the case of *MacCarthaigh v. Ireland*. MacCarthaigh was tried for robbery and wished to conduct his defence through the medium of the Irish language. He applied to be tried by a jury who spoke Irish, and relied upon Article 8 of the Constitution in support. The Prosecution responded by referring to Article 38.5 of the Constitution, which guarantees the right to trial by jury, and to authorities, including American case-law, which supported the principle of random selection. The High Court refused the defendant's application for an Irish speaking jury, a decision later upheld by the Supreme Court, primarily on the ground that summoning an Irish speaking jury would effectively exclude some eighty per cent of the population from the pool of eligible jurors, and that this seriously compromised the representative character of the jury. This judgment, however, has been the subject of critical comment, in that it is not apparently reconcilable with the purported constitutional position of the Irish language as the first official language of the State."

Conclusion and next steps

The Government considers that the overriding question is whether bilingual juries are right in principle. The practical issues – although these are not insignificant and have some bearing on the principle – are of a lesser order.

The jury system is important in the United Kingdom. Criminal trials are the forum where many conflicts between the state and the individual are resolved. Being tried for a serious offence by one's fellow citizens is an important right, particularly in a country which has no written constitution.

Juries are selected at random from the whole community. Much of the authority of, and widespread public confidence in, the jury system derives from its socially inclusive nature. Members of the public are not excluded from jury service by their sex, wealth, class, education or any other irrelevant factor. Juries are made up of ordinary people. Random selection makes the jury a representative of society as a whole. It helps to give the jury its independence and impartiality, which are vital components of a fair trial and hence of justice itself.

There is a linkage between the ever greater element of randomness in the selection of juries and increasing democracy. Over the centuries, the historical direction has been towards greater social inclusiveness in jury selection. For example, the property qualification for jury service was abolished a long time ago and women are no longer excluded from jury service as they once were. These developments have run hand in hand with the increasing long-term democratisation of society.

The long term trend towards greater random selection of juries has been strengthened still further in recent years. The Criminal Justice Act 2003, brought forward by this Government, removed virtually all of the then remaining grounds for exclusion from jury service (the small number of exceptions being, for example, people with certain criminal records).

The main objection to bilingual juries has always been, their interference with this key principle of random selection. If bilingual juries were proceeded with in Wales, they would probably only be used in a small minority of trials. Where they were used, however, they would be limited to the minority of

people who can speak Welsh as well as English. On the face of it, bilingual juries would run directly counter not only to the long term historical development in favour of greater social inclusiveness in jury selection, but also to recent developments championed by the present Government.

Bilingual juries in Wales would involve a significant interference with the random selection principle. According to 2001 census results, 21% of people in Wales said they could speak Welsh (of whatever level or usage). This would amount to the exclusion from the jury, in every case involving a bilingual jury, of about four fifths of the population of Wales.

Furthermore, research conducted as part of the Ministry of Justice's 2007 report into "Diversity and Fairness in the Jury System" found that a far larger percentage of the Welsh population declared they were fluent in Welsh in the 2001 census than in a summoning survey conducted as part of the research. The census shows that 16.5% of the population in Wales speaks, reads and writes Welsh. This was not reflected in the proportion of those summoned for jury service for Welsh courts who declared that they were fluent in Welsh (a much lower figure of 6.4%). On the basis of this research, where bilingual juries were used, they would exclude well over nine tenths of the population of Wales.

Every interference with the random selection principle displaces either the majority of the population (in this case, English speakers, including those with inadequate knowledge of Welsh) or some minority. It has been suggested in the context of bilingual juries that as, for example, most Welsh speakers are white, some black and minority ethnic members of the population could be displaced and as a result, bilingual juries would not represent the full ethnic diversity of Wales.

Other proposals for interfering with the random selection principle are made from time to time and are consistently rejected. For example, it is argued on occasion that juries should include a certain number of appointed professional jurors, on the grounds that ordinary members of the public lack sufficient expertise to decide trials. This would not be consistent with the random selection principle.

Thus, the key question arising out of the consultation is, whether the majority of respondents who supported bilingual juries in principle presented arguments which would justify disapplying random selection in the context of bilingual jurors.

Two main arguments were provided as to why the principle of random selection should be overridden in the case of bilingual juries. The first was that the present legal prohibition on selecting a bilingual jury in Wales was inconsistent with legislation which gives participants in trials in Wales the right to use Welsh in court. The second was that bilingual juries would enable best evidence to be given, in that a witness or other speaker using Welsh or English would always be understood directly by the jury, rather than through an interpreter.

With regard to the first argument, reference to the current legal status of the Welsh language is not persuasive. There is also legislation on jury selection which makes it clear that jury selection procedures cannot be manipulated to generate a jury composed of members of any particular social group, including Welsh speakers. Indeed, it is noticeable that the juries legislation, the Juries Act 1974, was not amended in consequence of the enactment of the Welsh Language Act 1993.

Turning to the question of best evidence, it is a moot point whether evidence is best understood directly, rather than through a professional simultaneous interpreter, where two languages are in use during a trial. Certainly, one would have to have a very high level of understanding of both languages – in effect, perfect bilingualism - to be able to understand evidence given in both languages better than one would be able to understand one's weaker language through a professional interpreter.

It is questionable how many Welsh and English speakers would have this high degree of bilingualism (having regard to the statistical information mentioned above). Indeed, a bilingual juror could feel obliged to listen without using the interpreter and consequently may understand less well than through an interpreter, increasing the risk of miscarriages of justice. The evidential argument has not been made out.

The country where the linguistic position is probably most closely analogous with the position in Wales is the Republic of Ireland. The Government notes that the Irish Supreme Court (MacCarthaigh v. Eire [1998] IESC 11; [1999] 1 IR 186 15th July, 1998) has decided that there is no right under the Irish constitution to be tried by an Irish speaking jury. The judgment was based mainly on random selection arguments.

This judgment is particularly striking in that Irish has a formal constitutional position as the first language of the Republic of Ireland, and English as second language, rather than Irish and English being regarded broadly as equals as Welsh and English are in Wales. The Government notes also that it was the prosecution that challenged the right to trial by an Irish speaking jury in the MacCarthaigh case, and that in Ireland crimes and offences are prosecuted in the name of the people. Ireland was, of course, an independent country at the time of the judgment.

Some comment should also be made on the practicalities of selecting a jury from a relatively small percentage of the population. These are uncharted territory. Most Welsh speakers live outside the main areas of population in Wales, which raises the prospect of having to transfer trials or require jurors to travel outside the usual catchment areas. Such arrangements could well involve disruption to jurors, witnesses, victims, defendants and trials generally. Such disruption would run counter to the Government's efforts to make trials quicker and more efficient.

The bilingual juries proposal is difficult to resolve because it is one of those subjects which comes down to a choice between two good things – in this instance, the jury system and the Welsh language. The question is, where the overall balance lies in relation to the particular issue. On this occasion the Government has decided not to accept the proposal, primarily because the balance of argument lies against the negative impact of bilingual juries on random selection from the community as a whole and hence on social inclusion and justice.

Consultation Co-ordinator contact details

If you have any complaints or comments about the consultation **process** rather than about the topic covered by this paper, you should contact Julia Bradford, Ministry of Justice Consultation Co-ordinator, on 020 3334 4492, or email her at consultation@justice.gsi.gov.uk.

Alternatively, you may wish to write to the address below:

Julia Bradford
Consultation Co-ordinator
Ministry of Justice
102 Petty France
London SW1H 9AJ

If your complaints or comments refer to the topic covered by this paper rather than the consultation process, please direct them to the contact given at the beginning of this paper.

The consultation criteria

The seven consultation criteria are as follows:

1. **When to consult** – Formal consultations should take place at a stage where there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

2. **Duration of consultation exercises** – Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

3. **Clarity of scope and impac**t – Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

4. **Accessibility of consultation exercises** – Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

5. **The burden of consultation** – Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

6. **Responsiveness of consultation exercise**s – Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

7. **Capacity to consult** – Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

Annex A – List of respondents

Bwrdd yr Iaith Gymraeg / Welsh Language Board

Council of HM Circuit Judges

Criminal Bar Association

Crown Prosecution Service

Cymdeithas yr laith Gymraeg

Dr. Catrin Fflur Huws

First Minister for Wales Rhodri Morgan

Heini Gruffudd

HH Judge John Rogers QC

HH Judge Dafydd Hughes

HH Judge Merfyn Hughes QC

HH Judge Philip Richards

HH Judge Roger Dutton

Judge Dewi Watkin Powell

Law Society's Wales Committee

Lord Chancellor's Standing Committee on the Welsh Language

Mr Gwynedd Parry

Plaid Cymru – The Party of Wales

SOLACE Wales (Society of Local Authority Chief Executives and Senior Managers)

Standing Committee for Legal Wales

The Bar of the Wales and Chester Circuit

The Electoral Commission

The Hon. Mr Roderick Evans

Whitehall Prosecutors Group

© Crown copyright
Produced by the Ministry of Justice