



**Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru  
Pwyllgor ar y Papur Gwyn—Trefn Lywodraethu  
Well i Gymru**

**The National Assembly for Wales  
The Committee on the Better Governance for Wales  
White Paper**

**Dydd Mawrth, 28 Mehefin 2005**

**Tuesday, 28 June 2005**

**Cynnwys**  
**Contents**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Cyflwyniad ac Ymddiheuriadau<br>Introduction and Apologies .....             | 3  |
| Dull Gweithio a Rhaglen Waith<br>Approach to Working and Work Programme..... | 3  |
| Dyddiad y Cyfarfod Nesaf<br>Date of Next Meeting .....                       | 12 |

Cofnodir y trafodion hyn yn yr iaith y llefarwyd hwy ynndi yn y pwyllgor. Yn ogystal,  
cynhwysir cyfieithiad Saesneg o gyfraniadau yn y Gymraeg.

These proceedings are reported in the language in which they were spoken in the committee.  
In addition, an English translation of Welsh speeches is included.

*Aelodau o'r Cynulliad yn bresennol: Dafydd Elis-Thomas, y Llywydd (Cadeirydd), Lorraine Barrett, Jocelyn Davies, Jane Hutt, David Melding, Carl Sargeant, Kirsty Williams.*

*Swyddogion yn bresennol: Paul Silk, Clerc y Cynulliad.*

*Gwasanaeth Pwyllgor: Siân Wilkins, Clerc.*

*Assembly Members in attendance: Dafydd Elis-Thomas, the Presiding Officer (Chair), Lorraine Barrett, Jocelyn Davies, Jane Hutt, David Melding, Carl Sargeant, Kirsty Williams.*

*Officials in attendance: Paul Silk, Clerk to the Assembly.*

*Committee Service: Siân Wilkins, Clerk.*

*Dechreuodd y cyfarfod am 5.30 p.m.  
The meeting began at 5.30 p.m.*

### **Cyflwyniad ac Ymddiheuriadau Introduction and Apologies**

**Y Llywydd:** Croeso i gyfarfod cyntaf y Pwyllgor ar y Papur Gwyn—Trefn Lywodraethu Well i Gymru. Nid oes ymddiheuriadau.

**The Presiding Officer:** Welcome to the first meeting of the Committee on the Better Governance for Wales White Paper. There are no apologies.

### **Dull Gweithio a Rhaglen Waith Approach to Working and Work Programme**

**Y Llywydd:** Mae papur gerbron ar ein dull gweithio. Af drwy'r papur fel ag y mae. Gwelwch destun y cynnig yn y paragraff cyntaf sy'n amlinellu diben y pwyllgor, y dull gweithio a'r rhaglen waith. Efallai mai'r peth pwysig i'w bwysleisio ar y dechrau yw bod dau ymgynghoriad yn digwydd ar yr un pryd, mewn ffordd. Mae ymgynghoriad yn codi o'r Papur Gwyn ei hun, sy'n cael ei gynnal gan Lywodraeth y Deyrnas Unedig drwy Swyddfa Cymru, ac yna byddwn ni yn dilyn ein cylch gorchwyl ni, fel y nodir ym mharagraff 5, sef ystyried y cynigion a'u perthnasedd i strwythur newydd arfaethedig y Cynulliad a'r pwerau deddfwriaethol arfaethedig, a chymryd tystiolaeth. Efallai y dylwn bwysleisio y byddwn yn

**The Presiding Officer:** There is a paper before us on our approach to the work. I will go through the paper as it stands. You will see the text of the motion in the first paragraph, which outlines the purpose of the committee, the approach to the work and the work programme. Perhaps the most important point to emphasise at the outset is that there are two consultations taking place at the same time, in a way. A consultation arises from the White Paper itself, which is being undertaken by the UK Government through the Wales Office, and then we will be following our remit, as set out in paragraph 5, namely to consider the proposals and their relevance to the proposed new structure for the Assembly and the proposed legislative powers and to take evidence. Perhaps I should emphasise that we will

‘Cymryd tystiolaeth gan sefydliadau ac unigolion sydd â diddordeb uniongyrchol yn strwythur newydd arfaethedig y Cynulliad’.

‘Take evidence from organisations and individuals with a direct interest in the proposed new structure of the Assembly’.

Felly, yr awgrym yw na fyddwn yn cynnal

Therefore, the suggestion is that we will not

ymgyngoriad eang iawn, ond y byddwn yn ceisio darparu a chysoni tystiolaeth ar ran y Cynulliad. Pwysleisiaf, yng nghyswllt yr hyn a ddywedais yn y Cyfarfod Llawn heddiw wrth ateb pwynt o drefn, nad ydym yn ymwneud â phennod 4 y Papur Gwyn ac na fyddwn yn gwneud unrhyw gyfeiriad ato. Os byddwn yn derbyn tystiolaeth ar bennod 4, awgrymaf ein bod yn ei nodi ond nid yn ei drafod, os yw hynny'n briodol.

Ar bwynt 6, y bwriad yw ein bod yn adrodd i'r Cynulliad erbyn 19 Medi fan bellaf. Bydd hynny'n golygu y bydd ein hadroddiad wedi ei gwblhau ond na fyddwn wedi adrodd i'r Cynulliad o fewn amserlen sy'n cyd-fynd ag amserlen ymgyngoriad Swyddfa Cymru, sy'n dod i ben, os cofiaf yn iawn, ar 16 Medi.

A oes unrhyw sylwadau ar y papur hyd yn hyn?

**Lorraine Barrett:** Regarding point 7 on committee meetings, where it says that the quorum of the committee will be three Members, do you think that we could make that at least one from each party, instead of just three Members, so that each party is represented?

**The Presiding Officer:** I was very keen for us to be able to have the opportunity to hear evidence. Obviously, when we come to deliberate, I would hope that we will all be here. Therefore, the intention of the relatively small quorum—although I do not think that it is really small in a committee of this size—would be to allow the evidence to be taken. There will be no deliberation at those meetings that have a minimum quorum, if it is helpful that I give you that assurance. I do not want us not to be able to go ahead with our programme of evidence because someone is unable to attend. That was my concern.

**Kirsty Williams:** I think that concerns regarding the quorum could perhaps be overcome if the next part of the sentence was changed. If people were allowed to send substitutes, then that would not be so much of an issue. I think that the issue arises from the fact that we have a potentially very heavy load of committee meetings to get through a big section of work against a tight timetable. People's concerns could be addressed if we could allow substitutions in exceptional circumstances because of an inability to attend. I think that would be a sensible provision and a sensible way forward.

**The Presiding Officer:** I will call Carl, but I will respond to that first by saying that you said 'in exceptional circumstances'. I would like to see this being a close working committee. Regular substitution, from my experience of the Assembly review of procedure, often prolongs the period of work because people who are not present do not pick up on what may have happened before and so on. I would argue that the evidence-gathering sessions are precisely that, and all the evidence will be on record. I do not see why substitution is necessary if we are listening to evidence. The difficulty might be that if you allow a substitute for any of the hearing meetings, you could end up in a situation where you would have a substitute for a deliberative meeting at the end. That might cause difficulties. I do not see this as a party committee. I appreciate that we are all members of parties; I am acting in my role as Presiding Officer and will, therefore, not be voting, but I hope that we can move forward in a way that reflects the maturity of the institution.

**Carl Sargeant:** In support of my colleague, Kirsty Williams, there is undoubtedly full commitment from colleagues here with regard to the importance of this White Paper committee. I do not think that there was ever any doubt about our commitment. However, given the short timescale that is being imposed on a small committee, substitutes would be helpful and appropriate, although I understand your point. Although you recognise that we should be mature and that the party element should not come into it, it may creep in now and then. It is important that we maintain party balance, and I support Kirsty Williams's point about substitutions where appropriate.

**The Presiding Officer:** Is that the view of you all? If so, I shall have to modify what I said earlier.

**Jocelyn Davies:** For the Assembly review of procedure, we did not have substitutes. The leaders and business managers were members, but the leaders tended not to attend. I do not think that it was necessarily to the detriment of the committee, but, bearing in mind the short timescale, it would be helpful if we could have substitutes. However, when we come to discuss the report, we would obviously expect the original members of the committee to attend.

**David Melding:** I think that Jocelyn has hit the nail on the head. The deliberative session would be weakened if the membership as constituted here is not present. I anticipate being able to attend all the meetings, but I am aware that I serve South Wales Central and I do not have any difficulty travelling. Some flexibility for other Members may be quite useful. I hear what you say about being able to read up on the evidence, but, if all the parties are tied in to the process and able to ask questions of witnesses, a substitute may not be a bad idea. However, you are quite right that we do not want that to be frequent practice where one of the Members cannot attend a single meeting in the course of several planned. I do not anticipate having to call on a substitute but, given the circumstances, it is a reasonable request.

**The Presiding Officer:** This will require a change to the Standing Order, but I understand that the Business Committee has discussed that already.

**Jane Hutt:** This has been a useful discussion. The matter was brought to the Business Committee this morning, and I agreed that I could table this for next week. However, the discussion has clarified the point that that provision would be for exceptional circumstances. We need to aim to be present for the deliberative meetings, although that takes us beyond the timetable in the sense that it would be the end of the term, and into September. We should try to secure our availability before we firm up the final dates for meetings. Kirsty has already mentioned that some leave will be taken during the beginning of September, but there is some flexibility. If we could have a bit more time to firm up the final dates in early September, I think that we could fulfil both your views and the views of the Members here.

5.40 p.m.

**The Presiding Officer:** I concur with that arrangement. Perhaps it would be useful if we had a short note indicating the committee's agreement with substitution in exceptional circumstances, plus expecting that all of us will be there for the deliberative session. I am happy with that.

I ddychwelyd at y papur, a pharagraff 7, a oes unrhyw sylw eraill, Glerc, ynglŷn â'r tystion a'r cyfarfod nesaf, a'r ymateb yr ydym wedi ei gael hyd yn hyn? To return to the paper, and paragraph 7, are there any other comments, Clerk, on the witnesses and the next meeting, and the responses that we have received to date?

**Mr Silk:** Would you like me to speak on the witnesses that we have so far, Chair?

**The Presiding Officer:** Yes, and if you could possibly tie them in with dates, if we are in a position to do that.

**Mr Silk:** We have been in touch with all the people on this list, and, with one exception—Richard Wyn Jones—they are either ‘possibles’ or ‘definites’. We have tentatively arranged several dates, subject to the committee’s agreement, with these people. I do not know whether you would like me to mention some of those dates?

**The Presiding Officer:** Yes, please.

**Jane Hutt:** Before we get on to that list, would it be all right if we just went back to the issues about who should be invited—we have done the meetings of the committee—and go back to paragraph 9 for a moment, recognising that these papers will be in the public domain? It struck me that I suggested last week that the committee should seek evidence from the business, local government and voluntary sector partnership councils. I wondered whether the previous sentence should be removed, because that was there in an earlier informal version, and it suggests

‘that the Committee should not invite evidence from wider Welsh society such as the social partners, WLGA, ASPBs, civil society groups, legal professions etc.’.

Is that slightly contradicted now by the fact that we agreed, at an informal session, to seek evidence? Just for clarity for the outside world, should we just delete that previous sentence? Other Members may think that it is all right—that one leads to the other—but it is slightly contradictory.

**The Presiding Officer:** The distinction is between specifically inviting and a broad invitation of evidence. My understanding is that we, as an Assembly, have broadly invited evidence. Indeed, there will be an invitation on our Assembly website.

**Jane Hutt:** That is fair enough.

**The Presiding Officer:** We have specifically requested individuals with a specific interest. I thought that what is in the paper is a fair reflection of what we discussed last week, as this was added, or discussed informally, before this committee was constituted; I should not have said it like that, because what I mean is that anything that is discussed informally is reflected in this paper.

**Jocelyn Davies:** I thought that, when we met informally last week, we agreed that we would make representations to the media, because it broadcasts our proceedings, and that we should invite specific individuals.

**The Presiding Officer:** I understand that media representatives have been approached.

**Jocelyn Davies:** I could not see it in the paper.

**The Presiding Officer:** However, they cannot yet decide which of them is to appear.

**Jocelyn Davies:** Have we approached someone from the Welsh-language media?

**The Presiding Officer:** Yes, we have.

**Jocelyn Davies:** I think that we just named one individual last week.

**The Presiding Officer:** I think that we have approached the BBC. I am sure that it can provide someone if we need to have both, although I do not see much difference between them—they all seem to be able to misreport us, or they have in the past anyway.

**David Melding:** On the previous point, when we have the partnerships in, we intend to discuss with them whether there is a parliamentary partnership, as well as a governmental one, because, at present, the corporate nature is that it is done by these partnerships, but that is the crucial question, so it is very focused. If we go to the wider society, we are just replicating what the Wales Office will be doing in its consultation. Therefore, we need to be very focused when we get the partnerships in and to make them aware that this is what we will be seeking to discuss with them.

**The Presiding Officer:** It is basically the issue that these are established by the Act, and what happens then when there is no statutory basis to them, I think. Also there is the extent to which they have felt that they have been of value. This was the point that you made when we previously discussed this informally.

**Carl Sargeant:** For clarity, I would like to make two points. First, Jane Hutt mentioned paragraph 9, which states:

‘For these reasons it is suggested that the Committee should not invite evidence from wider Welsh society’.

It then goes on to say that the committee will seek evidence from the business and local government partnership councils. Would it not be clearer to remove the earlier line in the paragraph? Also, paragraph 7 states that,

‘The schedule of witnesses for these will be arranged by the Clerk, in conjunction with the Chair’.

Would it not be reasonable to include the Chair and committee and discuss the evidence partners within this forum?

**The Presiding Officer:** That is what we are about to do.

**Carl Sargeant:** I accept that, but would it not be clearer if that was said in the paper?

**The Presiding Officer:** Well, in fact, the Clerk and I have already been discussing this list informally before we come to this formal view. This paper brings us to where we are now; it is not a paper that is going anywhere else. Therefore I was not trying to focus on amending this paper because it is an information paper. It sets the direction in which we are going; it is not anything that will appear as part of our evidence, if you are happy with that.

If there are, however, points that have come out in the paper that I have not covered, please call me to order.

**Kirsty Williams:** Before Paul goes into his list, as outlined in 13 (D), I would like to return to paragraph 11, and the issue that,

‘Two separate oral evidence sessions could then be held, one with the First Minister, and one with the other party leaders.’

You will recall that in the informal meeting that we had, I expressed doubt about whether that would be the appropriate way of doing it. Having given it further thought, I think that it would

be necessary for each of the party leaders to have a separate slot. First of all, there are very real differences between how each party leader will approach this. Also, there is the question of diary commitments. I would imagine that it would be impossible to get a single date at which all three opposition leaders would be available. Thus a session for each party leader individually would be preferable.

**The Presiding Officer:** That is what has happened, in fact.

Are we happy to move on to Paul's draft timetable?

**Lorraine Barrett:** I have one tiny point. You have the Chairs of the House Committee, Business Committee, Committee on Equality of Opportunity and Legislation Committee listed, but what about the Committee on European and External Affairs, and the Audit Committee?

**The Presiding Officer:** I understand from the White Paper that the Audit Committee will remain unchanged. The Committee on European and External Affairs is not a statutory one; it is represented through the Panel of Chairs. It has not yet been decided how the Panel of Chairs will present evidence, and that will not be decided until the panel's next meeting. Obviously, I do not want to be presenting evidence to myself; I prefer to ask the questions rather than present the evidence.

**Kirsty Williams:** The only other committee that is not written down, or has not been mentioned, is the Committee on Standards of Conduct. This committee has already considered what it would like to see in the Government of Wales Act with regard to changes to the standards regime. The most obvious is the long-standing belief that we should have a statutory commissioner for standards. I am in a difficult position, as I chair the Committee on Standards of Conduct and am a member of this committee, but I am anxious that the work that has already been done—I think that there is already a paper, or one is being worked on by officials—with regard to what the Committee on Standards of Conduct thinks should be in the Government of Wales Act, should be presented to this committee at some point.

**The Presiding Officer:** We will certainly note that. So, we need to think of a way that both the Panel of Chairs and the Committee on Standards of Conduct can give evidence to us, despite the fact that we are both members of this committee also.

**Kirsty Williams:** The Committee on Standards of Conduct has concrete requests.

**Y Llywydd:** A oes unrhyw bwyntiau eraill ar baragraffau 11, 12 neu 13? Gwelaf nad oes. Symudwn ymlaen felly at y rhaglen waith.

**The Presiding Officer:** Are there any further points on paragraphs 11, 12 or 13? I see that there are not. We will therefore move on to the work programme.

5.50 p.m.

**Mr Silk:** As has already been said, the three party leaders are not able to come on one day in any case, so one will come on one day and two will come the next day, I believe. The First Minister has said that he is willing to come. We have not heard anything from the Secretary of State. The Chairs of the House Committee, Business Committee, Committee on Equality of Opportunity and Legislation Committee have all given times when they are available. We also have a provisional slot for the Permanent Secretary and staff representatives. Of the list of experts, most have been contacted and most have said that they are willing to give evidence, although some cannot. We are trying to fit those, as far as possible, into one or perhaps two sessions.



On paragraph 14, if the committee agrees, the Presiding Officer will send a letter after this meeting to all Welsh Members of Parliament and peers and also to Assembly Members. One outstanding question is whether any former Assembly Members who are not peers should be invited.

As far as the partnership councils are concerned—and, of course, the chair of each partnership council is a Minister—we have contacted the officials who work for the partnership councils to see whether anybody wishes to represent that partnership council, whether that be the Minister or another member.

**Y Llywydd:** A oes unrhyw sylw ar hynny? **The Presiding Officer:** Are there any comments on that?

**Kirsty Williams:** The list is very long and we are in a difficult situation because, if these people have already been approached, we cannot rescind the invitation, as that would be ungracious and impolite, but I wonder, in reflection, whether it is necessary to have all of these people, some of whom represent the same institutions and work in the same departments as each other. We might have missed a trick by inviting some of these people and then not inviting others. For instance, the constitution unit at University College London has done considerable work on devolution across the piece, and it might have been useful to have a perspective from somebody from UCL. The paragraph says that we would invite people with a direct interest, and I wonder about the directness of the interest of some of the people who have been invited here. I do not know about the Bevan Foundation. It obviously has an interest, but I do not know whether it would be more direct than that of other organisations.

**The Presiding Officer:** I believe that these are people who have specifically studied our activity and have written on it, in most cases, which is why we thought that they had a direct interest. However, if there are further names, please add them today so that we can approach them at the same time.

**David Melding:** I know that the Institute of Welsh Affairs has co-operated with UCL, and probably still does. It may be possible to ask Robert Hazell, who headed up the unit. I think that it would be quite useful to have that outside dimension. The unit has done a lot of work in looking at the way in which we operate.

**The Presiding Officer:** Dr Alan Trench would be the other possibility, because he has done most of the specific work involving Wales. He may be around tomorrow.

**Mr Silk:** There is a conference on the White Paper, on 11 July, which the Institute of Welsh Affairs and University College London are organising at the Wales Millennium Centre. They have said that they would like members of this committee to attend that.

**Kirsty Williams:** When is it?

**Mr Silk:** It is on 11 July.

**Jocelyn Davies:** Could you circulate details of that?

**Mr Silk:** Yes.

**The Presiding Officer:** It is not suggested that we take evidence in the Wales Millennium Centre, is it? It is a bit large for that.

**Lorraine Barrett:** I support David's suggestion. Could we have another day to put a few more names through if there are some people that we want to suggest? We have MPs and

peers, could Members of the European Parliament be included? That is paragraph 14.

**The Presiding Officer:** The reason for not including MEPs is because they do not have a direct involvement with the legislative process related to this place—they do have an involvement, clearly, when they draft European legislation, but we are obliged to make that into law anyway, whereas MPs and peers will be specifically involved with the White Paper and with the subsequent Bill. That was the idea, I think.

**Lorraine Barrett:** But they would have the opportunity, in any event, to send in written submissions, as anyone would. I would just make the point that I not particularly keen on inviting former Members, although it would be open to them to submit their views, like any other member of the public.

**Jocelyn Davies:** I support Lorraine on her point about MEPs, because they are invited to our meetings of the Committee of European and External Affairs. I am not sure that they are able to attend, but they do have an open invitation to attend those meetings. So, they can take part in our proceedings at the moment.

**The Presiding Officer:** Okay, shall we add them to the list, then?

**Jocelyn Davies:** Well, to write to them.

**Jane Hutt:** I would just like to clarify whether, if other names are proposed over the next 24 hours, we could submit them. I am thinking of Robert Hazell, as David suggested, who might be our connection with UCL. However, can I clarify whether we are saying that all of the people on this list of experts have been invited now to submit written and/or oral evidence? How have they been approached? Can I have that clarified?

**Mr Silk:** If it would be helpful for the committee, I can tell you precisely what the status is for each of them.

**Jane Hutt:** That would be helpful.

**Mr Silk:** Roger Sands has been approached informally, and he is willing to give oral evidence, but not to submit written evidence. Paul Grice is happy to give oral evidence, but it would have to be by video link. I do not have a final answer from Sir Christopher Jenkins yet; I know that he has some interesting views on the White Paper. Sir Michael Wheeler-Booth is willing to submit a paper and to come to give evidence. I have not been able to speak to Vernon Bogdanor. Laura McAllister is willing to give evidence. Richard Wyn Jones is not able to give evidence.

**The Presiding Officer:** However, he is prepared to send a paper.

**Mr Silk:** I have not been able to contact Roger Scully. David Miers is willing, in principle, to give evidence. Rick Rawlings is also willing, in principle, to do so.

**Jane Hutt:** This is oral evidence, yes?

**Mr Silk:** Oral evidence, yes.

Keith Patchett is willing to give evidence. I do not know about Ann Sherlock. David Lambert is willing to give evidence. I am not sure about Victoria Winckler.

**Ms Wilkins:** We have not had a decision yet, but we have made contact.

**Mr Silk:** Also, John Osmond is prepared to do so. However, none of these people would be distressed if the committee decided that it did not want to hear from them.

**Jane Hutt:** I think that it is more a question of managing time, and we would certainly want written evidence from all of them. It is probably more a matter of ensuring a balance of oral evidence, and whether we would have the opportunity to look at that when we look at timings and so on, and anybody else who has been added subsequently.

**Kirsty Williams:** Given that we have written to all Welsh MPs and peers, is it then our intention to select some of those MPs or peers to give oral evidence, or will written evidence be sufficient?

**The Presiding Officer:** I think that the answer to that is that it depends on what they say in their written evidence, does it not? I am on dangerous ground now, but it depends on whether anything they say requires further clarification, I suppose. That would be one way of looking at it. If Members will allow the Clerk, Siân and me to continue to work on the timetable, we will, obviously, receive any further suggestions that you have in the meantime.

A oes unrhyw fater arall yn codi o'r papur?      Are there any other matters arising from the paper?

**Kirsty Williams:** With regard to annex B and the schedule of meetings, it would be extremely helpful to look at possible dates in September. I know that it is your intention to have the deliberative meeting that we have talked about previously in September. I have supplied dates to Siân in terms of my availability in September. It would be extremely helpful to be able to clarify, for my own peace of mind and my diary, what could be done in September and also on 7 July. Is it our intention to meet for all of those slots? Will we be meeting all day or will we simply meet for a portion of the day on Thursday 7 July?

6.00 p.m.

**The Presiding Officer:** At present, we will be meeting for most of the day on 7 July, as far as I can see.

**Mr Silk:** To clarify, we are grateful for what Members have said about their availability. We have at least five Members who will be available for all of those slots on 7 July. Unless Members want it, we would not anticipate having each of those slots filled by evidence.

**Kirsty Williams:** I think that Members would appreciate an early indication of what you would require of us on that day.

**Mr Silk:** The certainty is that the first of the sessions on that day is the only one that the Permanent Secretary can attend. The others are sessions that we hope the academics, experts and others will attend. Therefore, that is what better suits the committee rather than the witnesses.

**Kirsty Williams:** And in respect of September?

**The Presiding Officer:** We are up against the time limit of 16 September, therefore, in terms of deliberating, the sooner we meet in September, the better. The date for initial deliberation is 12 July, so that means that we will have started the work of deliberating before we deliberate and agree the final report in September. How early in September could Members make it?

**Kirsty Williams:** I can do 1 September and 2 September if you want to meet early in

September.

**Jocelyn Davies:** The first week in September?

**Kirsty Williams:** No; 1 September, 2 September and 12 September.

**The Presiding Officer:** If you could indicate to Siân your availability in September, we will find a date that suits us all because we have all agreed—for which I am very grateful—that we will try to be here. I will be here, God willing, if I may say that in a secular institution.

**Lorraine Barrett:** God and our partners willing.

**The Presiding Officer:** God and our partners willing. I am sorry, I am addressing a member of the National Secular Society. [*Laughter.*] I always get into trouble. I apologise to faith communities and others.

A oes unrhyw gwestiynau neu faterion eraill i'w codi? Gwelaf nad oes.      Are there any further questions or issues to raise? I see that there are none.

6.03 p.m.

### **Dyddiad y Cyfarfod Nesaf Date of Next Meeting**

**Y Llywydd:** Awn ymlaen felly at ddyddiad y cyfarfod nesaf. Felly, dyma gyhoeddiad nid ar gyfer y Sul nesaf, ond ar gyfer y cyfarfod nesaf.      **The Presiding Officer:** We will, therefore, move on to date of the next meeting. So, this is an announcement not for next Sunday, but for the next meeting.

**Mr Silk:** Chair, for Monday of next week, we hope that Mike German, Glyn Davies and Sir Michael Wheeler-Booth will be able to give evidence between 9.00 a.m. and 11.00 a.m. On Tuesday—at this time next week—the leader of Plaid Cymru and the leader of the Welsh Conservatives will give evidence, one after the other.

**Jocelyn Davies:** Glyn Davies is giving evidence as Chair of the Legislation Committee.

**The Presiding Officer:** He is not giving evidence as an assistant leader of the Conservative Party; it is all right. [*Laughter.*]

Diolch yn fawr am eich hynawsedd. Edrychaf ymlaen at gydweithio gyda chi hyd at ddiwedd y gwaith hwn. Diolch hefyd i'r Clerc a'r swyddogion.      Thank you very much for your co-operation. I look forward to our collaboration between now and the culmination of this work. I also thank the Clerk and officials.

*Daeth y cyfarfod i ben am 6.04 p.m.  
The meeting ended at 6.04 p.m.*