

# CULTURAL PROPERTY (ARMED CONFLICTS) BILL [HL]

## EXPLANATORY NOTES

### What these notes do

These Explanatory Notes relate to the Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill [HL] as introduced in the House of Lords on 19 May 2016 (HL Bill 3).

- These Explanatory Notes have been prepared by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport in order to assist the reader of the Bill and to help inform debate on it. They do not form part of the Bill and have not been endorsed by Parliament.
- These Explanatory Notes explain what each part of the Bill will mean in practice; provide background information on the development of policy; and provide additional information on how the Bill will affect legislation in this area.
- These Explanatory Notes might best be read alongside the Bill. They are not, and are not intended to be, a comprehensive description of the Bill.

## Table of Contents

Subject	Page of these Notes
<b>Overview of the Bill</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Policy background</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Legal background</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Territorial extent and application</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Commentary on provisions of Bill</b>	<b>8</b>
Part 1: KEY DEFINITIONS	8
Part 2: SERIOUS BREACH OF THE SECOND PROTOCOL	8
Clause 3: Offence of serious breach of Second Protocol	8
Clause 4: Ancillary offences	10
Clause 5: Responsibility of commanders and other superiors	10
Clause 6: Penalties	11
Clause 7: Attorney General's consent to prosecutions	11
Part 3: CULTURAL EMBLEM	11
Clause 8: The cultural emblem	11
Clause 9: Offence of unauthorised use	11
Clause 10: Use authorised by appropriate national authority	11
Clause 11: Other authorised use: moveable property	11
Clause 12: Other authorised use: personnel	12
Clause 13: Defences	12
Clause 14: Forfeiture following conviction under section 9	12
Clause 15: "Appropriate national authority"	12
Part 4: PROPERTY EXPORTED FROM OCCUPIED TERRITORY	13
Clause 16: "Unlawfully exported cultural property" etc.	13
Clause 17: Offence of dealing in unlawfully exported cultural property	13
Clause 18: Forfeiture in connection with dealing offence	14
Clauses 19-27: Forfeiture otherwise than in connection with offence and seizure and retention of property liable to forfeiture.	14
Part 5: PROPERTY REMOVED FOR SAFEKEEPING	16
Clause 28: Immunity from seizure or forfeiture	16
Part 6: GENERAL	17
Clause 29: Liability of company officers for offences by company	17
Clause 30: Crown application	17
Clause 31: Extent	17
<b>Commencement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Financial implications of the Bill</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Compatibility with the European Convention on Human Rights</b>	<b>18</b>

*These Explanatory Notes relate to the Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill [HL] as introduced in the House of Lords on 19 May 2016 (HL Bill 3)*

**Related documents**

**21**

**Annex A - Territorial extent and application in the United Kingdom 22**

# Overview of the Bill

1 The Bill is divided into six parts and contains four Schedules. These Parts are as follows:

- Part 1: sets out key definitions.
- Part 2: incorporates into domestic law the offence created by Article 15 of the Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict (“the Convention”), makes provision in relation to ancillary offences and extends criminal liability to commanders and superiors who fail to prevent the commission of an offence in certain circumstances.
- Part 3: prohibits the unauthorised use of the cultural emblem, the symbol created by the Convention to identify cultural property which is protected. The Bill makes it an offence to use the emblem otherwise than as authorised by, or under the Bill. It identifies authorised uses of the emblem, and gives the appropriate national authority power to designate further authorised uses.
- Part 4: makes provision in relation to cultural property which has been unlawfully exported from an occupied territory. It creates a new offence of dealing in such cultural property, and makes further provision in relation to that offence, providing for the forfeiture of the cultural property concerned. Further, it provides powers of search and seizure if there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that unlawfully exported cultural property may be found at a premises. It provides for the retention of such cultural property so that it may be returned to the competent authorities of the territory previously occupied at the close of hostilities, in fulfilment of the United Kingdom’s obligation under the First Protocol to the Convention.
- Part 5: provides immunity from seizure or forfeiture of cultural property which is entitled to special protection under Article 12 of the Convention because it is being transported to the United Kingdom, or through the United Kingdom to another destination, for safekeeping during a period of armed conflict.
- Part 6: sets out general provisions.

The Bill also contains four Schedules. These are:

- Schedule 1: 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict.
- Schedule 2: Regulations for the execution of the Convention
- Schedule 3: First Protocol to the Convention.
- Schedule 4: Second Protocol to the Convention.

## Policy background

- 2 The Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill will introduce the necessary domestic legislation to enable the United Kingdom to ratify the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Convention) and accede to its two Protocols (1954 and 1999).
- 3 The Hague Convention, adopted following the massive destruction of cultural property that took

*These Explanatory Notes relate to the Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill [HL] as introduced in the House of Lords on 19 May 2016 (HL Bill 3)*

place in the Second World War, provides for a system of general and special protection of cultural property in situations of armed conflict. Parties to the Convention are required to respect both cultural property situated within their own territory and cultural property within the territory of other Parties, by refraining from using it, or its immediate surrounding, for purposes which are likely to expose it to destruction or damage in the event of armed conflict, and by refraining from committing any hostile act against the property. The Convention also restricts use of a distinctive emblem (which can only be used as provided by the Convention in connection with the protection of cultural property). Amongst other matters the Convention also deals with the transport of cultural property under special protection (including immunity from seizure).

- 4 The Convention was followed by two Protocols. The first in 1954 (the 'First Protocol') imposes a number of obligations on Parties in relation to the protection of cultural property in occupied territories. Parties must undertake to prevent the export of cultural property from any territory occupied by it during an armed conflict and to take into its custody any cultural property protected under the Convention and imported into its territory either directly or indirectly from any occupied territory. At the end of the occupation, each Party is obliged to return any cultural property in its territory that was exported from the occupied State and refrain from retaining it as war reparations.
- 5 The United Kingdom originally chose not to ratify the Convention or to accede to the First Protocol, not on the grounds that it opposed measures to protect cultural property in the event of armed conflict, but rather because it considered, together with a number of other countries, that it did not provide an effective regime for the protection of cultural property.
- 6 The Second Protocol, in 1999, extends and clarifies the obligations under the Convention. In particular it identifies five acts, each a serious violation of the Protocol, which are to be considered an offence under the Protocol. It also establishes an enhanced system of protection for specially designated cultural property.
- 7 The Second Protocol removed many of the United Kingdom's concerns and in doing so allowed the Government of the time to announce its intention to ratify the Convention and its two Protocols in May 2004. This resulted in the publication of the draft Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill in 2008. The Draft Bill was welcomed by the House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee, which found it to be strongly supported on the basis of the evidence it received. In substance the policy behind the Bill has remained the same since 2008 although minor changes have been made to update and improve the drafting.
- 8 As of May 2016, 127 countries are party to the Hague Convention, 104 countries are party to its First Protocol and 68 countries are party to its Second Protocol.

## Legal background

- 9 Primary legislation is required in order for the United Kingdom to ratify the Convention and accede to its Protocols. Although the United Kingdom already complies with the Convention during all military operations, and recognises and respects the cultural emblem used to mark protected cultural property, existing United Kingdom laws are not sufficient to meet the obligations set out in the Convention and its Protocols in full. The Convention and Protocols oblige us to create new offences and search and seizure powers, which can only be achieved through primary legislation
- 10 Article 15(1) of the Second Protocol lists five acts, which constitute offences when committed intentionally and in violation of the Convention. Article 15(2) of the Second Protocol requires parties to establish those acts as criminal offences under their domestic law. The relevant acts are:
  - Making cultural property under enhanced protection the object of attack;

- Using cultural property under enhanced protection or its immediate surroundings in support of military action;
  - Extensive destruction or appropriation of cultural property protected under the Convention and the Second Protocol;
  - Making cultural property protected under the convention and the Second Protocol the object of attack;
  - Theft, pillage or misappropriation of, or acts of vandalism directed against cultural property protected under the Convention.
- 11 The behaviour which article 15(1)(a) and (d) seeks to criminalise (making cultural property the object of attack) is partially covered by existing offences under section 1(1) of the Geneva Conventions Act 1957, section 51 of the International Criminal Court Act 2001, and section 1 of the International Criminal Court (Scotland) Act 2001. However, neither offence is sufficient for the following reasons:
- in neither case is the definition of the property protected sufficient to encompass attacks directed at all forms of cultural property, as defined in Article 1 of the Hague Convention;
  - the offences are more restricted than the offences under Article 15(1) of the Second Protocol.
- 12 There is no equivalent offence for Article 15(1)(b) of the Second Protocol (using cultural property under enhanced protection in support of military action).
- 13 A breach of Article 8(2)(b)(xiii) (destroying or seizing the enemy's property unless such destruction or seizure be imperatively demanded by the necessities of war) of the International Criminal Court Statute is a criminal offence under section 51 of the International Criminal Court Act 2001, and section 1 of the International Criminal Court (Scotland) Act 2001. These offences, though not specifically directed at cultural property would cover the behaviour criminalised under Article 15(1)(c). However, the offences do not apply in relation to non-international conflicts; and the jurisdiction we have taken to prosecute this offence is not sufficiently wide to meet our obligations under Article 16 of the Second Protocol.
- 14 There are also a number of existing offences in domestic law which could be used to prosecute the behaviour covered by Article 15(1)(e). However, our jurisdiction to prosecute United Kingdom nationals for the existing domestic offences committed outside the United Kingdom only applies where they are subject to military discipline, or in the service of the Crown and acting (or purporting to act) in the course of their employment. This is not sufficient even to satisfy the more limited jurisdictional requirements for this offence. For example, it would not enable the United Kingdom to prosecute a United Kingdom national, in the context of an armed conflict, which is taking place in a state that is a Party to the Convention, for the intentional vandalism of cultural property done in a personal capacity.
- 15 Article 16 of the Convention describes the distinctive emblem of the Convention. Article 17 sets out conditions for its use, and provides that any other uses shall be forbidden. Under Article 85(3)(f) of Protocol 1 Additional to the Geneva Conventions 1977, perfidious use of the cultural emblem is a grave breach of the Protocol. This is also an offence under the law of England and Wales - see section 1(1) of the Geneva Conventions Act 1957. However forbidden uses of the cultural emblem under Article 17 of the Convention would not in most cases be considered to be "perfidious". Furthermore the Hague Convention has a broader application than the Additional Protocol 1 to Geneva Conventions – i.e. the Hague Convention applies in the event of an armed conflict not of an international character within the territory of one of the High Contracting Parties. Hence legislation is needed to implement the obligation under Article 17 of the Convention to ensure that the emblem is not abused.
- 16 The Convention and Protocols also impose obligations on Occupying States and other Parties to take measures to suppress any illicit export of cultural property from occupied territories and return any

*These Explanatory Notes relate to the Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill [HL] as introduced in the House of Lords on 19 May 2016 (HL Bill 3)*

cultural property protected by the Convention at the end of hostilities. In particular, 1 of the First Protocol requires a Party to prevent the exportation of cultural property from territory occupied by it, and to take into its custody any cultural property imported into its territory from another occupied territory. It also obliges Parties to undertake to return any such property at the close of hostilities. Article 21(b) of the Second Protocol requires Parties to adopt the legislative, administrative or disciplinary measures necessary to suppress any illicit export other removal or transfer of ownership from occupied territory in violation of the Convention or the Second Protocol.

- 17 There is existing United Kingdom legislation in this field such as the Return of Cultural Objects Regulations 1994 (as amended), the Dealing in Cultural Objects (Offences) Act 2003 and the Iraq (United Nations Sanctions) Order 2003 and Export Control (Syria Sanctions) (Amendment) Order 2014. However, these are not sufficient to enable the United Kingdom to comply fully with its obligations under the Convention and Protocols, due to differences in application and scope.
- 18 Article 14 of the Convention requires Parties to give immunity from “seizure, placing in prize, or capture” to any cultural property which is protected under Articles 12 (Transport under special protection) or 13 (Transport in urgent cases), and to the means of transport exclusively engaged in transferring protected cultural property. Although some property and transport would already be covered by existing legislation, such as the State Immunity Act 1978 and the Diplomatic Privileges Act 1964, these only apply to state owned property, so legislation is needed to ensure that cultural property and transport is afforded the necessary protection whilst it is in the United Kingdom.

## **Territorial extent and application**

- 19 The Bill will extend to England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
- 20 The table in Annex A summarises the position regarding territorial extent and application in the United Kingdom. It also summarises the position regarding legislative consent motions and matters relevant to Standing Orders 83J to 83X of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons relating to Public Business.

# Commentary on provisions of Bill

## Part 1: KEY DEFINITIONS

21 This Part provides definitions of terms used within the Bill.

## Part 2: SERIOUS BREACH OF THE SECOND PROTOCOL

### Clause 3: Offence of serious breach of Second Protocol

22 *Subsection (1)* creates a new criminal offence, a serious breach of the Second Protocol, which is committed where a person intentionally does an act listed in Article 15(1) of the Second Protocol knowing that the property to which the act relates is cultural property. The five acts listed in Article 15(1) are as follows:

- a. making cultural property under enhanced protection the object of attack;
- b. using cultural property under enhanced protection or its immediate surroundings in support of military action;
- c. extensive destruction or appropriation of cultural property protected under the Convention and the Second Protocol;
- d. making cultural property protected under the Convention and the Second Protocol the object of attack; and
- e. theft, pillage or misappropriation of, or acts of vandalism directed against, cultural property protected under the Convention.

23 *Subsection (1)(b)* stipulates that the act concerned must violate the Convention or the Second Protocol (which reflects the wording of Article 15(1)). In order to prosecute an offence based on Article 15(1) of the Second Protocol it is therefore necessary to identify how the act set out at Article 15(1) violates the Convention or Second Protocol. For example, if the military forces of a Party to the Convention were to make cultural property protected by the Convention and Second Protocol the object of an attack (an act specified in Article 15(1)(d)), this would constitute a violation of the obligation in Article 4(1) of the Convention to refrain from any act of hostility against such property. In contrast, the same act would not constitute such a violation if the obligation in Article 4(1) was waived on the basis of military imperative as permitted by Article 4(2)<sup>1</sup>. Acts will not be covered if they occur in peacetime – relevant provisions of the Convention and the Second Protocol<sup>2</sup> apply in the event of war or armed conflict between two or more Parties<sup>3</sup> or an occupation of the territory of a Party<sup>4</sup> as well as in the event of armed conflicts “not of an international character” occurring within the territory of one of the Parties<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Article 4(2) of the Convention is refined by Article 6(a) of the Second Protocol.

<sup>2</sup> Articles 18 and 19 of the Convention, Article 3 and 22 of the Second Protocol.

<sup>3</sup> See Article 18(1) of the Convention.

<sup>4</sup> See Article 18(2) of the Convention.

<sup>5</sup> See Article 19 of the Convention and Article 22 of the Second Protocol.

- 24 Articles 15(1)(a) and (b) of the Second Protocol set out offences against cultural property under “enhanced protection”. The Second Protocol sets out a system whereby cultural property in countries which are parties to the Second Protocol can be granted enhanced protection<sup>6</sup>. Such protection is only granted to cultural property which is “of the greatest importance for humanity”<sup>7</sup>. Enhanced protection status is very rare; there are currently only 10 pieces of cultural property that have received enhanced protection worldwide and they are all World Heritage Sites. Article 12 of the Second Protocol obliges the Parties to a conflict to refrain from making cultural property under enhanced protection “the object of attack or from any use of the property or its immediate surroundings in support of military action.” The threshold for receiving enhanced protection is very high and therefore it is unlikely that such offences will in practice be committed
- 25 Article 15(1)(c) and (d) deal with offences against cultural property which is protected by both the Convention and the Second Protocol. Damage to cultural property in a country which is not a Party to both the Convention and the Second Protocol will not be covered by these offences.
- 26 Article 15(1)(e) covers theft, pillage or misappropriation, or acts of vandalism directed against, cultural property protected under the Convention. This offence is the most likely to be prosecuted of the five Article 15 offences since it will apply to offences against cultural property committed in the many countries which have ratified the Convention regardless of whether they are also Parties to the Second Protocol.
- 27 Action taken by the armed forces of a country which is not a Party to the Convention or the Second Protocol, and is not therefore bound by the obligations set out in the Convention and the Protocol, will not amount to an offence under this clause, since the requirement under Article 15 that there must be a violation of the Convention or the Second Protocol will not be satisfied. Article 16(2)(b) of the Second Protocol makes it clear that members of the armed forces and nationals of a State which is not a Party to that Protocol do not incur individual criminal responsibility by virtue of the Second Protocol unless they are serving in the armed forces of a State which is a Party to the Protocol.
- 28 The remaining subsections of this clause make provisions about jurisdiction, implementing the requirements of Article 16(1) of the Second Protocol. *Subsection (2)* makes it clear that for each of the offences described in Article 15(1) of the Second Protocol, the act can take place within the United Kingdom or in another country.
- 29 By *subsection (3)* United Kingdom and non- United Kingdom nationals can be prosecuted for a serious breach of the Second Protocol in relation to the acts set out at Article 15(1)(a)-(c) of the Second Protocol.
- 30 In contrast, *subsection (4)* provides that in relation to the acts set out at Article 15(1)(d)-(e) of the Second Protocol (which are considered less serious) the criminal offence can only be committed by a United Kingdom national or a person subject to United Kingdom service jurisdiction.
- 31 *Subsections (5) and (6)* define the terms “United Kingdom national” and “person subject to United Kingdom jurisdiction” for the purposes of Part 2 of the Bill.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Articles 10-14 of the Second Protocol.

<sup>7</sup> See Article 11 of the Second Protocol.

## Clause 4: Ancillary offences

- 32 This clause implements the obligation in Article 15(2) of the Second Protocol to extend criminal responsibility to persons other than those who directly commit the act described in Article 15(1) of that Protocol. It sets out provisions about jurisdiction which mirror those for the principal offence set out in clause 3.
- 33 *Subsection (1)* provides that an offence which is ancillary to the offence of a serious breach of the Second Protocol (clause 3) may be committed in the United Kingdom or elsewhere.
- 34 *Subsection (2)* provides that any person may be prosecuted for an ancillary offence in relation to any of the acts listed in Article 15(1)(a)-(c) above, regardless of their nationality.
- 35 *Subsection (3)* provides that a person may only be prosecuted in connection with an ancillary offence concerned with the acts listed in Article 15(1)(d) or (e) above, if he or she is a United Kingdom national, or is subject to United Kingdom service jurisdiction.
- 36 *Subsections (4), (5), and (6)* define what is meant by “an offence that is ancillary to an offence under section 3” in relation to each jurisdiction of the United Kingdom.
- 37 *Subsection (7)* ensures that the provision made in relation to ancillary offences applies not only to offences which are ancillary to the principal offence, but also to offences which are ancillary to ancillary offences. This subsection would apply, for example, where a person had destroyed evidence in order to conceal an attempt by a friend to steal cultural property protected under the Convention. The person who destroyed the evidence would be guilty of an offence under section 5 of the Criminal Law Act 1967, an offence which would in itself be ancillary to the ancillary offence committed by the friend of attempting to commit a serious breach of the Second Protocol.

## Clause 5: Responsibility of commanders and other superiors

- 38 This clause provides for an additional form of criminal responsibility, namely that of commanders and superiors for the acts of their subordinates. Such criminal responsibility complies with general principles of international law referred to in Article 15(2) of the Second Protocol and is contained within the Statute of the International Criminal Court which is regarded as an authoritative statement of the general principles of international law in relation to criminal liability. The wording of the section is based on Article 28 of the Statute of the International Criminal Court (similar provision is made in section 65 of the International Criminal Court Act 2001). As *subsection (6)* makes clear, courts will be obliged to take account of the jurisprudence of the International Criminal Court in interpreting and applying this clause.
- 39 The wording in *subsections (2) and (4)* draws a distinction between the standards expected of military and quasi-military commanders in relation to military forces under their command, and other superiors such as government officials or heads of civilian organisations, as it is recognised that the latter may not have the same degree of control over the actions of their subordinates. The commander will incur liability under this provision where he or she knew, or owing to the circumstances at the time should have known, that his or her forces were committing an offence. A superior will only be liable where he or she knew or consciously disregarded information indicating that the subordinate was committing an offence.
- 40 *Subsection (1)* makes it clear that liability under this provision is a form of aiding and abetting. Under section 8 of the Accessories and Abettors Act 1861, which extends to England and Wales and Northern Ireland, a person who has aided or abetted the commission of an offence is liable to be prosecuted, and is subject to the same penalty, as a principal offender. In Scotland broadly equivalent provision is made in relation to statutory offences by section 293 of the Crown Proceedings (Scotland) Act 1995. *Subsection 7* makes it clear that this section does not preclude

any criminal liability which arises apart from this clause. So if a commander is prosecuted in reliance on this subsection, this would not rule out prosecutions of individual members of his forces in relation to the same events.

### Clause 6: Penalties

- 41 This clause provides for the maximum penalty for the offence of serious breach of the Second Protocol, and for offences which are ancillary to such offences.

### Clause 7: Attorney General's consent to prosecutions

- 42 This clause ensures that prosecutions for the offence of serious breach of the Second Protocol, or for related ancillary offences may only be brought in England and Wales with the consent of the Attorney General. In Northern Ireland, the consent of the Director for Public Prosecutions for Northern Ireland is required. No equivalent provision is made in relation to Scotland as the position of the Lord Advocate as master of the instance in relation to all prosecutions in Scotland means that such provision is unnecessary.

## Part 3: CULTURAL EMBLEM

### Clause 8: The cultural emblem

- 43 This clause defines the cultural emblem introduced by the Convention to identify cultural property which is protected under the Convention. Article 17 of the Convention permits use of the cultural emblem to identify cultural property or for personnel engaging in protecting such property.

### Clause 9: Offence of unauthorised use

- 44 This clause creates a new offence of unauthorised use of the cultural emblem. This implements the obligation under Article 17 of the Convention to prevent use of the emblem except as authorised by the Convention. It is also an offence to use another design which is capable of being mistaken for the emblem because it so closely resembles it. The offence is punishable by a fine, and proceedings may only be brought with the consent of the Director of Public Prosecutions in England and Wales, or, in Northern Ireland, the Director of Public Prosecutions for Northern Ireland. No consent requirement is made in relation to Scotland as the position of the Lord Advocate as master of the instance in relation to all prosecutions in Scotland means that such provision is unnecessary.

### Clause 10: Use authorised by appropriate national authority

- 45 *Subsection (1)* gives to the appropriate national authority the power to give permission for particular uses of the cultural emblem as being "authorised" for the purposes of this part of the Bill. "Appropriate national authority" is defined in clause 15 of the Bill as the Secretary of State, in relation to England, and the devolved authorities in the other parts of the United Kingdom. Permission which has been given may be withdrawn. *Subsection (2)* imposes an additional requirement where the cultural property concerned is immovable cultural property. In this case, a copy of the permission given must be displayed with the emblem. For example a certificate signed by the Secretary of State would be sufficient evidence of permission in England

### Clause 11: Other authorised use: moveable property

- 46 This clause provides that the cultural emblem can be used to identify moveable cultural property, whilst the cultural emblem triangle can be used to identify cultural property undergoing protected transportation under Article 12 or 13 of the Convention. Article 12 of the Convention provides for the transfer of cultural property to take place under special protection, in accordance with the procedures set out in the Regulations to the convention. Article 13 provides for such transfer in cases of urgency where it is not possible to follow those

procedures.

- 47 For example if an armed conflict were to occur in one part of the United Kingdom, the cultural emblem triangle could be displayed on moveable cultural property during its transportation under special protection to a refuge in an area of the United Kingdom not affected by the conflict. If the armed conflict occurred un-expectedly and protection of the cultural property was determined to be a matter of urgency, the cultural emblem triangle could be displayed on such property during its transportation without the procedures in the Regulations having been followed (provided a request under Article 12 had not previously been refused).

#### Clause 12: Other authorised use: personnel

- 48 This clause authorises the use of the cultural emblem to identify two classes of people. The first class consists of those personnel who have duties of control under the Convention in relation to cultural property, such as the representative for cultural property appointed under Article 2 of the Regulations, or the Commissioner General. The second class consists of personnel who have been designated by the appropriate national authority as being engaged in the protection of cultural property in the appropriate part of the United Kingdom. For example if a cultural property expert is designated by the Secretary of State for the protection of cultural property in England, they would be authorised to wear an armband bearing the cultural emblem when transporting cultural property for safekeeping

#### Clause 13: Defences

- 49 This clause sets out three defences to the offence of unauthorised use of the cultural emblem (clause 9). Under *subsection (2)*, it is not an offence to use the cultural emblem for a purpose for which it had previously been lawfully used by the accused before this clause comes into force.
- 50 Under *subsection (3)* it is not an offence to use the emblem where it forms part of a trademark registered before the clause comes into force, and the trademark is being used lawfully in relation to the goods or services for which it was registered. An example of this could be a badge for a sports club.
- 51 Under *subsections (4) and (5)*, it is not an offence to use a design on goods provided that the design was applied to the goods by their manufacturer or someone trading in those goods before they came into the possession of the accused, and the person applying the design was using it lawfully in relation to the same type of goods before the clause comes into force. Use of the emblem by the manufacturer or trader would come within the terms of the defences set out in *subsections (2) and (3)* of this clause. The defence in *subsections (4) and (5)* is intended to ensure that the purchaser of such goods does not commit an offence. For example, if a retailer sold T-shirts printed with a design closely resembling the cultural emblem, he or she would not incur criminal liability for continuing to sell similar T-shirts after the Bill becomes law. Any consumer who bought the T-shirts would also not incur criminal liability after the Bill becomes law. *Subsection (6)* makes it clear that, where the defendant can provide evidence that a defence exists, the burden to prove the offence still lies with the prosecution.

#### Clause 14: Forfeiture following conviction under section 9

- 52 This clause gives the court which convicts someone of the offence of unauthorised use of the emblem the power to order the forfeiture of the articles in respect of which the offence was committed, and where appropriate, their destruction.

#### Clause 15: “Appropriate national authority”

- 53 This clause defines the term “appropriate national authority” in relation to each part of the United Kingdom. That term is used in clauses 10 and 12 of the Bill.

## Part 4: PROPERTY EXPORTED FROM OCCUPIED TERRITORY

54 Under the First Protocol, the United Kingdom is under an obligation to take cultural property which has been exported from occupied territory and imported into the United Kingdom into its custody, and to return that property to the competent authorities at the close of hostilities. Further, under Article 21 of the Second Protocol, the United Kingdom must take measures to suppress any illicit export, other removal or transfer of ownership of cultural property from occupied territory in violation of the Convention or the Second Protocol. This Part of the Bill is intended to enable the government to implement those obligations. Under paragraph 1 of the First Protocol all export of cultural property from occupied territory is prohibited.

### Clause 16: “Unlawfully exported cultural property” etc.

55 This clause states what is meant by “unlawfully exported cultural property” for the purposes of this Part of the Bill. The cultural property in question must have been exported from occupied territory, and its export must have been unlawful under either the laws of the territory in question, or under rules of international law such as the First Protocol. The unlawful export need not have taken place after this Bill comes into force – cultural property unlawfully exported from occupied territory at any time after 1956 (when the First Protocol came into force) will come within the definition. So, for example, outstanding antiquities stolen in an occupied territory and smuggled out of that territory would fall within the definition of “unlawfully exported cultural property”.

56 *Subsection (5)* makes clear that the test for “occupied territory” is drawn from Article 42 of the [Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land](#), done at the Hague, 18 October 1907. Under that provision: “Territory is considered occupied when it is actually placed under the authority of the hostile army. The occupation applies only to territory where such authority is established and in a position to assert itself.”

57 *Subsection (6)* provides that, where the Secretary of State issues a certificate stating whether a particular territory is or was occupied by a Party to the First or Second Protocol or any other state, that certificate will be conclusive evidence of that fact. However, this does not mean that a certificate needs to be provided in all cases. Alternative evidence may be provided to prove the status of a particular territory.

### Clause 17: Offence of dealing in unlawfully exported cultural property

58 *Subsection (1)* makes it an offence to deal in cultural property which has been unlawfully exported from occupied territory, if the perpetrator either knew or had reason to suspect that the cultural property concerned had been unlawfully exported.

59 *Subsection (2)* ensures that an offence is only committed where the property concerned is imported into the United Kingdom after the commencement of this clause. No offence will be committed in relation to cultural property which is not imported into the United Kingdom.

60 *Subsections (3), (4) and (5)* define “dealing” for the purpose of this section, identifying each of the activities which may result in the commission of an offence. *Subsection (3) (b) and (c)* provide for activities where a person may not have directly dealt with the unlawfully exported cultural property themselves. An example under *subsection 3(c)* would be where an antiquities dealer Y makes arrangements for a statue to be sold at auction, knowing that it is unlawfully exported cultural property, Y will be guilty of an offence, even if he or she does not actually “acquire” or “dispose” of the statue at any point themselves.

61 Under *subsections (6), (7) and (8)*, the offence is triable either in the crown court or the magistrates court. These subsections set out the maximum penalties following conviction in

either the crown court or magistrates court.

- 62 A dealer does not commit an offence under this clause if, for example, they take temporary possession of a cultural object to enable them to carry out due diligence, or provide a valuation, only for them to discover that it has been unlawfully exported from an occupied territory. In such a scenario, the dealer could not be said to have 'acquired' the object, and therefore no dealing has taken place. They would also have lacked the requisite mental element or "*mens rea*" to commit the offence. In order to commit an offence in this context, a dealer would have to both "acquire" the object i.e. buy, hire, borrow or accept, and do so knowing, or having reason to suspect that it is unlawfully exported cultural property

### Clause 18: Forfeiture in connection with dealing offence

- 63 This clause ensures that, where someone has been convicted of the offence of dealing with unlawfully exported cultural property, the court may order the forfeiture of that property, and may make further provision for its retention or disposal. The forfeiture provision is required in order for the United Kingdom to comply with its obligation to take into its custody cultural property imported into its territory either directly or indirectly from any occupied territory (see paragraph 2 of the First Protocol).

### Clauses 19-27: Forfeiture otherwise than in connection with offence and seizure and retention of property liable to forfeiture.

- 64 These clauses make provision for the forfeiture of cultural property otherwise than in connection with an offence. As with the forfeiture provision under clause 18, these provisions are required in order for the United Kingdom to comply with its obligation to take into its custody cultural property imported into its territory either directly or indirectly from any occupied territory (see paragraph 2 of the First Protocol).
- 65 Unlawfully exported cultural property is liable to forfeiture, provided that it has been imported into the United Kingdom after clause 19 comes into force. Forfeiture orders can only be made if an application is made to the Court within 4 months of the day on which either the property is seized under clause 23, or an order made for the retention of the property under clause 24 – see clause 27(1)(d).
- 66 Clause 21 provides that a court may decide to make a forfeiture order under clause 20 conditional on compensation being paid. This enables the court to protect the interests of a person who acquires cultural property in good faith not knowing that it was unlawfully exported from occupied territory. The court does not have power to order the payment of compensation itself. Parties to the First Protocol are obliged to prevent export of cultural property from territory that they occupy during armed conflict and to return cultural property which is exported. In order to secure the return of unlawfully exported property, the Party which was in occupation is obliged to pay an indemnity to the holders in good faith of any cultural property (see paragraph 4 of the First Protocol). Compensation may be paid by the authorities which are seeking the return of the cultural property in question, or by the Secretary of State. If the compensation due has not been paid within four months of the date on which the forfeiture order was made, the order ceases to have any effect.
- 67 Clause 22 gives the court power to make an interim order for the safekeeping of property which

is or may be the subject of an application for a forfeiture order under clause 20. For example, where cultural property is in a fragile condition and requires work to stabilise it, the court would be able to order that it should be transferred to the custody of a museum for the necessary conservation work to be carried out.

- 68 Clause 23 ensures that the police may apply to a justice of the peace, in England and Wales<sup>8</sup>, for a warrant authorising a constable to enter the premises identified in the warrant in order to search for cultural property which has been unlawfully exported from an occupied territory and, where such property is discovered as a result of the search, to seize it. The police must be able to demonstrate to the justice of the peace that there are reasonable grounds for believing that such cultural property is situated in the premises in question. The issue of a warrant under this clause is, in England and Wales<sup>9</sup>, subject to the safeguards set out in section 15 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, and must be executed in accordance with the requirements in section 16 of that Act. *Subsection (3)* provides that someone exercising a power under such a warrant has authority to use reasonable force where this is necessary, for example, to gain access to the premises in question, or to open locked storage space. *Subsection (9)* has the effect that the additional powers of seizure from premises provided under section 50 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 will be exercisable in relation to the powers of seizure in this section.
- 69 Once cultural property has been seized under this provision, it must be retained by the police until either a forfeiture order is made under clause 20 or the property is returned or disposed of in accordance with clause 27.
- 70 Clause 24 gives a justice of the peace (or their equivalent in Scotland or Northern Ireland) the power to authorise the continued retention of property which was originally seized in connection with the investigation or prosecution of the offence of dealing in unlawfully exported cultural property, on the application of a constable. This may happen, for example, where cultural property was originally seized as evidence in relation to an offence of dealing in unlawfully exported cultural property, but either it is decided that no criminal proceedings should be brought, or any criminal proceedings brought result in the acquittal of the accused, so that the power under which the police originally seized that property no longer applies.
- 71 Under *subsection (2)*, once retention of the property has been authorised, it must be retained by the police until either the property is forfeited under clause 20 or the property is returned or disposed of in accordance with clause 27. An order for continued retention may only be made if the justice of the peace is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that the property may be liable to forfeiture under clause 19 (see *subsection (3)*). Property is liable to forfeiture under that clause where it is cultural property within the meaning of the Convention, it has been unlawfully exported from occupied territory, and it was imported into the United Kingdom after the commencement of clause 19.
- 72 *Subsection (6)* states that the Police (Property) Act 1897, and the related Act under the law of Northern Ireland, which make provision with respect to the disposal of property in the

---

<sup>8</sup> In Scotland, a sheriff or summary sheriff; in Northern Ireland, a lay magistrate.

<sup>9</sup> In Scotland, issue and execution of a warrant must be carried out in accordance with the common law. In Northern Ireland, there is equivalent provision in Articles 17 and 18 of the Police and Criminal Evidence (Northern Ireland) Order 1989 (1989 No. 1341).

possession of the police, do not apply to property retained under clause 24(5).

- 73 Clauses 23(5) and 24(4) oblige the person who has custody of property which has been seized or retained to give notice to the owner (unless the property was seized in the presence of the owner or his employee/agent (see clause 23(6)). Clause 25 further provides that notices must be in writing and set out grounds for seizure/retention. Clause 25(2) and (3) explain how notice is to be given.
- 74 Clause 26 deals with property seized in connection with investigation or prosecution of the “dealing” offence under clause 17 and which is not being held by the police. An example of this scenario would be if an object had been sent to a museum for expert advice on its provenance. Once the object is no longer needed for the investigation or prosecution of the clause 17 offence, it must be transferred to a constable as soon as is reasonably practicable (see *subsection (2)*). The police can then make an application to retain the property pending forfeiture or return or disposal.
- 75 Clause 27 imposes a duty on the person who has custody of cultural property which has been seized to return it to the owner, as soon as reasonably practicable, once forfeiture is no longer being pursued. However if it has not been reasonably practicable to return the cultural property to its owner within a period of twelve months, then the person who has custody may dispose of it as they think appropriate.

## Part 5: PROPERTY REMOVED FOR SAFEKEEPING

### Clause 28: Immunity from seizure or forfeiture

- 76 Under Article 14 of the Convention, the United Kingdom is required to grant immunity from seizure to any cultural property which enjoys special protection under Article 12 of the Convention. Article 12 applies to cultural property which is being transported for safekeeping. The means of transport for cultural property which enjoys special protection must also enjoy immunity of seizure. Clause 28 of the Bill implements the United Kingdom’s obligations under Article 14 of the Convention to ensure that such cultural property may not be seized or forfeited while it is in the United Kingdom.
- 77 As *subsections (3) and (4)* make clear, the immunity applies both to cultural property which is being transported to the United Kingdom, and to cultural property which is in transit through the United Kingdom *en route* to another destination for safekeeping. In the case of cultural property which is being transported to the United Kingdom, for which the United Kingdom has agreed to act as depositary (i.e. accepting the obligations to safeguard the property under Article 18 of the Regulations for the Execution of the Convention), *subsection (5)* provides that the cultural property is protected while it remains in the custody of the Secretary of State, or any other person or institution which has been made responsible for the its safekeeping by the Secretary of State. If the cultural property leaves the custody of such an institution, for example if it is stolen, it is no longer protected, and may be seized by the police so that it can be returned to the institution in question.
- 78 *Subsection (7)* ensures that the same protection applies to any vehicle which is being used to transport cultural property protected under Article 12 of the Convention.
- 79 *Subsection (8)* sets out the extent of the protection which will be given to objects under this clause. It includes immunity against all forms of execution which might be made against an object protected under the clause, any order made in civil proceedings and any measure taken in criminal proceedings (or for the purposes of a criminal investigation) which might affect the control or custody of an object.

## Part 6: GENERAL

### Clause 29: Liability of company officers for offences by company

80 This clause provides that, if an offence under this Bill is committed because an officer of a company or Scottish partnership (e.g. private military contractors) agrees to the offence that is committed (e.g. looting of protected cultural property), or assists with its commission by failing to prevent it, then the officer will be guilty of an offence as well as the company or partnership.

### Clause 30: Crown application

81 This clause makes clear that all the provisions contained in the Bill apply to the Crown. This means for instance that enforcement powers such as powers of entry apply to premises carried out or used by or on behalf of the Crown (e.g. to government offices), and powers of seizure similarly apply to Crown property. The Bill will not, however, apply to the Queen in her private capacity. The clause makes clear that the Crown cannot be criminally liable, however this does not affect the criminal liability of persons in crown service (e.g. civil servants).

### Clause 31: Extent

82 The Bill will extend throughout the United Kingdom. In addition, under *subsection (2)*, by Order in Council, its provisions can be extended to cover the Isle of Man and any British overseas territory.

## Commencement

83 The provisions in the Bill will be brought into force by regulations made by the Secretary of State in reliance on the power given in clause 32 of the Bill. The Bill will come into force in line with common commencement dates.

## Financial implications of the Bill

84 The financial effects to Consolidated Fund and National Loans Fund of this Act should be negligible. The only areas of additional expenditure likely to be incurred are through enforcement through compensating good faith purchasers of property which is to be returned to the previously occupied territory. It is not foreseen that expenditure under either of these headings will be significant.

85 An Impact Assessment has been published on [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)

86 National heritage agencies and enforcement agencies will bear one-off familiarisation costs. Prosecuting/enforcement authorities may face some costs if a crime is committed but we believe this to be both unlikely in occurrence and low in cost. These are not businesses but public sector organisations.

87 Costs to dealers in cultural property will be nil as this legislation will not add any additional burden on them beyond the normal due diligence that they should undertake for any piece of cultural property that they wish to buy or sell. Dealers will not be required to do anything more than is required under existing practices.

88 Owners/ guardians of cultural property protected by the Convention may voluntarily choose to affix the cultural emblem to their cultural property to visibly demonstrate that is protected by the Convention. As this is voluntary, this cost is considered as indirect.

## Compatibility with the European Convention on Human Rights

- 89 Section 19 of the Human Rights Act 1998 requires the Minister in charge of a Bill in either House of Parliament to make a statement about the compatibility of the provisions of the Bill with the Convention rights protected by the Human Rights Act. The Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, Baroness Neville-Rolfe, has made the following statement: “In my view the provisions of the Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill are compatible with the Convention rights.”
- 90 The Bill engages Articles 6 (right to a fair trial), 7 (no punishment without law) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights (the ECHR) and Article 1 of the First Protocol to the ECHR (right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions) but is compatible with the rights set out in those Articles.
- 91 Part 2 creates a new criminal offence of a serious breach of the Second Protocol. That offence is defined by reference to the acts defined as “offences” in Article 15(1) of the Second Protocol. This engages Article 7 of the ECHR, which includes a requirement that offences must be based in law which is sufficiently accessible, and the effects of which are reasonably foreseeable, so that an individual is able to foresee the consequences of his or her actions. The provisions relating to the Part 2 offence are readily accessible in the Bill and the Convention and two Protocols are set out in full in Schedules to the Bill. It is sufficiently clear from the Bill what conduct will amount to an offence. The Second Protocol forms part of the body of international criminal law, and reflects concepts used in other international instruments, which will be relevant to the extent that the provisions may be subject to judicial interpretation. Accordingly, these provisions comply with the requirements of Article 7 of the ECHR.
- 92 Article 7 of the ECHR is also potentially engaged by Part 3, which creates an offence of using the cultural emblem otherwise than as authorised and provides in clause 11 that use of the emblem is authorised where cultural property is undergoing protected transportation as provided for in Articles 12 and 13 of the Convention. Again, given that the Convention is set out in Schedule 1, it is sufficiently clear from the Bill what conduct is authorised by clause 11.
- 93 Part 3 also engages Article 1 of the First Protocol to the ECHR, which confers a right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions. Under clause 14, where a person is convicted of an offence of unauthorised use of the cultural emblem, the court may order the forfeiture of any article on which, or in connection with which, the emblem design was used. Such forfeiture would constitute a control of use of a person’s possessions. It is, however, justified as being in the public interest, subject to conditions provided by law and proportionate. There is a public interest in protecting the integrity of the cultural emblem and Part 3 gives it equivalent protection to that afforded to other international emblems including the Red Cross. It is considered that clause 14 strikes a fair balance between this public interest and the property rights of the person concerned.
- 94 Part 4 of the Bill potentially engages Articles 6, 7 and 8 of the ECHR and Article 1 of the First Protocol.
- 95 Articles 6 and 7 are potentially engaged by clauses 16 and 17, which define “unlawfully exported cultural property” and provide that it is an offence to deal in such property. Clause 16(3) defines

“unlawful” export by reference to the laws of the territory from which the property is exported or any rule of international law, and clause 16(5) defines “occupied territory” by reference to the Hague Regulations of 1907<sup>10</sup>. This potentially engages Article 7 as it may not be immediately apparent whether cultural property has been unlawfully exported from an occupied territory, but it is considered that the law is sufficiently accessible, and its effects reasonably foreseeable, if necessary with the assistance of professional advice to determine what constitutes “occupied territory”. Article 7 is also potentially engaged by the provision in clause 16(6) for a certificate issued by the Secretary of State to be conclusive evidence of whether a territory is or was occupied by a Party to the First or Second Protocol or by any other state. It is considered that the offence is sufficiently certain given that the Secretary of State must determine the issues by reference to the Hague Regulations (see clause 16(5)) and to publicly available information about which states have acceded to the First or Second Protocol<sup>11</sup>.

- 96 The certification provision in clause 16(6) also potentially engages Article 6, which provides that everyone shall be entitled to a fair trial. This is because the issue of a certificate deprives the defendant of the opportunity to adduce other evidence to the court on the issue of whether a territory is or was occupied. The Executive is best placed to make this assessment. A defendant would still be free to argue the other elements of the offence, for example that he or she did not “know or have reason to suspect” that the property was from an occupied territory. It is therefore considered that clauses 16 and 17 are compatible with Articles 6 and 7 of the ECHR.
- 97 Part 4 includes powers of entry, search and seizure in relation to unlawfully exported cultural property. Such powers restrict the right under Article 8 of the ECHR to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence. These powers are being introduced in pursuance of a legitimate aim – the protection of the cultural heritage of occupied territories, and the implementation of the United Kingdom’s obligations under international law. The powers seek to meet a real and pressing need – the extent of the looting to which the cultural heritage of an occupied territory may be subject has recently is illustrated by the widespread looting of museums in Iraq in 2003 - and they are a proportionate response to that aim. The power to issue warrants authorising entry, search and seizure is subject to judicial supervision and, in England and Wales, attended by the safeguards set out in sections 15 and 16 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984<sup>12</sup>. We consider that these provisions satisfy the requirements of Article 8 of the ECHR.
- 98 Part 4 of the Bill also provides for the forfeiture of cultural property which has been unlawfully exported from occupied territory, even in circumstances where an offence has not been committed under the laws of the United Kingdom in relation to that property. Authorising the deprivation of possessions restricts rights to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions under Article 1, Protocol 1 to the ECHR. It is, however, justified as being in the public interest, subject to conditions provided for by law and we consider this strikes a fair balance between the demands of the community and the rights of the individual owner.

---

<sup>10</sup> The Regulations respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land annexed to the Convention respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV), done at the Hague on 18 October 1907.

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.unesco.org/eri/la/convention.asp?KO=15391&language=E&order=alpha> and <http://www.unesco.org/eri/la/convention.asp?KO=15207&language=E&order=alpha>

<sup>12</sup> In Scotland, issue and execution of a warrant must be carried out in accordance with the common law. In Northern Ireland, there is equivalent provision in Articles 17 and 18 of the Police and Criminal Evidence (Northern Ireland) Order 1989 (1989 No. 1341).

- 99 The forfeiture provisions are essential in order to meet the United Kingdom's obligations under the First Protocol to enable the return of cultural property unlawfully exported from occupied territory. No cultural property may be forfeited without a hearing by a court, which will give the owner of that property an opportunity to contest the fact that it has been unlawfully exported from an occupied territory. Where the court is satisfied that the property was acquired by the owner in good faith without knowledge of the fact that it was unlawfully exported from occupied territory, the court may make forfeiture dependent upon payment of compensation to the owner. In these circumstances, the forfeiture order cannot take effect until the compensation has actually been paid and the forfeiture order will lapse if compensation is not paid within four months of the order. We do not therefore consider that these provisions contravene Article 1, Protocol 1 to the ECHR.
- 100 Part 5 of the Bill, which provides for immunity from seizure in relation to certain cultural property, potentially engages rights under Article 6 of the ECHR and under Article 1 of Protocol 1. The immunity applies to cultural property which has special protection under the Convention and is either in transit through the United Kingdom to another country, or is being transported to the United Kingdom, or for which the United Kingdom has agreed to act as the depositary, responsible for the safekeeping of the cultural property in question during an armed conflict.
- 101 Article 6 guarantees the right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time in the determination of civil rights and obligations, and this includes an effective right of access to the courts. The proposed immunity will not prevent potential claimants from bringing a claim before the courts against the owners of protected cultural property, but it will prevent the courts from granting seizure or restitution of the property concerned as a remedy for such a claim. Other remedies, including the award of damages, will be available, and we consider that this limitation is a proportionate restriction on the right of access to the court under Article 6. In addition, the immunity is temporary in nature. Where cultural property is in transit through the United Kingdom, the immunity is unlikely to last for more than a few days. Where the United Kingdom has agreed to act as depositary under the Convention for cultural property the immunity will apply while the cultural property is in the United Kingdom, which will be limited to the duration of the conflict in question. The government will be able to make enquiries into the provenance of the cultural property before it agrees to accept it for safekeeping, which will limit the risk that cultural property whose ownership is disputed will be brought into the United Kingdom. We do not consider that the immunity contravenes the provisions of Article 6.
- 102 For the same reasons, we consider that the immunity is a proportionate interference with any rights which might be engaged under Article 1 of Protocol 1 to the ECHR. The immunity is in the public interest in that it is intended to ensure that cultural property can safely be transported through or entrusted to the United Kingdom by another country during an armed conflict and returned to its country of origin at the close of hostilities. Such immunity is a requirement of the Convention itself<sup>13</sup> and is an integral part of the system established by the Convention to protect cultural property in the event of armed conflict. It is therefore considered that Part 5 strikes a fair balance between the interests of potential claimants and the public interest and is compatible with Article 1 of Protocol 1 to the ECHR

---

<sup>13</sup> Article 14 of the Convention

## Related documents

103 The following documents are relevant to the Bill and can be read at the stated locations:

- Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict with Regulations for the Execution of the Convention  
1954: [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13637&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13637&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
- First Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict with Regulations for the Execution of the Convention  
1954: [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=15391&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15391&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
- Second Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict with Regulations for the Execution of the Convention  
1954: [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=15207&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15207&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
- 1954 Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Two Protocols of 1954 and 1999 A Summary of Responses Received to the Government's Consultation October  
2006: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20121204113822/http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/HagueGovernmentsresponsepublicationversionfinal.pdf>
- Draft Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/243113/7298.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/243113/7298.pdf)
- House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee Draft Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill Ninth Report of Session 2007–08:  
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmcmds/693/693.pdf>
- Government Response to the Culture, Media and Sport Committee Reports on the Draft Heritage Protection Bill and Draft Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill (2008):  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/243360/7472.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/243360/7472.pdf)
-

## Annex A - Territorial extent and application in the United Kingdom

The Bill extends to the whole of the United Kingdom. There are no clauses or Schedules in the Bill that apply only to England or only to England and Wales, as set out in the table below. It is therefore not necessary to consider, for the purposes of Standing Order No. 83J of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons relating to Public Business, whether any provisions have minor or consequential effects outside England and Wales, or whether any provisions would be within the competence of any of the devolved legislatures.<sup>14</sup>

Provision	Extends to E & W and applies to England?	Extends to E & W and applies to Wales?	Extends and applies to Scotland?	Extends and applies to Northern Ireland?	Would corresponding provision be within the competence of the National Assembly for Wales?	Would corresponding provision be within the competence of the Scottish Parliament?	Would corresponding provision be within the competence of the Northern Ireland Assembly?	Legislative Consent Motion needed?
<b>KEY DEFINITIONS</b>								
Clause 1 - 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes (S, NI, W)
<b>SERIOUS BREACH OF SECOND PROTOCOL</b>								
Clause 3 - 7	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes (S, NI, W)
<b>CULTURAL EMBLEM</b>								
Clause 8 - 15	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes (S, NI, W)
<b>PROPERTY EXPORTED FROM OCCUPIED TERRITORY</b>								
Clause 16 - 27	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
<b>PROPERTY REMOVED FOR SAFEKEEPING</b>								
Clause 28	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes (S, NI, W)
<b>GENERAL</b>								
Clause 29	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes (S, NI, W)
Clause 30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes (S, NI, W)
Clause 31	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Clause 32	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>14</sup> References in this Annex to a provision being within the legislative competence of the Scottish Parliament, the National Assembly for Wales or the Northern Ireland Assembly are to the provision being within the legislative competence of the relevant devolved legislature for the purposes of Standing Order No. 83J of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons relating to Public Business.

<b>Clause 33</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Schedule 1</b>	N/A							
<b>Schedule 2</b>	N/A							
<b>Schedule 3</b>	N/A							
<b>Schedule 4</b>	N/A							

*These Explanatory Notes relate to the Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill [HL] as introduced in the House of Lords on 19 May 2016 (HL Bill 3)*



# **CULTURAL PROPERTY (ARMED CONFLICTS) BILL [HL]**

## **EXPLANATORY NOTES**

These Explanatory Notes relate to the Cultural Property (Armed Conflicts) Bill [HL] as introduced in the House of Lords on 19 May 2016 (HL Bill 3).

---

Ordered by the House of Lords to be printed, 19 May 2016

---

© Parliamentary copyright 2016

This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence which is published at [www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright](http://www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright)

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS