

GLASGOW TRADES HOUSE ORDER CONFIRMATION ACT 1920

Introduction

In December 2018, the Deacon Convener had attended a dinner where the question of what was the cause of the big Trades House dispute that occurred around 1920 was aired and a few alternative suggestions were made. The Trades House archivist was asked to research the details to clarify the position and in doing so produced the following report.

The Start of the Dispute in February 1919

The dispute began in February 1919 with a motion from Deacon James Robertson of the Incorporation of Bonnetmakers and Dyers, who wished to have a more equitable share of the representation of the Trades House. The minutes of the Trades House meeting are below:

Deacon James Robertson gave notice of motion:-

“That a Committee be appointed to investigate and report to the House upon the following questions, viz.:-

- 1. Whether the time has now arrived for increasing the representation of those Crafts with less than four representatives in the House; and*
- 2. Whether the Constitution of the House should be amended by Provisional Order to the effect that each Craft have a minimum representation of four.”¹*

In 1919, the representation of the House was as follows:

Hammermen:	6 representatives
Tailors	6 representatives
Cordiners	6 representatives
Maltmen	6 representatives
Weavers	4 representatives
Bakers	3 representatives
Skinnerers	3 representatives
Wrights	3 representatives
Coopers	3 representatives
Fleshers	3 representatives
Masons	3 representatives
Gardeners	3 representatives
Barbers	3 representatives
Bonnetmakers & Dyers	2 representatives

The dispute reminds one of the disagreement with the Merchants and Tradesmen in 1604 when the Incorporations fought to have equal representation with the Merchants. There was also an earlier dispute in the Trades House on the same topic and that lasted 6 years from 1771 to 77 and Harry Lumsden records the following:

¹ Minutes of the Trades House, 24th February 1919.

In 1771 an attempt was made to increase the representation of ten of the crafts, but the resolutions for this effect, passed by narrow majorities, some of them not even recorded, were called in question by the incorporations of Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners, and Maltmen, in an action of declarator and interdict in the Court of Session. The House took no part in the action. The decree of declarator pronounced by the court in 1771, after six years' litigation, fixed the constitution of the Deacon Convener's Council, the number of representatives from each craft, and also the vexed question of their rank and precedency. After a series of judgments by the Lord Ordinary in favour of the changes proposed, the court, on appeal, consistently reversed these decisions and in the end maintained the status quo.

It was declared that the constitution of the Convener's Council, the rank and precedency of the trades, and the number of representatives which each incorporation had a title to send to the council, had been established by immemorial custom, and could not be altered either by the trades or by the Convener's Council, even with the concurrence of the magistrates and Town Council. The number of representatives was then permanently fixed on the basis of inveterate usage, as above indicated.²

The Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners and Maltmen made an agreement in 1777 that if at a later date there was a challenge on the number of representatives from each of the Incorporations, they would stand firm together to oppose any alteration to the rule. With the challenge in 1919, the Incorporations of Hammermen and Cordiners split from the Incorporations of Tailors and Maltmen and this caused a major rift in the Trades House.

It is interesting to note that the proposal sought not to have equality of representatives, but to remain with the Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners and Maltmen having six representatives each and the remaining Incorporations increasing their representatives to four per Incorporation.

The First Meeting of the Committee on Representation 1919

A Committee was duly set up, the date of the meeting is unknown but their minute and recommendation is recorded below:

RECOMMENDATION.

That the representation of the Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners, Maltmen, and Weavers remain as at present, but that the representation of the other nine Crafts be increased to four each, and that thereafter no Craft be entitled to an additional extraordinary representative in the House.

AMENDMENT.

That the representation of the Crafts in the House be left as it is at present.

*For the Recommendation,
For the Amendment,*

22
4³

² Lumsden, Records of the Trades House 1713 to 1777, Page xiv.

³ Minutes of the Committee on Representation, 1919.

Meeting of the Committee and Sub-Committee on Representation 17th June 1919

The motion was thus duly carried and the Committee and Sub-Committee on Representation sat on 17th June 1919 where further discussion took place on the topic. The minute of the meeting can be found below:

MINUTES OF COMMITTEE AND SUB-COMMITTEE ON REPRESENTATION.

At a Meeting of the Special Committee of the whole House on Representation, this 17th day of June, 1919.

After a discussion the Meeting decided that the Notes by the Clerk fully embraced all investigations that might have been made by the House on the facts, and on the motion of Late Deacon H. G. Cree, seconded by Late Deacon James Dalrymple, it was unanimously agreed that the Notes should form the Report to the House on the matter.

A letter was read from Deacon David Reid, in which he expressed the view that there should be unanimity amongst the Crafts; that, in any case, an effort should be made to avoid the possibility of even a single Craft objecting to or opposing the proposals of the other Crafts. Deacon Reid suggested that a copy of the motion, along with the Clerk's Notes, should be formally sent to each of the Crafts for consideration by their Master Courts, in order to ascertain their views, and that thereafter the House should consider" whether an improvement in representation can be effected."

The Meeting agreed with Deacon Reid's suggestions to intimate formally to each Incorporation that the question of representation had been raised, but it was thought that the most appropriate time to do so would be after the House in Committee had come to some recommendation on the subject.

Thereafter the House proceeded to consider "whether an improvement in representation can be effected."

On the motion of Late Deacon James Miller, seconded by Mr. John Adam, it was unanimously agreed that a Sub-Committee, consisting of the Platform, the Sub-Committee. Deacons and Visitor (with power to each of the Deacons and Visitor to appoint a representative of his Craft in the House as his substitute to attend any meeting of the Sub-Committee and act and vote on his behalf) should consider this question and report to the Parent Committee on an early date. ⁴

The above minute would appear to indicate that the aim was to avoid any conflict between Incorporations and at the same time increase the representation of the Incorporations under represented, but without attempting to create an equal representation.

⁴ Minutes of the Committee and Sub-Committee on Representation, 17th June 1919

Minutes of the Special Committee on Representation, 24th June 1919

The next meeting which took place a week later when the Special Sub-Committee of the Trades House and it met on 24th of June, 1919 where the members present were asked individually to express their views. With one exception, the general feeling was that an improvement in representation could be effected and that it was also advisable.

The following extract of the Minute gives a true flavour of the meeting:

The suggestions put forward by the members during the discussion may be summarised as follows:-

- 1. That the representation of the nine Crafts (excepting the Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners, Maltmen, and Weavers) be increased to four.*
- 2. That each Craft should have equal representation in the House.*
- 3. That, over and above any change made, the Weavers should have the right, when one of their representatives is Deacon-Convener, Collector, Late Convener or Late Collector, to have an additional extraordinary member in the House in the same manner as the other nine Crafts have at present.*
- 4. That the representation of the Dyers should be increased to three, and no other change made.*

The views of each of the members present having been heard, the Meeting was asked to consider what recommendation should be made to the House on the subject. Deacon Robertson moved, seconded by Mr. John Laird, as follows:-

"In the spirit of compromise, with the object of securing unanimity on the question, and without committing the Crafts with smaller representation to any departure meantime from the principle of equal representation, the Sub-Committee recommend that the representation of the Hammennen, Tailors, Cordiners, Maltmen, and Weavers remain as at present, but that the representation of the other nine Crafts be increased to four each."

The Meeting resolved - Ex-Visitor Maxwell (Maltman) dissenting - that this recommendation be laid before the whole House in Committee.⁵

Minute of the Special Committee on Representation, 2nd July 1919

Another meeting of the Special Committee of the whole House on Representation took place on 2nd July 1919 where the Minutes of the meeting of 24th June were considered and the following was recorded in the Minute:

"Deacon James Robertson moved, "That the Recommendation be approved. Late Deacon Laird seconded.

Deacon Gourlay moved as an amendment, "That there be added to the "Recommendation the following words:- "And that thereafter no Craft be entitled to an additional extraordinary representative in the House." Late Deacon Speirs seconded the amendment.

The amendment was accepted by Deacon Robertson, and thereupon the words became part of the motion.

⁵ Minutes of the Special Committee of the whole House on Representation, 24th June 1919.

Visitor Allan M. Wilson then moved to recommend to the House "That the representation of the Crafts in the House be left as at present." Late Visitor George F. Paisley seconded.

A general discussion took place, and on a vote being taken, twenty – two members voted for the motion, and four members for Visitor Wilson's amendment.

The Chairman then declared the Recommendation duly carried as follows:- "That the representation of the Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners, Maltmen, and Weavers remain as at present, but that the representation of the other nine Crafts be increased to four each, and that thereafter NO Craft be entitled to an additional extraordinary representative in the House."

It was agreed that the Recommendation be intimated to each of the fourteen Incorporations for consideration by their Master Courts, or, if thought necessary, by their whole members, so that their representatives may have instructions how to proceed at the September meeting of the House, when the Recommendation will be submitted for confirmation.

The Clerk was instructed to forward to the Clerks of the Incorporations copies of the Committee's Report, relative Minutes, and Recommendation.⁶

It is interesting that only four members voted against the motion and the Visitor of the Maltmen appear to have been eager to retain the status quo.

The next meeting that took place was a full Trades House meeting and it occurred on 4th November 1919, where the following was recorded in the House Minute:

<i>"Hammermen</i>	<i>The Craft by majority have instructed their representatives to support the recommendation.</i>
<i>Tailors</i>	<i>The Craft by majority disapprove of the proposals.</i>
<i>Cordiners</i>	<i>The Craft offer no objection to the proposed change.</i>
<i>Maltmen</i>	<i>The Craft disapprove of the proposed change unanimously.</i>
<i>Weavers</i>	<i>The proposal, after being unanimously approved by the Master Court, were submitted to the Incorporation.</i>
<i>Bakers</i>	<i>The Meeting unanimously approve of the recommendations.</i> <i>The Master Court is unanimously in favour of the proposals.</i>
<i>Skinners</i>	<i>The Master Court is unanimously in favour of the proposals.</i>
<i>Wrights</i>	<i>The Master Court and the Craft have approved of the recommendations.</i>
<i>Coopers</i>	<i>The Master Court resolved to recommend full support to any steps taken towards obtaining increased representation, and the Incorporation</i>

⁶ Minute of the Special Committee of the whole House on Representation, 2nd July 1919.

have resolved to adopt, the Court's Recommendation.

Fleshers

The Master Court unanimously agreed to recommend that the recommendations be approved. At the Quarterly Meeting the Craft confirmed the views of the Master Court.

Masons

The Lammas Court Meeting of the Craft resolved as follows;-

"The Meeting request the representatives of the Incorporation to support the recommendation. In view of the necessity for an application to Parliament by Provisional Order or Private Bill if the present representation of the Incorporations in the House is to be altered, the position of this Incorporation is reserved for further consideration as to what is to follow should there not be unanimity, not only in the House itself, but unanimity among the fourteen Incorporations as well."

Gardeners

The Master Court has resolved that the Incorporation's representative support the recommendation.

Barbers

The Craft have authorised their representatives to Support the proposals.

Bonnetmakers and Dyers

The Lammas Court Meeting of the Incorporation unanimously agreed that the representatives of the Incorporation should support the proposals.

Late Deacon James Robertson moved "That the Minutes be approved and that the Recommendation be adopted." Ex-Deacon John Laird seconded.

Visitor George F. Paisley moved as an amendment "That the House disapprove of the Recommendation." Deacon John Wright seconded.

A discussion then took place, and on a vote being taken, 27 members voted for the motion, and ten for the amendment; six members declined to vote and two members were unable to vote, not having qualified, all as follows;-

FOR THE MOTION.	FOR THE AMENDMENT.
ROBERT DAVIDSON, Deacon SIR JOHN REID, Convener. Collector.	
Hammermen- J. H. MATHIESON. WILLIAM JACKSON.	Tailors- JOHN WRIGHT. Wm. CALDWELL. S. D. WHYTE. JOHN DALLAS. T. B. SLATER.
Cordiners- ANDREW BAIRD.	
Weavers- JOHN W. GOURLAY.	Maltmen- GEORGE F. PAISLEY.

<p><i>ARCH. SPIERS, JAMES C. PATERSON.</i></p> <p><i>Bakers- JOHN MORTON. JOHN WATSON. WILLIAM POLLOCK.</i></p> <p><i>Skinner- WM. M'LAY. JAMES DALRYMPLE. JAS. D. URQUHART.</i></p> <p><i>Wrights- MATTHEW S. SIMPSON. JOHN LAIRD.</i></p> <p><i>Coopers- J. E. D. MACGREGOR. JOHN MALCOLM.</i></p> <p><i>Fleshers- HENRY MACNAUGHTON. DR. EDWARD M'CONNELL.</i></p> <p><i>Masons- ROBERT TAYLOR.</i></p> <p><i>Gardeners- JOHN GEMMELL.</i></p> <p><i>Barbers- DAVID BORLAND. JOHN RENFREW. J. CAMPBELL BROWN.</i></p> <p><i>Dyers- ARCH. H. HAMILTON. JAMES ROBERTSON.</i></p>	<p><i>ALLAN M. WILSON. WILLIAM MAXWELL. JOHN ADAM. JAMES A. PATERSON.</i></p>
27	10
<p>DECLINED TO VOTE.</p> <p><i>Cordiners- THOMAS KELLY. DAVID REID. JAS. F. MARTIN. JAMES WHITTON. WALTER PROVAN.</i></p>	<p>NOT QUALIFIED TO VOTE.</p> <p><i>Hammermen- WM. BROWN.</i></p> <p><i>MASONS. ROBERT GILCHRIST.</i></p>

Gardeners- HUGH G. CREE. <p style="text-align: center;">6</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
---	-------------------------------------

*The Deacon Convener then declared the motion carried”.*⁷

With only the Tailors and the Maltmen opposed to the motion and the Masons possibly sitting on the fence, indicating that they reserved to alter their minds if there was not unanimity in the House and in the Incorporations. The Incorporation of Masons must have known that was almost impossible with this type of change to get unanimity amongst so many with opposing interests.

Minute of the Special Committee on Representation, 14th November 1919

Two weeks later the Special Committee of the Trades' House on Representation, Special Committee met on 14th November 1919 to consider what procedure should be followed to achieve the recent resolution of the House. The Clerk had circulated before the meeting, notes on the procedure that should be taken and details of the last precedent in the year 1772 (already circulated).

The meeting then debated and motions and counter motions were made, the following is a copy of the minute of the day's events:

“Late Deacon James Robertson moved that the Committee recommend to the House that the procedure, if any, should be by Provisional Order or Private Bill; Late Deacon John Laird seconded.

Deacon Wright then moved as an amendment that the Committee recommend that no further action be taken; Ex-Visitor William Maxwell seconded.

On a vote being taken, eleven Members voted for the motion, two Members (Tailor and Maltman) for the amendment, and one Member (Cordiner) declined to vote.

A discussion followed as to the promotion of the measure and the incidence of the expenses to be incurred.

Ex-Deacon John Laird moved that the Committee recommend that the expense of the Provisional Order or Private Bill be borne (in accordance with the precedent of 1672) by the Incorporations in favour of the desired change in such proportions as they may mutually arrange amongst themselves. Late Deacon Robertson seconded, and the motion was agreed to.

On the suggestion of the Deacon-Convener, the Committee recommend for the consideration of the Crafts that the expenses be borne in proportion to the capital of each Craft taking part in the promotion with a maximum liability of 1% of their respective Corporate Stocks, but that a guarantee fund should be raised with the object of partially or entirely relieving the funds of the House and the Crafts from the expense of the measure.

⁷ Minutes of the Trades House, 4th November 1919.

The representatives of the Tailors, Maltmen, and Cordiners disassociated themselves from the recommendations regarding promotion and expenses, the two former Crafts being against the measure and the latter Craft being neutral.”⁸

It looks as if some animosity may have been creeping in due to the disagreement with the alteration of representation in the House.

Minutes of the Trades House, 5th December 1919

About three weeks later the House met on 5th December 1919 and the following is an extract of the Minute of the Meeting:

“The Meeting then proceeded to consider the Minute of the Meeting of the Special Committee on Representation, of date 14th November, 1919, and the relative recommendations as to the procedure, promotion, and expenses of the proposed Provisional Order.

Late Deacon James Robertson moved “That the Minute be approved and that the recommendations therein contained be adopted.” Ex-Deacon John Laird seconded.

Late Deacon Walter Nelson then moved as an amendment, “That the Special Committee on Representation be thanked for their services and discharged, and seeing that an alteration in the representation cannot be agreed in the House and amongst the Incorporations, it be left to the Incorporations desiring improved representation to take such steps for the alteration in the present representation as they may deem desirable in the circumstances.” Mr. John Dallas seconded.

A discussion then took place, in which the following members took part viz: Messrs. John Wright, John Adam, Dr. Ed. M’Connell, James Miller, Hugh G. Cree, and David Borland. On a vote being taken, twenty-six members voted for the motion, nineteen for the amendment, and one member did not vote, not being in his place when the roll was called, all as follows :-

FOR THE MOTION.	FOR THE AMENDMENT.
<p><i>ROBERT DAVIDSON, Deacon Convener.</i></p> <p><i>Sir JOHN REID, Collector.</i></p> <p><i>Hammennen- Lord Provost STEWART. J. H. MATHIESON. WM. BROWN, C.B.E. HENRY MECHAN.</i></p> <p><i>Bakers- JOHN MORTON. JOHN WATSON.</i></p>	<p><i>Tailors- JOHN WRIGHT. WALTER NELSON. WM. CALDWELL. D. WHYTE. JOHN DALLAS. T. B. SLATER.</i></p> <p><i>Cordiners- ANDREW BAIRD. JAS. F. MARTIN</i></p>

⁸ Minutes of the Special Committee of the Trades' House on Representation, Special Committee, 14th November 1919.

<p><i>Skinner-</i> JAS. D. URQUHART.</p> <p><i>Wrights-</i> MATTHEW S. SIMPSON. JOHN LAIRD.</p> <p><i>Coopers-</i> J. E. D. MACGREGOR. ANDREW MOTHERWELL. JOHN MALCOLM.</p> <p><i>Fleshers-</i> HENRY MACNAUGHTON. Dr. EDWARD M'CONNELL. JAMES MILLER.</p> <p><i>Masons-</i> ROBERT TA YLOR. ELPHINSTONE FORREST. ROBERT GILCHRIST.</p> <p><i>Gardeners.</i> GEORGE C. M'CHLERY. JOHN GEMMELL.</p> <p><i>Barbers-</i> DAVID BORLAND. J. CAMPBKLL BROWN.</p> <p><i>Dyers-</i> ARCH. H. HAMILTON. J AMES ROBERTSON.</p>	<p>JAS. WHITTON. WALTER PROVAN.</p> <p><i>Maltmen -</i> GEORGE F. PAISLEY. ALLAN M. WILSON. WILLIAM MAXWELL; JOHN ADAM. JAMES A. PATERSON.</p> <p><i>Weavers-</i> JOHN W. GOURLAY ARCH. SPIERS. JAMES C. PATERSON.</p> <p><i>Gardeners- .</i> HUGH G. CREE.</p>
26	19
<p>NOT PRESENT AT VOTE. <i>Skinner-</i> JAMES DALRYMPLE.</p>	
1	

The Deacon-Convener then declared the motion carried.

On the motion of the Deacon-Convener it was agreed to appoint a Special Promotion Committee consisting of the Deacons of the Crafts (excepting Tailors and Maltmen) (with power to each to nominate a representative of his Craft in the House as his

substitute) to prepare and submit to the House Draft Provisional Order and to do everything necessary for the promotion of the Order, including the raising of a guarantee fund from each Craft in favour of the measure or from individual Craftsmen of such Crafts to cover the expenses of the same, and to decide on the apportionment of the expenses when ascertained in such manner as may be mutually arranged.

This was agreed to.”⁹

By this stage there appears to have been a change in the position of some of the Incorporations who initially would only agree to progress with the idea of a more equal representation in the House only if **ALL** Incorporations were in favour. By December 1919 there were 5 Incorporations were against the concept with 19 members of the House voting against it and the two Gardeners’ representatives voting for and one voting against the idea.

Minutes of a Special Promotion Committee of the Trades House on Alteration in Representation, 12th December 1919

A Special Promotion Committee of the Trades House on Alteration in Representation was convened in December 1919. The Incorporation of Weavers was not represented and the minutes of the meeting.

The Convener reminded the Meeting that the recommendation of the Special Committee on Representation of 14th ult., approved by the House on 5th inst., was to the effect that the expense of the Order should be borne (in accordance with the precedent of 1672) by the Incorporations in favour of the desired change, but in such proportions as they might mutually arrange amongst themselves.

He had suggested further for the consideration of the Crafts that the expense might be borne in proportion to the Capital of each Craft taking part in the Promotion with a maximum liability of 1% of their respective Corporate Stocks, but that a Guarantee Fund should be raised with the object of partially or entirely relieving the funds of the House and the Crafts from the expense of the measure. This was only in the nature of a suggestion, and was for the Crafts in favour of the order to consider.

The Meeting then considered how the expenses might be mutually borne amongst the Crafts taking part in the Promotion.

In the course of the discussion which followed, it was recognised that the Cordiners, being neutral, could not be expected to bear a share of the expense, and that the Incorporation of Hammermen and Weavers-while both in favour of the Order-were in a different position from the nine remaining Crafts, in that they were gaining nothing by, the Order, but merely maintaining their former Representation. In these circumstances it was made clear to the representatives of these nine Crafts present at the Meeting that at any subsequent Meetings of this Committee when the question of apportioning the expense of the Order might be further discussed, and the views of the Master Courts reported on, the above distinctions should be kept in view, and that the support promised by the Incorporations of Hammermen and Weavers did not necessarily involve these Incorporations in any proportion of the expense of the

⁹ Minutes of the Trades House, 5th December 1919.

Order, although 'individual ' Members of these Crafts might-if they thought fit-become guarantors.

It was reported that the Clerk had received official intimation from the Incorporation' of Cooper and Bonnetmakers and Dyers that guarantees, amounting to £1,000 each, or £2,000 in all, had already been received by these Crafts.

The feeling of the Meeting was in favour of guarantees being obtained from the individual members of each Craft, and that each guarantor should be liable (after the total costs have been ascertained) in the proportion that the total costs bear to the total sums guaranteed, e.g., if the costs were £1,000 and the total guarantees £10,000, each guarantor would be called upon for one-tenth of the sum in his guarantee.

The question arose as to how the costs would be apportioned if one or more Crafts preferred to pay a contribution towards the costs out of its Corporate Funds rather than raise a Guarantee Fund.

The whole question of apportioning guarantees from Members and contributions from the Corporate Funds of Crafts was left over for future consideration after the several Master Courts should have had an opportunity of considering the matter. In the meantime the Clerk was instructed to have a form of guarantee prepared and issued.

The Committee next considered whether the Order should be promoted in the 1920 Spring Session of Parliament or left over until the Winter Session.

It was decided to promote the Order during the Spring Session if the necessary proceedings could be taken in time.

The Clerk explained that in that case the proceedings would be approximately as follows:-

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <i>March 19th</i> | <i>Last day for first insertion of notices in newspapers.</i> |
| <i>March 26th,</i> | <i>Last day for second insertion of notices in newspapers.</i> |
| <i>April 16th,</i> | <i>Last day for depositing Draft Provisional Order and Promoters' Petitions at the Scottish Office, London, etc.</i> |
| <i>May 28th,</i> | <i>Last day for depositing Petitions against the Order.</i> |

The Clerk further explained that the promoting Incorporations would, therefore, have ample time to consider the question of the apportionment of the costs of the Order and to peruse the rough Draft of the Order, so that the final Draft in the form in which the Order is to be deposited could be approved by the Incorporations interested at their Candlemas Meetings.

The Agents were instructed to prepare a rough Draft of the Order, and have it submitted to the Parliamentary Agents in London for revisal, if possible, before the end of December.¹⁰

¹⁰ Minute of the Special Promotion Committee of the Trades House on Alteration in Representation, 12th December 1919.

Minutes of the Special Promotion Committee, 3rd February 1920

The next meeting of the Special Promotion Committee took place in February 1920 where the Clerk reported that the *Draft Provisional Order had been sent to each member of the Committee in the form which had been submitted to the Parliamentary Agents, who had been instructed not to alter the substance of the Draft, but to make any changes in phraseology and form which they thought necessary. The Draft Provisional Order as revised by Parliamentary Agents and Counsel had since been received with only a few verbal alterations.*

The Convener explained that there was nothing in the working clauses of the Order from 3 to 20 that was not already contained in the Bye-Laws of the House, the only departure being in the representation of the various Crafts. It would, however, now be necessary to make a change in Clause 13, so that elections to fill up vacancies may, in the option of any Incorporation, proceed at a General Meeting of the Craft as at present, or at a Meeting of the Master Court called for the purpose. The Committee unanimously approved of the Draft.

The Clerk reported that Parliamentary Counsel had suggested that *the Preamble of the Order should contain some reference showing that the alteration desired is expedient. The Committee, therefore, considered what were the best reasons to adduce, so that Counsel might enter them in his own way in the Preamble of the Draft Order. Several reasons were submitted by different members of the Committee, and it was agreed that these reasons should be communicated to Counsel with instructions to frame a suitable clause.*

The Committee then considered *the Draft Circular Letter calling the Special General Meeting of the House to pass the resolution consenting to the Draft Order, and also the Draft Form of Proxy for the use of members who might not be able to attend.*

The only business to be transacted at that Meeting will be to pass a resolution consenting to the Draft Order.

The Clerk explained that the *Draft Circular and Form of Proxy had been revised and approved by the Parliamentary Agents and Counsel. They required to be sent to every member of the House, along with a printed copy of the Draft Order.*

The Draft Circular was approved. Circular approved.

One or two members of Committee were of opinion that the wording of the Proxy to be modified.

Form of Proxy was in too general terms. It was remitted to the Clerk to consult again with the Parliamentary Agents to see if its terms could be modified.¹¹

¹¹ Minute of the Special Promotion Committee of the Trades House on Alteration in Representation, 3rd February 1920.

Minutes of the Trades House, 11th February 1920

Eight days later a meeting of the Trades House took place where it The Meeting then proceeded to consider the Minutes of meetings of the Special Promotion Committee of date 12th December, 1919, and 3rd February, 1920.

Deacon John Wright, on behalf of the Incorporation of Tailors, asked the Meeting that, before considering these Minutes, he and his colleagues should be granted permission to submit certain suggestions with a view to an amicable settlement of the question of representation.

Late Deacon Waiter Nelson supported the request.

After some discussion the Meeting agreed to hear any suggestions the Tailors desired to offer, and these were made by Mr. John Dallas. A discussion followed.

The Deacon-Convener then moved that the Minutes be approved. Late Deacon Robertson seconded.

Deacon Wright moved as an amendment that all portions of these Minutes committing the House to an immediate promotion of the Provisional Order be held as deleted, and that the following amendment be added so as to be incorporated and read in conjunction with both Minutes, viz. :-

"That presentation of the draft Provisional Order referred to in the Minutes be meantime delayed, and that a Committee be appointed to inquire into all matters bearing upon the present Constitution of the House and its administration, or which would tend to an improvement thereon, special consideration being given, inter alia, to

- a. The Representation in the House of the various Crafts*
- b. The distribution of Pensions in the gift of the House,*
- c. The existing Bye-laws, and*
- d. The relationship between the Crafts and the House,*

and to take legal, actuarial, or other professional advice on facts and evidence submitted by any of the Crafts, or arising out of the Committee's investigations, and thereafter to submit to the House for consideration a full report, which may, if the House so decides, form the basis for the promotion of a comprehensive Provisional Order, or for a petition unto The King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council for a Royal Charter of Incorporation."

Late Deacon Walter Nelson seconded.

A discussion then took place, and on a vote being taken, 26 members voted for the motion, and 12 for the amendment, as follows:-

FOR THE MOTION.	FOR THE AMENDMENT.
<i>ROBERT DAVIDSON, Deacon Convener. Sir JOHN REID, Collector.</i>	

Hammermen-
J. H. MATHIESON.
WM. BROWN.

Cordiners-
THOMAS KELLY.
DAVID REID.
WALTER PROVAN.

Weavers-
JOHN W. G OURLAV.
ARCH. SPIERS.

Bakers-
JOHN MORTON.
JOHN WATSON.
WILLIAM POLLOCK.

Skinner-
WM. McLAY.
JAS. D. URQUHART.

Wrights-
MATTHEW S. SIMPSON.
JAMES A. FERGUSON.
JOHN LAIRD.

Coopers-
J. E. D. MACGREGOR.

Fleshers-
HENRY MACNAUGHTON.

Masons-
ROBERT TAYLOR.
JOHN TRAIN.

Gardeners.
GEORGE C. McCHLERY.

Barbers-
DAVID BORLAND.
JOHN RENFREW.

Dyers-
ARCH. H. HAMILTON.
JAMES ROBERTSON.

Tailors-
JOHN WRIGHT.
WALTER NELSON.
WM. CALDWELL.
S. D. WRYTE.
JOHN DALLAS.
T. B. SLATER

Maltmen-
GEORGE F. PAISLEY.
ALLAN M. WILSON.
WILLIAM MAXWELL.
JOHN ADAM.
JAMES A. PATERSON.

Gardeners-
HUGH G. CREE.

The Deacon-Convener then declared the motion carried and the Minutes approved.¹²

The Tailors and Matmen were once again on their own with only a single member of the Incorporation of Gardeners supporting their position.

Minutes of a Special General Meeting of the House, 20th February 1920

A Special General Meeting of the House took place nine days later where Sir Alexander Gracie, K.B.E., M.V.O., as a representative of the Hammermen appeared and was received and qualified as use is, he having exhibited his Burgess Ticket or otherwise satisfied the meeting that he is a Guild Brother of the Craft Rank represented by him.

The following representatives, viz.:- Messrs. John Wright, Walter Nelson, Wm. Caldwell, S. D. Whyte, John Dallas, George F. Paisley, Allan M. Wilson, Wm. Maxwell, John Adam, and James A. Paterson protested against Sir Alexander Gracie being received and qualified at this meeting in respect that the meeting was a special general meeting ; that the only business which could competently be transacted was that mentioned in the circular calling the meeting; and that the receiving and qualifying of a member was not mentioned in the circular.

The Deacon-Convener referred to Bye-Law 6 (page 80 of the House Diary) as follows:

"Representatives elected who shall appear to accept and qualify while a vote is being taken shall not be allowed to qualify until after the vote shall have been completed, and he held that, as it has always been customary to qualify representatives at all meetings of the House, whether ordinary or special, it was quite competent for Sir Alexander Gracie to qualify at this meeting in the usual way.

The objection was, therefore, noted by the Clerk and repelled by the Deacon-Convener.

The Clerk then recorded the names of all the members present in person and by proxy, as noted above.

The following representatives, viz.:-Messrs. John Wright, Walter Nelson, William Caldwell, S. D. Whyte, John Dallas, George F. Paisley, Allan M. Wilson Wm. Maxwell, John Adam, James A. Paterson, and Hugh G. Cree protested against the proxy lodged by Late Deacon John Gemmell on the ground that it had not been lodged forty-eight hours before the hour of meeting.

The Deacon-Convener explained that as Late Deacon Gemmell was at present temporarily resident in the South of France, it was not reasonable to insist on his proxy reaching the hands of the Clerk within 48 hours of the meeting, and in these circumstances he thought the proxy should be received.

The objection was, therefore, noted by the Clerk and repelled by the Deacon-Convener.

¹² Minutes of the Trades House of Glasgow, 11th February 1920.

Thereafter it was moved by Deacon James H. Mathieson, seconded by Late Deacon David Reid, that it be

RESOLVED- "That the Draft Provisional Order now submitted to this meeting for which application is about to be made to the Secretary for Scotland under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, intituled Draft Provisional Order to vary the Representation of the Fourteen Incorporated Trades of Glasgow in the Trades House of Glasgow and for other purposes, be and the same is hereby consented to subject to such additions, alterations, and variations as the Secretary for Scotland and Parliament may think fit to make therein.

Late Visitor Allan M. Wilson moved as an amendment, seconded by Visitor James A. Paterson, "That the Draft Provisional Order be not consented to and that the Order be not proceeded with."

A general discussion followed, in which the following members took part, viz.:- Messrs. Walter Nelson, David Borland, George F. Paisley, James Dalrymple, John Dallas, Dr. Edward McConnell.

The Deacon-Convener then moved that the vote be taken by roll-call, and this was unanimously agreed to.

On the vote being taken forty-two representatives, present in person or by proxy voted for the motion, and thirteen representatives, present in person or by proxy voted for the amendment as undernoted:-

For the Motion: 42

For the amendment: 13

The Deacon-Convener then declared the motion duly carried.¹³

Minutes of Special General Meeting of the House, 26th March 1920

Another Special General Meeting was called in late March 1920 where the Deacon-Convener stated that he had called this meeting in response to a requisition signed by seven members of the House in the following terms;-

*To ROBERT DAVIDSON, Esq.,
Deacon-Convener of the Trades House of Glasgow.*

March, 1920

We request that a Special Meeting of the House be called for the purpose of considering what steps, if any, could now be taken with a view to having the Provisional Order proceeded with as an agreed measure.

In order to effect this purpose, a resolution in the following terms will be moved;-

RESOLUTION.

That a Special Committee of the House, representative of all interests, be appointed to review the Draft Provisional Order, with the object of arriving at agreement whereby the Order may proceed as a unanimously agreed measure, and to report not later than 8th April, 1920.

¹³ Minutes of Special General Meeting of the Trades House of Glasgow, 20th February 1922.

In the event of the foregoing resolution being carried we would suggest that it be a recommendation to the Committee in considering the matter to take into account;-

An equitable scheme of distribution of the annual income of the House among the pensioners recommended from the Fourteen Incorporations; that such scheme might be based on a percentage of the amounts distributed by the respective Crafts annually among their whole pensioners; that the scheme might also have reference to the proportion which the Crafts' distributions bear to their respective annual income.

- 1. That the scheme should safeguard the rights of existing pensioners of the House.*
- 2. That provision should also be made for the equitable disposal of surplus in any year.*
- 3. That the scheme as finally fixed be embodied in the Draft Provisional Order should it be considered permissible to do so.*
- 4. That the clauses in the Draft Provisional Order relating to enrolment and matriculation fees might be reconsidered.*
- 5. That the clauses in the Draft Provisional Order relating to the confirmation of the Bye-Laws and Regulations of the House might be reconsidered.*
- 6. That the representation from the Incorporations shall be as specified in the Draft Provisional Order.*

(Sgd.) JAMES. DALRYMPLE, Ex-Deacon, Skinners.

THOMAS KELLY, Deacon, Cordiners

JOHN W. GOURLAY, Deacon, Weavers

W. McLAY, Deacon, Skinners

MATTHEW S. SIMPSON, Deacon, Wrights

HENRY MACNAUGHTON, Deacon, Fleshers.

GEORGE C. McCHLERY, Deacon, Gardeners.

The Deacon-Convener stated, after making a strong appeal towards securing unanimity not only in regard to the Provisional Order but also in regard to the proposed resolution, that if the matter were pressed in the form proposed he would find it necessary to rule recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4 as out of order in respect (first) that they deal with matters which come under the ordinary administration of the House, and in any event (second) such matters did not come within the principle of the Provisional Order nor within the Statutory Notice which had already appeared in the Glasgow Herald and the Gazette. He suggested, however, that recommendations 1, 2, and 3 might form the subject of an independent inquiry, and report if the members thought this advisable.

Late Deacon James Dalrymple thereupon moved the resolution proposed by the requisitionists in an amended form, as two resolutions, as follows;-

- 1. That a Special Committee of the House, representative of all interests, be appointed to review the Draft Provisional Order with the object of arriving at agreement whereby the Order may proceed as a unanimously agreed measure, and to report not later than 19th April, 1920.*

That the Committee consist of the Deacon-Convener, the Collector, the twelve other members of the Promotion Committee, and one representative each of

the Incorporations of Tailors and Maltmen.

That it be a recommendation to the Committee in considering the matter to take into account;-

- a. That the clauses in the Draft Provisional Order relating to enrolment and matriculation fees might be reconsidered.*
 - b. That the clauses in the Draft Provisional Order relating to the confirmation of the Bye-Laws and Regulations of the House might be reconsidered.*
 - c. That the representation from the Incorporations shall be as specified in the Draft Provisional Order.*
- 2. That the following questions be remitted to the same Committee for consideration and report;-*
- a. An equitable scheme of distribution of the annual income of the House among the pensioners recommended from the Fourteen Incorporations; that such scheme might be based on a percentage of the amounts distributed by the respective Crafts annually among their whole pensioners j that the scheme might also have reference to the proportion which the Crafts' distributions bear to their respective annual income.*
 - b. That the scheme should safeguard the rights of existing pensioners of the House.*
 - c. That provision should also be made for the equitable disposal of surplus in any year.*

The motion was seconded by Late Deacon David Reid, and after a discussion unanimously approved.

While the above resolutions were passed unanimously, the representatives of the Tailors and the Maltmen intimated that it was to be distinctly understood that they were not to be prejudiced thereby in any future action which they might take in relation to the Provisional Order.

It was also unanimously agreed that the Special Committee to consider the matters arising out of the above resolutions should have power to remit preliminary consideration, including the drafting of a proposed report to a Sub-Committee of their number.

The Deacon-Convener intimated that the Draft Provisional Order would be deposited in its present form as approved at, the Wharncliffe Meeting of the House on 20th ult.¹⁴

No records of the proposed committee or their minutes appear in the records of the Trades House and therefore it did not appear to have any significant impact on the debate in hand.

¹⁴ Minutes of Special General Meeting of the Trades House of Glasgow, 26th March 1920.

Minute of the Trades House, 22nd September 1920

The final minute on this topic refers to a meeting of the Trades House which took place in September 1920. *The Clerk reported that Parliament had risen before the Glasgow Trades House Order, 1920, had been confirmed, and that it would not be dealt with in its further stages until Parliament re-assembled in October.*¹⁵

Parliament met later and approved the 1920 Act which altered the number of representatives each Incorporation were entitled to send the meetings of the Trades House as requested by the Trades House in their submission.

Formation of the Trades House Lodge ~ A Bye Product

During the protracted process quite a bit of animosity had arisen in the Trades House over the dispute and in the spring of 1920, on a train rumbling its way from Edinburgh to Glasgow was a deputation who had been consulting Counsel (later Lord Macmillan) on the dispute about the number of representatives each Incorporation had in the Trades House.

The record shows that: *Four of the Crafts had each six representatives, whereas others had only four or three, and one had only two. The discontent had been of long standing, and when the matter had last been fought (1771-77) and the less privileged had lost, the four privileged Crafts: Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners and Maltmen had made a solemn bond that if ever the question should be reopened they would stand shoulder to shoulder in defending their ancient right. The Hammermen and Cordiners were not inclined now to stand by that pact, in the changed times, but the Tailors and the Maltmen, shocked at this defection, and keen to uphold what their predecessors had pledged, had taken legal advice.*

The case was now before the court and counsel had reminded the craftsmen that these were "modern" days and the danger of losing far greater than of yore. This was the topic of discussion in that compartment of the returning train.

One of the number, John Dallas, later Collector of the Trades House and Deacon-Convener, then asked why should they not have a Trades House Masonic Lodge to promote and deepen that spirit of brotherhood and consideration, of which both the House and the Masonic Craft were practical exponents. In place of friction, they would have fraternity, and for controversy comradeship for the good of the whole House.

Why not? In that question and the favourable answer given by his companions-all keen Freemasons was born the Trades House of Glasgow Lodge, No. 1241, on the Roll of the Grand Lodge of Scotland.

The men in that compartment with John Dallas on that memorable occasion included John Adam, John Wright, James Paterson, William Nelson, and Robert M. Benzie.

*A meeting of Freemasons held in the Trades Hall on 14th April, appointed a Committee, consisting of one representative of each Incorporation, to arrange details about the founding of the Lodge, and a Charter was granted by Grand Lodge on 4th November, 1920.*¹⁶

¹⁵ Minutes of the Trades House 22nd September 1920.

¹⁶ The Rev. William J. Baxter, Sketch of the History of the Trades House of Glasgow Lodge No. 1241, 1945.