



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

**Burrell Collection (Lending and
Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill
Committee**

1st Report, 2013 (Session 4)

Preliminary Stage Report

Published by the Scottish Parliament on 11 November 2013

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body

Information on the Scottish Parliament's copyright policy can be found on the website -
www.scottish.parliament.uk



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee

Remit and membership

Remit:

To consider matters relating to the Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill

Membership:

Jackson Carlaw (Deputy Convener)
Mark Griffin
Gordon MacDonald
Joan McAlpine (Convener)

Committee Clerking Team:

Clerk to the Committee:

Joanna Hardy



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee

1st Report, 2013 (Session 4)

Preliminary Stage Report

The Committee reports to the Parliament as follows—

INTRODUCTION

1. The Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill was introduced to the Scottish Parliament on 29 May 2013. It is a Private Bill being promoted by Glasgow City Council (the promoter) under procedures set out in Chapter 9A of the Parliament's *Standing Orders*¹ and the *Guidance on Private Bills*.²

2. Glasgow City Council is the statutory inheritor of the responsibilities of the City of Glasgow Corporation, the body to which Sir William Burrell donated his collection and with which he concluded an Agreement governing its use. Glasgow City Council owns the Burrell Collection, although it is restricted in what it can do with the items by the terms of its Agreement with Sir William and by the Will. Glasgow City Council manages the Burrell Collection through the company Culture and Sport Glasgow (also known as Glasgow Life).

OBJECTIVES OF THE BILL

3. The purpose of the Bill is to provide Glasgow City Council with additional powers to lend, including lending overseas, any items forming part of the Burrell Collection, and to receive items on loan from others, in both cases with the agreement of the charity trustees of the Sir William Burrell Trust in accordance with a published code.

BACKGROUND TO THE BILL

4. The Burrell Collection is a large collection of art and artefacts, gifted to City of Glasgow Corporation by Sir William Burrell in 1944.

¹ The Scottish Parliament. <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/17797.aspx>

² The Scottish Parliament.

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/Bills/15709.aspx>

*Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee,
1st Report, 2013 (Session 4)*

5. Third of nine children, William Burrell was born on 9 July 1861. His father and grandfather were involved in shipping. Burrell entered the family firm in 1875 and, on his father's death, William and his brother took over the running of the firm. The brothers amassed a large fortune and Burrell entered into local politics. He was active in the setting up of the Glasgow International Art Exhibition in 1901. Burrell had a wide range of tastes and, on retirement, built up an important collection of Chinese ceramics, tapestries, stained glass, silver, bronzes, Persian and Indian rugs and furniture, travelling widely in the process. In 1916 he bought Hutton Castle in the Borders, although he did not move into the castle until 1927. The same year he was knighted for his public work and services to art.

6. In 1944, Burrell gave almost his entire collection to the city of Glasgow along with £250,000 to construct a building to house it. However, the terms of the bequest (he thought it should be in a rural setting) posed problems and it was not until the 1980s that a building for the Burrell Collection, in Pollok Country Park, was eventually completed. When the Burrell Collection opened in 1983, it received around 1 million visitors per year in the first couple of years. In recent years, visitor numbers have rarely exceeded 250,000. Many external factors can impact on visitor numbers, but the condition of the building and the removal of some works from display may be a contributing factor.

7. The building is now in need of renovation. It is estimated by the Promoter that it will be closed for four years while work takes place (current projections suggest that this will be between 2016 and 2020). During this time, Glasgow City Council would like items from the collection to go on tour to international venues. Council representatives also stated that they would “look at putting on display some of the collection in other buildings and museums in the city”.³

8. The Council argues that a one-off tour could increase awareness of the collection as well as providing fund-raising opportunities in the future (as a result of exhibitions based around reciprocal loans into the Burrell Collection). However, the use of the Burrell Collection is currently restricted in a manner which would prevent such a tour. The restrictions appear in two places:

- the Agreement between City of Glasgow Corporation (now Glasgow City Council) and Sir William covering the donation of the original items in the collection to the council, made in 1944.
- Sir William's will, which established the Sir William Burrell Trust (a registered Scottish charity) to purchase new items to be added to the Burrell Collection. Sir William died in 1958.

9. Although the wording is slightly different in the Agreement and the Will, there are three relevant restrictions:

- a restriction on any lending of certain fragile items, such as tapestries, carpets, lace and pastels. This restriction appears in the Will but not the Agreement and this is currently interpreted by the Trustees and

³ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 41.

Glasgow Life to mean that the restriction applies only to items purchased by Trustees after Burrell's death

- a restriction on lending other items in the Collection outside Great Britain
- a restriction on housing items which are not part of the Burrell Collection in the same building as the Burrell Collection.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

Standing Orders, Rule 9A.7: Stages of Private Bills

10. The procedure for a Private Bill introduced in the Parliament is—

(a) consideration of the general principles of the Bill and whether it should proceed as a Private Bill, preliminary consideration of objections and a decision whether to agree to those general principles and whether the Bill should proceed as a Private Bill (Preliminary Stage);

(b) consideration and disposal of objections and consideration of the details of the Bill (Consideration Stage); and

(c) final consideration of the Bill and a decision whether to pass or reject it (Final Stage).

Objections

11. The objection period ran from 30 May to 29 July 2013. No objections to the Bill were received. The Committee is therefore not required to give consideration to objections.

Preliminary Stage: function of the Committee

12. This Committee was established (under Rule 9A.5) to consider the Bill at Preliminary Stage and at Consideration Stage.⁴ Since no objections were lodged, the Committee's role at Preliminary Stage is to consider and report on—

- the general principles of the Bill; and
- whether the Bill should proceed as a Private Bill.

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE

General principles of the Bill

13. In order to inform its scrutiny of the Bill's general principles, the Committee invited a range of oral and written evidence.

⁴ Motion S4M-06944. Meeting of the Parliament. *Official Report*, 12 June 2013. Col 21068.

Powers to lend and borrow

14. As set out above, the Bill aims to alter restrictions on lending and borrowing contained in Sir William Burrell's Will and in the Agreement between Burrell and the City of Glasgow Corporation.

Previous attempt to alter the Will and Agreement

15. In 1997, a Draft "Burrell Collection (Lending)" Order was considered by a Committee of Lords Commissioners under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act 1936.⁵ The Draft Order was opposed by the Burrell Trustees. By a majority, the Commissioners found the need for the Order established, subject to certain qualifications.

16. The Commissioners found that—

“subject to safeguards, Sir William's prohibition on lending articles from the Burrell Collection outwith great Britain should be eased but should still apply to prevent the lending of items which Sir William specified in his Will as especially vulnerable, namely pastels, tapestries, carpets, rugs, needlework, lace and other textiles. These items should not be allowed to be lent at all”.⁶

17. Despite the support of the Commissioners, the Order did not proceed. In written supplementary evidence to the Committee, the Promoter explained that pursuing a Bill following the favourable Commission report would have meant that “the Council would have been prevented in lending key pieces from the Collection not only abroad but in Great Britain”. Furthermore, the Council considered this condition to be based on an “ill-defined category” and that case by case consideration informed by curatorial and conservation professionals was preferable. Taken together with the fact that, in 1997, Trustees and the council were not in agreement about the appropriate role for the Trustees in decision making, it was not felt to be an appropriate climate in which to be taking forward legislation.

18. Bridget McConnell, Chief Executive, Glasgow Life, stated that “technology and science have changed” in the 16 years since the Draft Order was considered.⁷ Christopher McLaren, of the Samuel Courtauld Trust – referring to the 1980s, said that the “science and technology of moving works of art was primitive compared with what happens now”.⁸

⁵ This Act sets out the process for Scottish private legislation prior to devolution. This involved promoters applying to the Secretary of State with a draft Provisional Order, which – if objected to – would be considered by a panel of Parliamentary Commissioners meeting in the affected area. If the Commissioners recommended that the Order proceed, the Secretary of State could introduce a Bill (an order confirmation Bill) to give it legal effect, subject to the Bill being passed by both Houses at Westminster.

⁶ Burrell Collection (Lending) Draft Provisional Order – report by the Commissioners in Inquiry held at the parish hall, 266 George Street, Glasgow, from 30 September to 30 October 1997.

⁷ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 39.

⁸ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 47.

*Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee,
1st Report, 2013 (Session 4)*

19. Sir Peter Hutchison, Chair of the Burrell Trustees, said that the Commissioners' endorsement of lending outwith Great Britain had led the Trustees to "look again at loosening the lending overseas situation".⁹

Scale of the plans to lend and borrow

20. The promoters provided an impression of the scale of lending that would take place should the Bill succeed. Bridget McConnell told the Committee that—

"apart from the one-off tour the possibilities of doing another major tour in our lifetime are not very high, we are talking here about the ability to occasionally lend one-off items for research or conservation purposes".¹⁰

21. Dr McConnell added "we are talking about five and seven venues for a tour of that scale".¹¹

22. Sir Angus Grossart agreed, stating that "the borrowing and lending is a relatively small part of what will happen, but it is significant".¹² Dr McConnell went on to put the likely number of items to be loaned at fewer than one hundred.¹³

The building

23. The Committee heard about, and saw for themselves on a fact-finding visit, the regrettable condition of the building in which the Collection is housed at Pollok Park. Several exhibits have been removed from display in order to protect them from water damage.

24. We saw tarpaulins being used in an attempt to prevent further water ingress and also heard about the construction complexities which mean that the insulation contained in the roof space is waterlogged and leads to leaks, which can appear even during dry weather.

25. We understand that the roof has been problematic since the building was completed.¹⁴ Councillor Graham said that "in my opinion, the roof is clearly a case of bad design".¹⁵ The Committee heard that in any case, of approximately 9,000 items in the Collection, only around 2,000 can be displayed at any given time. Refurbishment, as well as weatherproofing the building and protecting the collection, would provide an opportunity for expanding the display space and allowing more exhibits to be shown.

⁹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 76.

¹⁰ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 25.

¹¹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 41.

¹² Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 26.

¹³ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 30.

¹⁴ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 27.

¹⁵ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 29.

26. A proposed refurbishment programme, if approved, would mean that the building would be closed for a period of four years. Witnesses told the committee that it will cost an estimated £45 million “to do the job properly”.¹⁶ In addition to safeguarding the Collection, Dr McConnell said that Glasgow Life also hoped to “widen access, allow more people to learn more about the collection and make the exhibitions that are on display more meaningful”.¹⁷ She added “our ambition with the refurbishment is to be able to display more”.¹⁸ During our visit to the Burrell Collection, we viewed several under-utilised areas of the gallery – several of which were previously inaccessible by the public – that could be refurbished to produce additional display space. Sir Peter stated that “the refurbishment of the gallery is closest to our hearts and we welcome it enormously”.¹⁹

27. The Committee agrees that the building housing the Collection is in urgent need of refurbishment and does not, in its current condition, provide a safe environment for the collection.

28. The Committee welcomes the prospect of the extra capacity which would be provided through refurbishment and the opportunity this would bring to display items currently inaccessible by the public.

Fundraising

29. One of the supporting arguments made in the Bill’s accompanying documents is the potential for lending to “provide a revenue stream” to meet some of the costs of renovating the building in which the Collection is housed.²⁰ Witnesses said that they hoped to raise £15m through sponsorship and fundraising as a result of loans and a tour of the Collection.²¹ Bridget McConnell spoke of the opportunities for sponsorship that could accrue.²² Sir Peter Hutchison hoped that a tour would encourage sponsorship funding.²³

30. Witnesses spoke of the difficulties of meeting the costs of refurbishment. The Wallace Collection in London, by the terms of Lady Wallace’s bequest, is a closed collection to which no works of art are added and from which loans are prohibited. Jeremy Warren told the Committee that it had been “very difficult” to find the funding for the Wallace Collection refurbishment project.²⁴

¹⁶ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 29.

¹⁷ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 20.

¹⁸ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 25.

¹⁹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 78.

²⁰ Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill, Promoter’s Memorandum, Para 25.

²¹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 29.

²² Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 32.

²³ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 72

²⁴ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 57.

31. Witnesses representing other collections and galleries felt that it was difficult to quantify financial benefits accruing from lending and touring. There was general agreement that tours tended only to break even or generate a relatively minor profit but it was agreed that they could be used in various ways to attract donors and sponsors. That said, Jeremy Warren felt that it was more important to the health, revenue and visitor numbers of a museum to organise its own exhibitions programme using its own works.²⁵

32. It was even more difficult for witnesses to say with any certainty whether tours and loans would attract tourist revenue to Scotland.²⁶

33. Ben Thomson, Chair of the Board of Trustees, National Galleries Scotland argued that, once donations start to come in, it “gives credence to an organisation’s claim that it has gone widely, that the scheme is supported and that the collection is loved at a national and international level.”²⁷ He described the “significant psychological impact” that relatively minor donations can have on fundraising exercises. Jeremy Warren observed that “touring exhibitions do not raise significant sums” unless considerations of scholarship are put to one side and more “brazenly commercial” avenues – such as the lending of works to department stores – are pursued.²⁸

34. Sir Peter speculated that Sir William “would not have been too upset at the idea” of using the Collection to generate revenue.²⁹

35. The Committee is not fully convinced that a tour of the Burrell Collection will generate the desired £15 million contribution to the refurbishment of the building. It is clearly not possible to estimate revenue with any degree of certainty at this stage.

36. Nevertheless, the Committee accepts that a contribution is likely to be raised either directly as a result of touring the Collection or indirectly from raising its profile.

Risks and opportunities of lending

37. The Committee heard a range of views on the benefits that lending can bring. It was pointed out, too, that Burrell himself was a “considerable lender”.³⁰ Wider engagement by the public, scholarship, conservation, fundraising, reciprocity, awareness-raising, profile-raising and tourism were all cited as benefits that can accrue from lending.

²⁵ Scottish Parliament Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee. *Official Report 23 May 2012* Col 59.

²⁶ Scottish Parliament Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee. *Official Report 23 May 2012* Col 58.

²⁷ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 62.

²⁸ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 62.

²⁹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 84.

³⁰ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 19.

*Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee,
1st Report, 2013 (Session 4)*

38. Bridget McConnell said “the Collection is still a bit of a secret both here and internationally” and a tour “will raise awareness at home and abroad”.³¹

39. Sir Angus Grossart said that “This is a chance to engage with a wider range of institutions, including those to which we are not sending the loan exhibition.” He spoke of the opportunities for scholarship and profile-raising that can result in loan offers.³²

40. Against these benefits, the Committee wished to explore the risks associated with lending.

41. Councillor Graham told the Committee that “Glasgow has loaned 403 objects to 150 venues in 12 countries and received over 1,700 objects from 244 lenders” without making an insurance claim.³³

42. National Galleries of Scotland observes a range of restrictions relating to bequests, but also engages in 500 loans a year where it is permitted. All loans are approved by the trustees and a number of conditions are attached to ensure appropriate conditions, insurance and so on. With regard to risks, Ben Thomson said that “in the past 10 years there have been two instances of artworks being damaged”.³⁴ He spoke of the benefits of “getting art out and about so that people can look at it” pointing out that a public collection should be as accessible as possible to the public.

43. Christopher McLaren, Samuel Courtauld Trust, said that “we like to make loans” but “conservation is paramount”.³⁵ He described the Trust’s “main mission” as “increasing art appreciation among the public”. Mr McLaren reflected that “nothing is risk free in life” and “all risks must be considered in proportion to the benefit that ensues”.³⁶

44. Jeremy Warren from the Wallace Collection agreed that modern practices meant that the risk of moving works of art is “enormously reduced” but argued that, nevertheless, moving an object from place to place “shortens its life”. He warned that “it would be wrong for the Parliament, in making this decision, to think that objects are safe”. He went on to describe some unique benefits of a closed collection – a focus of energy on curatorial effort, rather than arranging tours and exhibitions and a unique marketing opportunity in being the only place where it is possible to view a specific work. He added that not being able to lend had not affected the Wallace Collection’s ability to borrow.

³¹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 30.

³² Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 42.

³³ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 15.

³⁴ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 43-44.

³⁵ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Cols 44-45.

³⁶ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 46.

45. Sir Peter argued that “it is clear that, on the whole, transportation is much safer” than it used to be and pointed out that most damage occurs when items are being packed, unpacked and redisplayed, which is not a process unique to overseas lending. Political and climate matters were the distinctive issues when looking at overseas loans he contended.³⁷ He concluded that “risk cannot be eliminated, but it can be mitigated”.³⁸

46. Michael Daley (ArtWatch UK) provided a number of recent examples of damage caused by moving works of art. He pointed out that, although air transportation has improved over the years, a work could not be transported by plane without first being transported by van or lorry. He urged the Committee to reject the Bill.³⁹

47. Peter Wilkinson (Constantine – experts in the packing and transportation of antiques and fine arts) acknowledged that “there is always going to be a risk with transportation” but argued that the risk tends to be in handling at the origin or destination. These risks ought to remain the same whether or not transportation happens overseas. However, Michael Daley informed the Committee that insurance companies estimate the risk of overseas loans to be “six times higher” than those made within the UK and contended that maintaining pressures and temperatures aboard aircraft was challenging.⁴⁰ Peter Wilkinson disagreed with this, arguing that modern freighter planes were insulated and heated and that palletising freight prevented movement.⁴¹ Frances Lennard, (Centre for Textile Conservation and technical Art History) pointed out that scientific advances mean that such risks can be mitigated more than ever before.⁴²

48. The Committee supports the aim of raising the Collection’s profile and increasing access to its treasures, believing that Burrell wished the Collection to be shown. The focus of the Committee’s decision in this matter is not whether Burrell would have wished to share the collection through loans (we know that he did) but whether it is safe, nowadays, to do so outside Great Britain.

49. The Committee accepts that all loans (whether outside Great Britain or not) involve a degree of risk. We note the argument that the greatest degree of risk tends to be presented by handling at the origin point or destination of works, a risk which remains the same whether or not the works are transported overseas. At the same time, we also note the evidence that insurers consider that risks are greater for overseas loans, perhaps due to

³⁷ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 77.

³⁸ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 79.

³⁹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 85-86.

⁴⁰ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 89.

⁴¹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 92.

⁴² Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 94.

conditions of loan being agreed but not always being adhered to in every destination.

Respecting donors' wishes

50. Donor Watch, in written evidence to the Committee, argues that “fidelity to donors’ wishes is a precious matter” and described the Bill as “a consequence of the current vogue for loan exhibitions and for using outward loans as barter for inward loans”. It went on to outline the drawbacks of loan exhibitions in that they deprive visitors of the opportunity to see works and place items in danger of loss or damage.

51. Ben Thomson, National Galleries of Scotland, said that “it is very tricky to strike the balance between going against the wishes of a will and going against ... accessibility and opening up collections”.⁴³ He added “in going against the wishes of the original benefactor, we have to be very sensitive and proceed with a degree of caution”.⁴⁴ In the past 10 years, National Galleries Scotland has not sought a change to any of its bequests.⁴⁵

52. Christopher McLaren told the Committee that the Samuel Courtauld Trust changed the trusts relating to the Seilern bequest (the Princes Gate collection). The change did not require legislation. Some items (such as paintings on panel preceding 1600) are excluded on conservation grounds, and all loans must be unanimously agreed by the trustees. With reference to The Courtauld Collection in particular, Mr McLaren said “the only valid reason for lending is to further art scholarship ... one has to argue it on that basis”. He added that “if you keep to the spirit of the will, perhaps changing the detail does not matter” arguing that most benefactors were broad-minded, forward-looking people.⁴⁶ He also pointed out that Burrell—

“left an endowment fund to increase the collection. If someone intends to increase their collection, by definition it cannot be static”.⁴⁷

53. He further asserted that “the whole collection does not have to be preserved in aspic ... that was not in Burrell’s mind”.⁴⁸ Sir Peter Hutchison agreed. He pointed out that, in contrast with closed collections such as the Wallace Collection and the Frick Collection, the Burrell Collection has always lent within Great Britain “uneventfully, on the whole”.⁴⁹

⁴³ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 43.

⁴⁴ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 44.

⁴⁵ Scottish Parliament Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee. *Official Report 23 May 2012* Col 60.

⁴⁶ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 47.

⁴⁷ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 56.

⁴⁸ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 56.

⁴⁹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 73.

54. Jeremy Warren, Wallace Collection, told the committee that the will governing the Wallace collection stipulated that the “collection shall be kept together, unmixed with other objects of art”. He added “there is always the temptation to break [the trust’s terms]” and observed that “it is often impossible to know why a person makes a certain provision in their will”. Reflecting on previous discussions on changing the terms of the Wallace bequest, he said—

“the main reasons why the trustees eventually agreed unanimously not to change the terms of the bequest were the wishes of the donor and a strong feeling that if a governing body, city or nation accepts a gift with certain conditions, it is not right to second-guess it in future years and say, “Actually, what he really meant was this” or “they would agree with us now.” We simply do not know that, and we have to respect those conditions for better or for worse”⁵⁰.

55. Mr Warren explained that trustees viewed any departure from the terms of the Wallace bequest as “the thin end of the wedge”.⁵¹ Regarding discussions about touring the Wallace Collection while refurbishment took place he said “I am sure that the issue was debated, but it was decided that we should not use that situation to break the terms of the bequest”.⁵²

56. Finally, Mr Warren warned that “other museums that have changed the terms of donors’ wishes have suffered adversely through potential future donors changing their mind and going elsewhere”⁵³ although he did add that “in practice, were the terms of the bequest to be changed, there would be a short-term reputational impact on Glasgow Museums but that “in five or 10 years the change would be forgotten”.⁵⁴

57. Referring to the clause in Sir William Burrell’s will forbidding the loan of “pastels, tapestries, carpets, rugs, needlework, lace and other textiles”, Mr Warren argued that “in this case, he knew what he was doing when he imposed that condition”.⁵⁵ He added that, with regard to more fragile items – such as pastels – changing the terms of the Will and Agreement would “have negative repercussions for people’s attitude to caring for particularly fragile works of art”.⁵⁶

58. Despite the Wallace trustees’ close observance of the terms of the bequest, Mr Warren did admit that minor relaxations had been allowed to enable works in the collection to be displayed “close to” borrowed works. He also admitted that,

⁵⁰ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 49.

⁵¹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 50.

⁵² Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 57.

⁵³ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 51.

⁵⁴ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 61.

⁵⁵ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 49.

⁵⁶ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 61.

“for practical reasons” Lady Wallace’s stipulation that a new building should be constructed to house the Wallace Collection had been set aside. He acknowledged too that declining visitor numbers could be a consequence of retaining closed collections.

59. As set out above, there is a stipulation in the Agreement relating to displaying works which do not form part of the Burrell Collection alongside those that do. Current practice is to show temporary exhibits, clearly labelled, beside items from the collection. Sir Peter assured the Committee that, if the Bill was passed, the integrity of the Collection would continue to be respected in this way.⁵⁷ Professor Gretton (Lord President Reid Chair of Law, University of Edinburgh) felt that such inward loans were “probably competent” although the legal situation was not 100 per cent clear.⁵⁸

60. Other arguments against changing the terms of bequests were put forward by witnesses. These included reputational risk and an expectation among members of the public that certain well known works of art would be available to be viewed.

61. Neil MacGregor (Director of the British Museum), in a written submission to the Committee, spoke of the “power of the dead to constrain the freedom of the living” and argued that—

“the living are more likely than the dead to be able to take changing circumstances into account. We cannot know how the dead might have changed their mind”.

62. Professor Gretton offered a view on the extent to which legal restrictions relating to property should be able to last forever. He said that, according to European legal tradition, “people should not be able to control property forever”. He noted that the Museums and Galleries Act 1992 (which does not apply to the Burrell Collection) specifies a period of 50 years, after which trustees are entitled to depart from the terms of the original bequest.⁵⁹

63. The Committee wished to explore the idea that altering the terms of bequests now might inhibit future benefactors. Christopher McLaren said that no adverse publicity arose from the Courtauld altering two bequests, but warned that it was important to ensure that “the original wish and spirit are adhered to”.⁶⁰ On the other hand, Jeremy Warren felt that “you might well lose some additions to the collection”.⁶¹

64. Sir Peter Hutchison summarised the Trustees’ position as follows—

⁵⁷ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 81.

⁵⁸ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 87.

⁵⁹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 99.

⁶⁰ Scottish Parliament Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee. *Official Report 23 May 2012* Col 60.

⁶¹ Scottish Parliament Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee. *Official Report 23 May 2012* Col 61.

“I like to think that 55 years after Sir William’s death, if I was to hold an imaginary conversation between my conscience and his, he would react favourably if I asked him to trust his trustees”.⁶²

65. The Committee is persuaded that it is sometimes appropriate to depart from the wishes of benefactors, particularly if the circumstances which may have led them to adopt a certain position have changed.

66. When such steps are taken, we believe it is important to attempt to understand the spirit of the benefactors’ wishes. In this case, we have heard convincing arguments that Burrell wished to promote access to his Collection as long as it was not placed in danger.

The lending code

67. The Bill provides for the preparation of a lending code, to be agreed by Glasgow City Council and the Burrell Trustees, setting out the basis upon which new powers for lending and borrowing would be exercised. Glasgow City Council provided a copy of the draft lending code for the Committee to scrutinise.

68. Trustees will not have the final say regarding loans to be made within Great Britain or on items to be borrowed, which will be referred to an expert in the event of a disagreement between the Trustees and Glasgow Life. This reflects the current position for loans within Great Britain. Under the terms of the Agreement, there is a process for dispute resolution in the event of a disagreement between Glasgow City Council and the Trustees on whether to lend within Great Britain.

69. Under the proposed lending code, Burrell Trustees have the final say on loans overseas. According to supplementary evidence supplied by the Promoter, the lending code places Trustees in a “central role”. Bridget McConnell, by way of reassurance, reminded members that “the Trustees are the final deciders”⁶³ while Sir Peter Hutchison assured the Committee that “we will be watchful”⁶⁴ and expressed Trustees’ satisfaction with the proposed new arrangements.⁶⁵

70. It is the Committee’s view that the Lending Code must provide a necessary safeguard against excessive and over-commercial lending and against very fragile items being put at unreasonable risk. The Committee notes with approval that, after an initial tour, which may help to raise funds for refurbishment, lending decisions would be based primarily on scholarship and the opportunity for conservation.

71. The Committee expects the Code to be regularly reviewed and updated to take account of evolving conservation practices, always with the safety of the collection at its heart.

⁶² Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 73.

⁶³ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 20.

⁶⁴ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 73.

⁶⁵ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 83.

Accreditation of receiving museums and galleries

72. The Bill states that loans may be made only to those museums and galleries belonging to the Accreditation Scheme administered by the Arts Council of England or to institutions overseas that “operate to a standard which is equivalent to the standard expected under the Accreditation Scheme”.

73. Sir Angus Grossart explained that—

“there are widely recognised standards in different countries, some of which are higher than the Arts Council’s standards. There should be no problem if we are engaging with the Louvre or the Metropolitan. The intention is to be involved with substantial institutions, and all that we can do is set a benchmark. At the end of the day, the wicketkeeper will be the Burrell trustees, and there is provision for them to take expert independent advice.”⁶⁶

74. Bridget McConnell added “if institutions do not meet our stringent requirements they will not get loans”.⁶⁷

75. Witnesses agreed that any recipient institution ought to meet the standard set by the UK scheme but Michael Daley warned that assurances of this nature are not always honoured.⁶⁸

76. We note that no international accreditation scheme exists and that reliance is therefore placed on the ability of Glasgow Museums to evaluate the risks involved in an overseas loan. In this context, we recognise that Glasgow Museums is an experienced lender and borrower of art and has an impressive record with regard to lending and borrowing a great number of items without making a single insurance claim. We would expect Glasgow Museums to retain these high standards in the future.

Fragile items

77. An inconsistency exists between Sir William Burrell’s Will and the Agreement between Sir William and Lady Burrell and the Glasgow Corporation in 1944 – some 14 years prior to Burrell’s death. The Will allowed lending (within Great Britain) of all items “except pastels, tapestries, carpets, rugs, lace, needlework and all other textiles” yet the Agreement did not make this exception. The vast majority of items in the Collection passed into the ownership of the Glasgow Corporation before Burrell’s death and, as such, are considered by the promoter to be subject to the stipulations of the Agreement and, therefore, available for loan within Great Britain regardless of their nature. Glasgow Life told the Committee that the tighter restriction applies only to delicate items within the 85 items bought by the Trustees since the gifting of the Collection.

78. Burrell had an opportunity to introduce extra restrictions into the Agreement – it was revised a number of times in the years between its initiation and Burrell’s

⁶⁶ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 37.

⁶⁷ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 38.

⁶⁸ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 89.

death. He did not do so. Robert Taylor explained that “if the restrictions were not in the 1944 Agreement, they could not govern the collection that Sir William had already donated to the city.”⁶⁹ Professor Gretton thought that “the point is arguable both ways”.⁷⁰

79. Sir Peter hoped that the proposed legislation would offer “a settled situation in which everybody knows what is happening”.⁷¹ In relation to the items specified in the Will, he doubted whether pastels would be lent and pointed out that items such as tapestries vary in robustness. He said “there is a lot to be said for taking each case on its merits”⁷² adding “we will be looking at things much more on a case-by-case basis rather than looking at categories that should not be lent, which in some cases are rather ill defined”.⁷³

80. In supplementary evidence to the Committee, the Promoter requested that it be judged on its own record, not on anecdotal evidence of damage to other travelling collections nor on the records of other organisations who may not have adopted the same stringent conditions.

81. The Committee wished to probe the specific conservation issues of the delicate works specified by Burrell in his Will. Peter Wilkinson acknowledged that a pastel “is one of the most difficult objects to move”⁷⁴ while Frances Lennard said that “I do not think that there is an intrinsic risk in moving a tapestry, for example” explaining that textiles are vulnerable to issues such as moths, high light levels, fluctuating relative humidity levels and poor handling. She explained that “the packaging and the care of all classes of museum objects has changed hugely” since Burrell wrote his will.⁷⁵

82. Jeremy Warren described the fragility of some pastel works. He said—

“Any honest curator or conservator would tell you that pastels, for example, are about the most fragile and difficult objects to look after in museums. I was asked to try to find a home for a very important pastel portrait as a gift, but two major museums turned it down because they simply could not cope with the hassle of trying to look after pastels. If the terms of the bequest were changed, I think that that would have negative repercussions for people’s attitude to caring for particularly fragile works of art”.⁷⁶

⁶⁹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 82.

⁷⁰ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 98.

⁷¹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 76.

⁷² Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 78.

⁷³ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 81.

⁷⁴ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 87.

⁷⁵ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 88.

⁷⁶ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 61.

83. The Committee received some additional written evidence from Graeme Gollan, National Galleries Scotland on the specifics of pastel conservation and transportation. In his submission, Mr Gollan describes the variety of pastel techniques and the fact that pastels may be on paper, card or parchment. All these factors led him to conclude that “I would not recommend a broad-brush approach to assessing the suitability of pastel works for loan”. Mr Gollan went on to say that twenty pastel works were loaned without encountering any condition problems. He described modern transportation measures such as custom-made boxes which protect from vibration and adverse environmental conditions. He did not consider that time in the air on board aircraft to be a particularly vulnerable leg of the journey.

84. In supplementary written evidence to the Committee, Glasgow Life provided a copy of the procedures that are followed to assess applications to lend pastels in its collections. The procedures involve a close examination of condition of the work and an extensive list of considerations to be made before a loan is allowed. Furthermore, the procedures stipulate a number of conditions of loan relating to transportation and handling methods.

85. The Committee welcomes the clarification that the Bill, if passed, would bring with regard to whether it is legally competent for the fragile or delicate items in the Collection to be loaned at all.

86. The Committee, having heard so much about the particular issues involved in conserving and transporting pastel works has given consideration to the possibility of amending the Bill at Consideration Stage in order to create a specific exclusion with regard to lending such works.

87. On balance, and having taken further evidence on this, we accept that no two pastel works are the same and it is therefore logical that decisions on loans should be made on a case by case basis, having regard to the detailed procedures already in operation by Glasgow Museums and with the Lending Code affording a further layer of protection.

88. Taking all these issues into account, the Committee is satisfied that, with regard to the lending of fragile items such as those specified in the Will (i.e. “pastels, tapestries, carpets, rugs, lace, needlework and all other textiles”) the lending code offers a sufficient safeguard and that loans will be granted on a case by case basis, with conservation at the forefront of decision-making.

Conclusion

89. The Committee has heard and read evidence both supportive and critical of the Bill. We note that, despite extensive coverage of the Bill, no objections were lodged. We accept that there are risks and ethical questions inherent in altering the terms of Sir William’s bequest but believe that the time has come to allow his Collection to be seen by a wider audience. We are persuaded that the Trustees and Glasgow Life will work together and act responsibly to ensure the safe keeping of the Collection.

90. **The Committee view this Bill as a useful consolidation and clarification of legal rights and responsibilities in relation to the Collection and we welcome the opportunity to clear up inconsistencies between the Will and the Agreement and clarify the position with regard to borrowing. We also welcome the fact that a mechanism would be provided for future amendment if this proves necessary.**

91. **The Committee places a great deal of emphasis on the restoration of the building housing the Burrell Collection, particularly since it was so central to Burrell's wishes and to his Agreement with the City Council. In recommending that this Bill be passed, we place our trust in the Promoter to ensure that the refurbishment takes place and would consider any failure to do so as a betrayal of that trust.**

Consideration of whether the Bill should proceed as a Private Bill

92. In addition to considering the general principles of the Bill, the Committee is required to consider whether the Bill should proceed as a Private Bill in accordance with Rule 9A.8.3 of *Standing Orders*. This involves the Committee satisfying itself first, that the Bill is in accordance with Rule 9A.1.1 and, secondly, that the accompanying documents conform to Rule 9A.2.3 and are adequate to allow proper scrutiny of the Bill.

Does the Bill meet the definition of a Private Bill?

93. A Private Bill is a Bill introduced for the purpose of obtaining for an individual person, body corporate or unincorporated association of persons particular powers or benefits in excess of or in conflict with the general law, and includes a bill relating to the estate, property, status or style, or otherwise relating to the personal affairs, of the promoter.⁷⁷

94. The promoter of the Bill is Glasgow City Council, which is a body corporate. The provisions of the Bill relate to a specific collection of art and artefacts owned by Glasgow City Council and governed by a private agreement between the Council and a third party.

95. For these reasons, the Committee is satisfied that the Bill conforms to the requirements of Rule 9A.1.1, the definition of a Private Bill.

Is a Private Bill appropriate?

96. A Bill should not proceed if the result sought would more appropriately be achieved by means of changes to the public and general law that would give the same powers or benefits to others in a similar position, without the need to single out the promoter.

97. Since the changes sought are particular to the Burrell Collection and the terms on which it is owned by the promoter, a Public Bill would not have been appropriate.

⁷⁷ *Standing Orders*, Rule 9A.1.1

Was an alternative route available?

98. The Agreement did not provide any ready method for variation or amendment after Sir William's death. Accordingly, written evidence from the Office of the Scottish Charity regulator (OSCR) found that "there is in our view no other competent legal remedy which permits the restrictions on lending and borrowing imposed on the Corporation (and the promoter as its successor) to be relaxed".⁷⁸

99. OSCR went on to confirm that its powers to approve changes to the constitution of charities do not provide a mechanism to effect the changes sought by the Bill.⁷⁹

100. Alan Eccles, Agent to Glasgow City Council, told the Committee that—

"A private bill is the only way to establish a legal framework for the future that sets out the full processes, rationale and methodology behind how lending and borrowing should take place".⁸⁰

101. Professor George Gretton agreed, stating that "the council had no option. The bill is the only way to do it".⁸¹

102. The Committee agrees that there is no alternative remedy or process that would achieve the aims of the Bill.

Adequacy of accompanying documents

103. The Committee must consider the Bill's accompanying documents and decide whether they conform to Rule 9A.2.3 and are adequate to allow proper scrutiny of the Bill (Rule 9A.8.3).

104. During oral evidence, it was brought to the Committee's attention by Professor George Gretton that including the Will and the Agreement as a schedule to the Bill would be helpful for future users.⁸²

105. Standing Orders Rule 9A.8.3 states that—

"in considering whether the Private Bill should proceed as a Private Bill, the Private Bill Committee shall consider ... whether the accompanying documents lodged ... are adequate to allow scrutiny of the Private Bill".

106. It is the Committee's view that the accompanying documents, as they stand, do not allow proper scrutiny of the Private Bill and scrutiny would be greatly improved by the addition of the Will and the Agreement within the Explanatory Notes. This would also assist those referring to the Act in the future.

⁷⁸ OSCR. Written Evidence. Paragraph 2.2.1.

⁷⁹ OSCR. Written Evidence. Paragraph 2.2.3

⁸⁰ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 9 September 2013* Col 36.

⁸¹ Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 97.

⁸² Scottish Parliament. Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee. *Official Report 19 September 2013* Col 97.

107. The Committee considers that the accompanying documents to the Bill conform to Rule 9A.2.3 and, subject to the addition of the Will and the Agreement, are adequate to allow proper scrutiny of the Bill.

CONCLUSION

108. The Committee recommends to the Parliament that the general principles of the Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill be agreed to and that the Bill should proceed as a private Bill.

**ANNEXE A: EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE BURRELL
COLLECTION (LENDING AND BORROWING) (SCOTLAND) BILL
COMMITTEE**

1st Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Tuesday 18 June 2013

Declarations: Members of the Committee were invited to declare any relevant interests. The following interests were declared: Joan McAlpine as a paid Columnist for the Daily Record and a resident of Glasgow. Gordon MacDonald as a member of the National Trust for Scotland and Historic Scotland. All members made a declaration of impartiality under Rule 9A.5.4A.

Choice of Convener: The Committee chose Joan McAlpine as its Convener.

Choice of Deputy Convener: The Committee chose Jackson Carlaw as its Deputy Convener.

Decision on taking business in private: The Committee agreed to take item 6 in private.

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill - witness expenses: The Committee agreed to delegate to the Convener responsibility for arranging for the SPCB to pay, under Rule 12.4.3, any expenses of witnesses on the Bill.

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee considered its approach to the scrutiny of the Bill at Preliminary Stage. The Committee agreed an initial list of witnesses it wished to invite to provide evidence. These were: Glasgow City Council, Glasgow Life, Burrell Renaissance, The Burrell Trustees, The International Convention of Exhibition and Fine Art Transporters, The Arts Council of England and The Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator. The Committee also agreed to publish a call for evidence on the general principles of the Bill on its website.

2nd Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Monday 9 September 2013

Decision on taking business in private: The Committee agreed to take item 3 in private.

Burrell collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill: The Committee took evidence on the Bill at Preliminary Stage from—

Mr Archie Graham, Deputy Leader, Glasgow City Council;

Dr Bridget McConnell, Chief Executive, and Sir Angus Grossart, Director, Glasgow Life;

Mr Alan Eccles, Agent to Glasgow City Council, Maclay Murray and Spens LLP;

*Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee,
1st Report, 2013 (Session 4) – Annexe A*

Mr Jeremy Warren, Collections and Academic Director, Wallace Collection;

Mr Ben Thomson, Chairman of the Trustees, National Galleries of Scotland;

Hon Christopher McLaren, Chairman, The Samuel Courtauld Trust.

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill: The Committee considered the evidence taken and discussed next steps in its scrutiny of the Bill at Preliminary Stage.

3rd Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Thursday 19 September 2013

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill: The Committee took evidence from—

Sir Peter Hutchison, Chair, Burrell Trustees;

Mr Robert Taylor, Law Agent of the Testamentary Trustees of the Burrell Collection, Bannantyne Kirkwood France & Co;

Mr Peter Wilkinson, General Manager/MD Scotland, Constantine;

Ms Frances Lennard, Senior Lecturer, Textile Conservation, The Centre for Textile Conservation and Technical Art History;

Mr Michael Daley, Director, ArtWatch UK;

Prof George Gretton, Lord President Reid Chair of Law, University of Edinburgh.

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee considered the evidence taken and the next steps in its scrutiny of the Bill at Preliminary Stage. The Committee agreed to consider its draft report in private at future meetings.

4th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Thursday 3 October 2013

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill: The Committee considered a draft Preliminary Stage report. Various changes were agreed to, and the Committee agreed to consider a revised draft, in private, at its next meeting.

5th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Thursday 31 October 2013

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill (in private): The Committee agreed its Preliminary Stage Report.

ANNEXE B: ORAL AND WRITTEN EVIDENCE

Please note that all oral evidence and associated written evidence is published electronically only, and can be accessed via the Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee's webpages at:

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/64708.aspx>

Oral Evidence

2nd Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Monday 9 September 2013

Mr Archie Graham, Deputy Leader, Glasgow City Council;

Dr Bridget McConnell, Chief Executive, and Sir Angus Grossart, Director, Glasgow Life;

Mr Alan Eccles, Agent to Glasgow City Council, Maclay Murray and Spens LLP;

Mr Jeremy Warren, Collections and Academic Director, Wallace Collection;

Mr Ben Thomson, Chairman of the Trustees, National Galleries of Scotland;

Hon Christopher McLaren, Chairman, The Samuel Courtauld Trust.

3rd Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Thursday 19 September 2013

Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill: The Committee took evidence from—

Sir Peter Hutchison, Chair, Burrell Trustees;

Mr Robert Taylor, Law Agent of the Testamentary Trustees of the Burrell Collection, Bannantyne Kirkwood France & Co;

Mr Peter Wilkinson, General Manager/MD Scotland, Constantine;

Ms Frances Lennard, Senior Lecturer, Textile Conservation, The Centre for Textile Conservation and Technical Art History;

Mr Michael Daley, Director, ArtWatch UK;

Prof George Gretton, Lord President Reid Chair of Law, University of Edinburgh.

*Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee,
1st Report, 2013 (Session 4) – Annexe B*

Written Evidence

Arts Council England

ArtWatch UK

Neil MacGregor, Director, British Museum

Donor Watch

Donor Watch further evidence

Glasgow Life and Glasgow City Council (Bill Promoter)

Museum Galleries Scotland (MGS)

National Galleries of Scotland (NGS)

Nicholas Tinari

Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR)

Members who would like a printed copy of this *Numbered Report* to be forwarded to them should give notice at the Document Supply Centre.

Produced and published in Scotland on behalf of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body by APS Group Scotland

All documents are available on
the Scottish Parliament website at:

www.scottish.parliament.uk

For details of documents available to
order in hard copy format, please contact:
APS Scottish Parliament Publications on 0131 629 9941.

For information on the Scottish Parliament contact
Public Information on:

Telephone: 0131 348 5000
Textphone: 0800 092 7100
Email: sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk

ISBN 978-1-78392-078-5
