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The claim made by Herbert Morrison and Hugh Dalton that Morrison was denied the leadership of the Labour Party in the 1935 election by the votes of Labour MPs who were members of a masonic lodge to which Arthur Greenwood belonged has been repeated by several historians, but without considering the character of the lodge. This article is a detailed examination of the genesis, membership and activities of the lodge in question, New Welcome No. 5139, consecrated in 1929. The documentation relating to the establishment of the lodge claimed that its purpose was to make Freemasonry more accessible to the working classes, but the pattern of lodge membership suggests that it was intended from the start as a ‘class lodge’ for Labour MPs and officials which would assist relations between the new Labour government and Freemasonry. Following the formation of the National Government, the lodge’s character changed, and membership eventually became open to all men associated with the Palace of Westminster. It is argued that New Welcome Lodge had little impact on the 1935 leadership election. It is shown that the claim made by the anti-masonic writers Stephen Knight and Martin Short that Clement Attlee was a freemason misconstrues Dalton’s memoirs; no evidence that Attlee was a freemason has ever been found.

One well-known point at which the history of the British Labour Party intersects with the history of Freemasonry is the election of Clement Attlee as leader of the Labour Party in 1935. George Lansbury’s resignation as leader shortly before the 1935 general election created a crisis and the parliamentary party appointed Attlee as interim leader on condition that a full leadership ballot would be held once the general election was out of the way. This leadership election was held in November 1935. Attlee was by no means the favourite. His conduct of the general election campaign had been undistinguished. He faced powerful challenges from Herbert Morrison, whose candidature was energetically promoted by Hugh Dalton and who was seen as the front runner, and Arthur Greenwood, who had strong trade union support. 1 Morrison and his supporters afterwards claimed that he was defeated because of masonic machinations. 2 It was suggested...
that a group of freemasons within the Labour Party supported Greenwood, a member of their masonic lodge, in the first ballot. When Greenwood finished bottom of the ballot, the freemasons allegedly switched their votes in the next ballot to Attlee, thus denying Morrison the leadership. Thus, it has been claimed, Attlee owed his ascent to the party leadership to masonic influence. However, these allegations have been repeated without investigation of the history and character of the masonic lodge. An examination of the records of the lodge’s history held by the United Grand Lodge of England suggests that the claims made as to the influence of the lodge on the Labour leadership election were exaggerated, but also provides remarkable insights on the reaction of some English freemasons to the prospect of a Labour government in 1929.

The suggestion that a masonic lodge influenced the 1935 leadership election was first made by Hugh Dalton in his memoir, *The Fateful Years*, published in 1957. Dalton wrote that:

Later it came to my knowledge that on November 22nd, four days before the Party meeting, there was held a meeting of a Masonic Lodge to which at that time a number of Labour MPs and some Transport House officials belonged. A list of members of this Lodge was shown to me. No doubt voting for the Party leadership was discussed, formally or informally, at this meeting, and Greenwood was the Masons’ Candidate. Most members of the Lodge were closer friends of his than of the other two candidates. I have very little knowledge of Freemasonry and no strong feelings either for or against it. But the incident has, I think, some historical interest.³

Dalton gave more circumstantial information about this masonic lodge in his political diary, published by Ben Pimlott in 1986. Dalton found out about the lodge’s existence during a conversation with William Nield of the Labour Party’s Research and Policy Department at the House of Commons on 6 April 1938. Nield showed Dalton ‘a document of some interest’. Dalton described it as follows:

It was a summons to a special meeting of the New Welcome Lodge, dated four days before the meeting of the Parliamentary Party at which Attlee was re-elected Leader after the last election. This Lodge is masonic and appears to cater especially, though not exclusively, for Labour MPs. The secretary summoning the meeting was Scott Lindsay [the Secretary of the Parliamentary Labour Party]. He canvassed me for Greenwood at the time and, in reply to my obvious point of doubt,⁴ told me that Greenwood promised that, if elected Leader, he would never be out of control on important occasions. A full list of members of the Lodge was on the back of the summons. The list included Sir Robert Young, Joe Compton, A. Short, Major Milner, J. W. Bowen, Rev. H. Dunnico, Colonel L’Estrange Malone, Colonel H. W. Burton (a Tory M.P. and the only one in this galère), Jack Hayes, F. J. Bellenger, Willie Henderson, F. O. Roberts, Greenwood himself (these two appear to have joined about the same time), W. Dobbie, Ben Tillet[1], George Hicks, Lord Kinnoul[1] (now dead).⁵

Dalton declared that ‘This is a surprisingly large number, and some of the names are very surprising’. Dalton recalled that he had invited Bellenger to a meeting at his flat on 20 November 1935 designed to rally support for Morrison and to encourage Morrison to stand for the leadership. Dalton had been embarrassed when news of this meeting had been leaked to the press, and he now wondered if Bellenger, as one of Greenwood’s fellow masons, had been responsible. Nield told Dalton that he had shown the lodge summons to Herbert Morrison, who had said ‘I have got a copy locked up in my drawer. Someone sent it to me a few days after the election’.⁶
A year later, Dalton was to encounter New Welcome Lodge once more. On 24 May 1939 he noted that:

Bellenger engages me in conversation on the Terrace and asks whether I have ever considered becoming a Mason. I say no. He then explains how useful this association is and tells me that there is a Lodge at the House of Commons, called the New Welcome Lodge, to which a number of Labour MPs belong. ‘Greenwood’, he said, ‘is a member’. He assured me that there was no politics in Free Masonry, but that there was a wonderful sense of fellowship, etc. I thanked him for his suggestion but said I did not feel that I would care to join. I added, ‘There is a good deal of talk going round about this Lodge’. ‘There ought not to’, said he, slightly embarrassed I thought.7

Far from reassuring him as to the benign character of New Welcome Lodge, Dalton’s conversation with Bellenger encouraged him to see a distinct masonic bloc in the Labour Party which supported Greenwood and was opposed to Morrison. Dalton increasingly propagated the view that support for Attlee was being orchestrated by the freemasons in order to ensure that Morrison would never become leader. In his diary entries for the party conference at Southport at the beginning of June 1939, he notes that ‘I tell Francis Williams a few things, e.g. about the Masons, which he did not know, on the last morning of the Conference’.8 Attlee was at that time ill and was awaiting a prostrate operation. Ellen Wilkinson published an article suggesting that the time was ripe for a change in leadership. In Dalton’s view, opposition to any change in the party leadership was led by masonic supporters of Greenwood:

The Masons had been going actively about, swearing that they would have Ellen’s head on the charger and alleging an immense and far-tentacled intrigue to impose Morrison upon a reluctant and indignant Parliamentary Party... The Masons, though no doubt hoping that Attlee will come through his operation all right, would like him to retire upon grounds of health in a month or two and Greenwood to get the leadership, but for the moment they concentrate on indignation at this attempt to stab a sick man in the back.9

Dalton urged Wilkinson ‘if attacked, to counter by spilling some Masonic beans’. Dalton declared that ‘whereas Attlee is quite virtuous, in spite of all his inadequacies, Greenwood and the Masons are a scandal, and this is a chance to expose them’.10 Dalton afterwards had a conversation with Albert Alexander about the leadership issues.

I mention to him the Masonic matter, of which he seems ignorant — I suppose he is not a Mason himself in some other Lodge? — but he agrees with me that it would be a scandal and an impossibility for Greenwood to lead the Party.11

Dalton’s view of the influence of New Welcome Lodge on the 1935 leadership election is now well established in labour history, having been repeated for example by Ben Pimlott,12 Richard Whiting,13 David Martin,14 and Andrew Thorpe.15 The suggestion of a masonic dimension to Attlee’s ascent has continued to reverberate to the present day. In 1984, Stephen Knight published an attack on Freemasonry, which portrayed it as a malign secret network underpinning the British establishment. He cited the 1935 Labour leadership election in support of his claims, but misrepresented the facts as reported by Dalton:

Two men in particular seemed to have achieved high office in the Labour Party directly through membership of the Brotherhood: Attlee, Prime Minister from 1945 to 1951, and
Arthur Greenwood, Deputy Leader of the Party from 1935. On 22 November 1935 a masonic Lodge whose members included Transport House officials and several Labour MPs held one of its regular meetings. The party meeting to select a new Leader was fixed for 26 November. Three men were in the running. Even though Attlee was a Mason, it was Greenwood, a member of the Transport House Lodge, who was, according to Hugh Dalton, Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer between 1945 and 1947, ‘the Masons’ Candidate’. 

In an unusually generous comment on Freemasonry, Knight added:

First, of course, this is not an example of Freemasonry at work in Parliament but inside an individual party, which is quite different. Secondly, considering the facts coolly, it is hard to see much that is sinister in them. Freemasons getting together in secret to decide whom they as a group want to have as leader seems no different from the Tribunites, the Manifesto Group or any other sub group within a party doing the same thing.

Generous Knight may have been, but freemasons would not agree with him. The discussion of religion and politics at masonic meetings is forbidden. As the Book of Constitutions of the United Grand Lodge of England states, ‘no private piques or quarrels must be brought within the door of the lodge, far less any quarrels about religion, or nations, or state policy’. The relevant constitution goes on to declare that freemasons ‘are resolved against all politics, as what never yet conduced to the welfare of the lodge, nor ever will’. In principle, freemasons using their membership for party political purposes would be subject to the masonic disciplinary process. In a letter to the former Labour MP Sir Herbert Dunnico in 1940, the then Pro Grand Master of United Grand Lodge of England Lord Harewood observed that ‘It is the great strength of English Freemasonry that we take no part in politics, and that our Lodges contain only those who are obedient to the laws and loyal to the “Sovereign of their native land”’. This of course assumes that republicans could not be masons, an irony which Charles Bradlaugh pointed out during his short career as an English freemason.

Although Knight cites Dalton’s memoirs as his source, at no point either there or in his diary did Dalton suggest that Attlee was a freemason. He merely portrays him as the beneficiary of a masonic vote. Nevertheless this suggestion that Attlee was a freemason was repeated by Knight’s follower, Martin Short, who stated that:

According to Hugh Dalton (the future Chancellor of the Exchequer) both Attlee and his rival Arthur Greenwood were Masons. Dalton says that a Masonic caucus of MPs and Transport Union officials backed Greenwood in the leadership ballot. He came third, so in the run-off the Masons switched their votes to Brother Attlee. This ensured his victory over the non-Mason, Herbert Morrison.

Short corrects Knight’s error in describing the lodge as ‘the Transport House Lodge’, and correctly identifies it as the New Welcome Lodge:

The New Welcome Lodge has been one of British politics’ longest and best kept secrets. Persistent rumours that a lodge existed somewhere in Parliament have been laughed off until now because of false tales that it meets within the Palace of Westminster. In fact it meets five times a year at Freemasons’ Hall.

The allegations made by Knight and Short about Attlee’s election received extensive publicity. When Short’s book came out in 1989 he was publicly challenged by Attlee’s
son, the 2nd Earl Attlee, in the letters page of the *Daily Telegraph* to produce evidence for Clement Attlee having been a freemason.\(^{22}\) So certain was Lord Attlee that his father had not been a freemason that he offered £1,000 to a charity of Short’s choice should he produce any evidence that his father had been a freemason. Grand Lodge was intrigued by this public challenge and the then Pro Grand Master, Lord Cornwallis, invited Lord Attlee to lunch at Freemasons’ Hall to discuss it. His Lordship accepted and John Hamill was present at the lunch. In his role as Grand Lodge’s Librarian and Curator, Hamill had been asked when the Knight book appeared to conduct a search of the membership registers to see if Attlee had been a freemason under the United Grand Lodge of England. His name does not appear in the registers of English Freemasonry. Over lunch Lord Attlee stated that after his father’s death he had gone through all his papers and had found no evidence for his having been a freemason. There were papers referring to other organizations to which his father had belonged but nothing even remotely connected with Freemasonry. He believed that even had his father been a member for only a very short time reference to it would have survived in his personal papers or diaries or within family memory.

This fact was confirmed to John Hamill by another member of the family, Clement Attlee’s daughter, Lady Felicity Harwood. Her husband, Geoffrey Harwood, became a freemason. He and John Hamill were members of the same London lodge, Honour and Generosity No. 165. Geoffrey always brought her to the ladies’ dinners of the lodge and, after his death in 1988, the lodge continued to invite her and on a number of occasions Hamill was her escort for the evening. She was adamant that her father could not have been a freemason without some record of it having survived in his papers or within family memory. She added that she would have found it strange if he had been a freemason for, in her words, ‘he was not a clubbable man’.

Although Knight and Short misrepresented Dalton’s report by claiming Attlee as a freemason, the central claim made by Dalton, that there was a masonic lodge to which several Labour MPs, including Arthur Greenwood belonged, was correct. There are two lodges connected with the Palace of Westminster. The first is the Gallery Lodge No. 1928, formed in 1881. Its membership originally consisted of journalists, particularly those in the parliamentary ‘lobby’, Hansard writers and others from the world of publishing. Like many lodges formed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by particular groups, it has in the last few decades lost its original membership ethos, and such members of the press and Hansard writers as the lodge has today are all retired — the membership has been opened to others so that the lodge can survive.\(^{23}\) The second lodge with parliamentary connections is that for which Dalton saw a summons in 1938 — New Welcome Lodge No. 5139, the subject of this paper. That the lodge, since its formation in 1929, has had parliamentary connections is beyond doubt. The reasons for its formation, however, have been the subject of much conjecture and the existing primary source material does not put them beyond doubt.

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, a masonic lodge simply served the town or city in which it was based. While the membership of a lodge might reflect local social networks or groupings, there was no formal requirement that prospective members should belong to a particular profession or social group. The only exceptions were military lodges formed for members of particular regiments. From the late nineteenth century, non-military masonic lodges began to be formed whose membership was
restricted to particular social groups. This development began with lodges for old boys of particular schools, which in turn led to the creation of lodges associated with universities and medical schools. These school and university lodges paved the way for the establishment during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries of many ‘class lodges’, so called because they were restricted to a particular class of membership. Many of these lodges were formed to serve professional men working in the emerging public sector, such as those for employees of school boards. A number of lodges were formed for members of new county and borough councils — the study of such lodges would be a fruitful area of research for historians of local government. By the 1930s, there were lodges for every conceivable profession.

Although the growth of lodges restricted to certain professional or social groups was not restricted to the metropolitan area, it was a marked feature of London Freemasonry. This reflected London’s growth in the nineteenth century. As the professional classes moved out of central London into the new suburbs, geographically based lodges became increasingly less viable and lodges based around common professional, social and leisure interests became more attractive. The Gallery Lodge is a good example of such a professionally based lodge in London. Another was the Insuranto Lodge No. 3733, consecrated at Freemasons’ Hall in London on 6 July 1914, whose members were officials of insurance companies, building and friendly societies. A founder of Insuranto Lodge and one of its first masters was Percy Rockliff, who had been the first secretary of the New Tabernacle Provident Society, established in East London in 1896 with an initial membership of 20 members. When Rockliff retired as secretary of the society in 1932, it had 23,000 members, who shared in an annual Christmas distribution of £30,000.

From 1905, Rockliff was also secretary of the London and County Permanent Benefit Society, now part of the Cheltenham and Gloucester Building Society. At various times secretary of the Joint Committee of Approved Societies and president of the Faculty of Insurance, Rockliff was a particularly distinguished figure in the insurance world.

Rockliff and Insuranto Lodge took a leading role in the establishment of the New Welcome Lodge. The minutes of the Insuranto Lodge record that, on 1 July 1929, the lodge passed the following motion proposed by Rockliff:

That the members of Insuranto Lodge No. 3733 do recommend for the favourable consideration of the MW Grand Master, the petition for the formation of a new lodge to be known as ‘The Lodge of Citizenship’.

This was the lodge which was to become ‘The New Welcome’. For a new lodge to be formed, it is necessary for the petitioners to fill out a formal petition to the Grand Master giving details of the intended founders, the nomination of the first Master and Wardens together with their choice of name for the new lodge and its intended place and dates of meeting. The petition has to be accompanied by a letter from the founders giving their reasons for forming the lodge and justifying their choice of name. The proposal for the new lodge has also to be supported by an existing lodge. The petition for the lodge proposed by Rockliff and the Insuranto Lodge survives. Of the eleven who signed the petition, seven were officials of insurance companies and mutual societies and members of Insuranto Lodge, including Rockliff himself, George Royle, a former mayor of Bedford who was President of the New Tabernacle Society, and George Canter, formerly Secretary of the Post Office Employees’ Approved Society and Secretary of the
National Incorporated Beneficent Society. The other signatories to the petition were sitting Labour MPs, namely John William Bowen, General Secretary of the Union of Post Office Workers; Charles Sitch, Secretary of the Chainmakers’ and Strikers’ Association; the Sheffield trade unionist, Alfred Short; and the non-conformist minister, Herbert Dunnico. Bowen was the only one of the founders who was both a member of Insuranto and an MP, and perhaps provided a link between the two groups. Curiously, although Dunnico, Short, Bowen and Sitch were identified as MPs in the summons for the consecration of the lodge, no details are given of their parliamentary affiliation in the petition. It could be that they omitted it in deference to Freemasonry’s non-political stance and because they did not regard membership of parliament as being their principal profession. Conspiracy theorists might suggest that this information was omitted for more sinister reasons.

Preserved with the original petition for the lodge is a series of letters to the Grand Secretary, Sir Philip Colville Smith, from Rockliff and William Appleton, the Secretary of Insuranto Lodge, who was Secretary of the General Federation of Trade Unions from 1907 to 1938. These are printed in full in an appendix below. The correspondence shows that discussions about the new lodge had been going on for some months. It seems that the story started in December 1928 with the consecration of a new masonic chapter attached to the High Cross Lodge No. 754 in Tottenham (the lodge to which Charles Bradlaugh had been admitted in 1865). Rockcliff was a member of this lodge, serving as its master in 1929, and was one of the founders of the new chapter. Among those officiating at the ceremony was Colville Smith himself and George Royle, who was to be one of the founders of New Welcome. According to Appleton, an address was made during the ceremony by Prebendary George Perry, Rector of St Vedast, Foster Lane and a former Mayor of Finsbury, in which he lamented the difficulty of persuading less wealthy men to become freemasons. Colville Smith expressed his approval of Perry’s speech, and spoke to Appleton about his feeling that Freemasonry could play a part in creating greater social harmony. Appleton wrote to Colville Smith to say how much he had appreciated this conversation, and to say that he had discussed the matter ‘with a Fellow Mason who mixes very freely amongst the ordinary workmen’ (presumably Rockcliff) and promising to write again after further discussion. Rockcliff himself reported to Colville Smith in January that he and Appleton had been ‘giving earnest thought to the subject of the proposed new Lodge’.

On 31 January 1929, Appleton wrote to Colville Smith with a detailed memorandum proposing the formation of a Lodge of Citizenship which would seek to take forward the ideas expressed at the High Cross ceremony. The lodge would adopt principles of ‘economic administration’ in order to encourage the ‘better social type of manual and clerical worker’ to join Masonry ‘without importunity’ or neglect of their families. The level of subscriptions would be kept to a minimum and, instead of the sumptuous dinners usually associated with masonic meetings, the meal after meetings of the new lodge would be ‘of that simple and homely character which is, even today, associated with some provincial, and many rural lodges’. In order to prevent undue claims by members of the lodge on masonic charities, the lodge would form its own masonic charitable association (a similar fund was already operated by Insuranto Lodge). Appleton hoped that these details would be sufficient to allow a petition for the formation of such a lodge to be granted.
Rockcliff followed up Appleton’s letter with one of his own on 5 February, declaring that the aim of the new lodge was to ‘bring home to the industrial section of the community the principles and tenets of the craft’. While Freemasonry to some extent broke down social barriers in rural areas, he observed, it was less successful in this respect in metropolitan areas. While the new lodge would begin in London, it would seek to set up offshoots elsewhere in the country. The aim would be to recruit members who ‘by permeating the ranks of the industrial classes, would become missionaries for and exemplars of the advantages which Masonry confers, not only upon its members, but upon those with whom its members come into daily contact’. These masonic emissaries would help calm social unrest: ‘Masonry would exercise a steadying influence (“as citizens of the world”) upon those who are brought within its fold, and help to render nugatory any unsettling influences which might be at work in factories and elsewhere’.

Despite the encouragement they had received from Colville Smith, it was evidently felt that the proposal of Rockcliff and Appleton required further consideration, and it was not until six months later in August 1929 that the formal petition for the lodge was submitted, accompanied by the formal letter explaining the rationale for the new lodge required by the rules. This was composed by Rockcliff and again described the aims of the founders in terms similar to those he had used in his earlier letter. The lodge was intended to spread ‘knowledge of the principles and practice of Freemasonry amongst other than wealthy members of the community in crowded urban areas’. While it was aimed at the less well-off, it would still preserve ‘such a dignity in its proceedings as to make membership of it desirable’, while practising such economies in its administration to ensure that membership fees were at a reasonable level. Rockcliff proposed three names for the lodge: the 1929 Lodge (to mark the year of its founding), the Civitas Britannicus Lodge; and the New Citizen Lodge.

Apart from this correspondence, no other documents about the formation of the lodge exist in the Grand Lodge archives. On the face of the information supplied by these documents, the intent of the founders was laudable, even if in masonic terms it was somewhat political, and to our modern minds, somewhat patronizing. Rockcliff and Appleton were correct in their view that it was difficult for ‘the better social type of manual and clerical workers’ to gain admittance into London lodges. In the context of the widespread establishment of ‘class lodges’, the petition for the proposed Lodge of Citizenship was not unusual. However, the political concerns expressed by the founders and their declared intention of using the lodge to promote social harmony were extremely unusual. The lodge petition was approved, but there was some further discussion about the lodge name. The name eventually decided upon was New Welcome Lodge, presumably reflecting the declared intention of offering working-class candidates a warm welcome.

It is clear from the correspondence that New Welcome Lodge was regarded as a sensitive project. This is evident from the exchanges about the design of a badge for the lodge. Rockcliff had asked the Grand Secretary whether a representation of Big Ben could be used as the lodge badge. The Grand Secretary had ruled this out. The masonic jeweller, Harry Bladon, made a design based on a drawing of the open door of the entrance to the monumental new Freemasons’ Hall at Great Queen Street in London, built as a masonic peace memorial. This was again vetoed by the Grand Secretary. Rockcliff wrote again asking whether the design could be amended and saying that it was...
difficult to think of other ideas for an emblem: ‘Friendly Society designs, of which there are quite a number, are of the hackneyed class and type’. Eventually, Bladon produced a more generic design of a door opening to reveal a masonic tessellated carpet.

The new lodge was consecrated on 1 November 1929 at the lodge room in 10 Duke Street, St James’s, by Colville Smith as Grand Secretary. Rather than being secretive, as Martin Short described it, the arrival of New Welcome Lodge was widely reported in the press, as was common with masonic events at that time. The Daily Telegraph carried a report headed ‘Freemasonry. New Lodge with Many MPs’, while ‘Lounger’ in the Sporting Times gave a lengthy account of the ceremony and the banquet afterwards at the Jules Restaurant in Jermyn Street.

The consecration was also reported in detail in the publicly available newspapers published for freemasons. The description of the purpose of the new lodge in the masonic press differs from that given in the letters of Appleton and Rockliff. It was described simply as a lodge for MPs. The Masonic Record in reporting the consecration of New Welcome welcomed ‘this new and striking development in Freemasonry shielded as it is by the exclusion of all political discussions from its meetings’. Likewise, the weekly newspaper, the Freemason, declared that ‘Masonry happily knows no politics, but that is, happily, also no reason why politicians should not benefit by the teaching and practice of the Craft and do their utmost to make its usefulness known among their friends and supporters.’

Comments such as these suggest that, while Appleton and Rockliff may have claimed in their correspondence with Grand Lodge that the aim was to establish a lodge which would attract working men, the intention was somewhat different — the lodge was in fact a parliamentary ‘class lodge’. The four candidates for membership proposed at first meeting of the lodge were all Labour MPs, namely Robert (later Sir Robert) Young, recently appointed Deputy Speaker, James Shillaker, Joseph Cotton, and William Watson Henderson, the son of the new Foreign Secretary, Arthur Henderson.

In February 1930, Scott Lindsay the secretary of the Parliamentary Labour Party was initiated in the lodge, and he became secretary of the lodge in December 1931. Between the foundation of the lodge and the end of 1934, 47 men joined the lodge. Of these, 25 were or had been Labour MPs, together with the Labour peer Lord Kinnoull. The only Conservative MP to join the lodge during this time was Col. Henry Burton, who was already a member of another masonic lodge, Wickford Lodge No. 4220 in Essex. Burton was a provincial officer in Essex at the same time as Herbert Dunnico and joined the lodge while Dunnico was Master. His membership of the lodge was probably due to this personal connection.

Among the Labour MPs who joined New Welcome Lodge were, as Dalton noted, such distinguished figures as Greenwood, Ben Tillett, and Frederick Roberts, the Minister of Pensions in 1924 and from 1929–31. Some of the MPs who joined New Welcome were already members of other lodges, such as Cecil L’Estrange Malone, who had previously been initiated in Athlumley Lodge No. 3245. The majority were, however, new to Freemasonry and were initiated in New Welcome Lodge. Some of these MPs proved to be enthusiastic masons and afterwards attained national rank under the United Grand Lodge of England, such as James Milner, a Junior Grand Warden, Charles Ammon, also a Warden, and William Henderson, a Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies. Of the 21 men who joined the lodge before 1935 who were not members of either house of parliament, some were messengers or clerks in the Palace
of Westminster, while others were apparently connected with the catering and entertaining arrangements for the lodge. These recruits also included some who were sons of members of the lodge, such as Dunnico’s son Herbert, who was initiated by his father. A special dispensation was obtained from Grand Lodge so that Dunnico junior, who was under twenty one, could be initiated while his father was master of the lodge. A handful of initiates in the lodge were prominent in the Labour movement, but did not serve as MPs, such as William Spence, General Secretary of the National Union of Seamen, and George Gibson, General Secretary of the Mental Hospital and Institutional Workers’ Union and the first General Secretary of the Confederation of Health Service Employees on its formation in 1946.

Occasionally, personal and political connections can be traced which apparently explain the membership of the lodge. For example, Rockliff was a member of the Dental and Opthalmic Benefit Board. Jack Hayes, the Labour Whip, was Secretary of the British Optical Association, and this may explain how he came to be one of the first to join the lodge. Hayes had been Parliamentary Private Secretary to Frederick Roberts in 1924. Malone, who joined the lodge in 1931, was MP for Northampton, where Roberts was Secretary of the local Labour party. The combined influence of Hayes and Malone probably explains the fact that Roberts was proposed for membership at the meeting when Malone joined the lodge. Roberts was joined in his initiation by Albert Bellamy, his then PPS, even though Bellamy was gravely ill. When Bellamy died a few weeks later, Malone was appointed as Roberts’s PPS.

Nevertheless, the membership of the lodge was far from secret. The Times referred to the lodge as ‘consisting largely of Labour MPs’ in a report of a meeting of Grand Lodge in 1931, and carried a report of the installation of Sir Robert Young as Master of the lodge. Above all, masonic newspapers such as the Freemason published regular reports on meetings of the lodge. These reported notable initiations, such as those of Tillett, Roberts and Greenwood, and gave reports of speeches which provide a valuable insight into how members of the lodge perceived Freemasonry. For example, Alfred Short, on his installation as master in 1931, stated that members of the lodge were imbued ‘with the true Masonic Spirit for Social Service’ and declared that the aim of the lodge was ‘Social Service through the Craft’. Likewise, Fred Kershaw on his installation stated that the lodge was composed of men who had spent long years in benefiting the conditions of their fellow creatures, men who moved in immense circles of influence … If these men could interpret in its true sense, in the spirit of brotherhood, all that Masonry stood for, both in Parliament and elsewhere, it was obvious that their work in all spheres of activity would be for the betterment of the world. There could be no finer achievement than for their members … to in future bring the great spirit of brotherhood to bear upon the body politic.

Some of the most striking speeches at lodge meetings were made by Arthur Greenwood. These suggest that Greenwood was deeply committed to the ideals of Freemasonry. The Freemason reported at length the speech made by Greenwood following his initiation:

What has attracted me to this magnificent Order is that it is a brotherhood of men bound together by loyalty, by friendship and common objects. I am young in your midst. I hope I shall not be a stumbling block in your great Craft, but a stepping stone. Political earthquakes
happen to have given me a temporary prominence, but my heart is with the rank and file. I therefore do not suppose that I shall ever be an illustrious figure in Freemasonry, but I hope it will always be said of me that I have been a loyal Brother who has done his best to bring distinction to the Order; to make Freemasonry what it ought to be and to stand by all Brother Masons. I have pledged my word tonight, and I never pledge it lightly."

Perhaps the most powerful exponent of this theme of Freemasonry as means of promoting brotherhood was Herbert Dunnico, one of the founders of the lodge and its master from 1930–1. Dunnico’s mastership saw not only the initiation of Greenwood, Roberts and many others, but also one of the most remarkable events in the history of the lodge, the initiation of the former transport workers leader, Robert Williams. Dunnico concluded by declaring that ‘he had never done Bro. Williams any greater favour than in initiating him into their great order’. In replying, Williams noted that he entered the lodge ‘bereft of everything that mattered in the shape of worldly goods’. Instead, he had found something more valuable — comradeship and friendship. He hoped that the confidence reposed in him would be justified and he pledged himself to help promote fealty to Freemasonry. However, in the wreck of his life, Williams found it impossible to keep his promise. It must have been very difficult for him to afford the costs of lodge membership. He never attended another meeting or paid any dues, and, in 1933, he was automatically excluded from the lodge. Three years later, he committed suicide.

Dunnico’s charitable attempt to help Williams by enrolling him in New Welcome seems to be the only example of an attempt to put into action the proposal of Appleton and Rockliff to create a lodge which would be accessible to those who could not otherwise afford to become freemasons. How can the discrepancy between the stated intentions of Rockliff and Appleton in founding the lodge, and its actual character as a well-heeled parliamentary lodge dominated by Labour MPs be reconciled? The answer to this question might have remained a mystery had it not been for the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the lodge in 1980.

For that occasion, a brief history of the lodge was produced, which gave a completely new reason for the formation of the lodge. It baldly states:
The intention was to form a Lodge with parliamentary connections which would enable those Members of Parliament and Officials of the Labour Party, finding difficulty in joining other Lodges, to enter Masonry without prejudice to the feelings against the Craft which existed in some circles in which they moved. There were already a number of Members of Parliament who were active Masons, and their support was enlisted for the formation of the new Lodge. It is of interest that even at this early stage, the Founders of the Lodge were restricted in the number of Members of Parliament who joined and in fact only four of the original Founders were serving Members of Parliament.

The history then goes on to record recollections of the formation of the Lodge by Percy Rockliff in the late 1930s:

In the early months of 1929 Sir Colville Smith asked Bro Rockliff to call and see him at Freemasons’ Hall.

At this interview, the Grand Secretary informed Bro. Rockliff that the then Prince of Wales (afterwards King Edward VIII, later Duke of Windsor) was somewhat concerned at the number of occasions on which ballots, taken in Lodges, appeared to be used to exclude from Masonry Labour MPs seeking membership therein. HRH had therefore suggested to the Grand Secretary that a Lodge might be formed specially for the purpose of enabling Labour MPs and officials to become Masons if they so desired.

It was known to Bro. Rockliff that, at annual Labour Conferences, motions had for years appeared upon the Agenda papers designed to exclude Freemasons from holding offices in the Trade Union movement. Latterly, these motions had been rendered nugatory by moving ‘next business’ when the objectionable item was reached on the Agenda. Notwithstanding this, the Grand Secretary thought that the idea of the Prince of Wales should be proceeded with. Would Bro. Rockliff, as Secretary of Insuranto Lodge, undertake the formation of a new Lodge, for this express purpose, by taking charge of a petition for its creation?

At a further meeting with Sir Colville Smith, Bro. Rockliff was informed that the Pro Grand Master (Lord Ampthill) had suggested, after consultation with the Prince of Wales, that the proposed name of the new Lodge should be changed to ‘New Welcome’ as being more indicative of its purpose. To this variation Bro. Rockliff at once agreed.

Bro. Rockliff next paid a visit to the House of Commons where he met Bro. Dunnico and other MPs with whom he discussed and agreed personnel for filling the three principal chairs.

The only source for this information is Rockliff’s recollections. A search of the Grand Secretary’s private letter files and letter books reveals no correspondence between Colville Smith and Rockliff or Appleton other than the documents we have already quoted. Rockliff’s account, however, does fit with the events and the early history of New Welcome Lodge whilst the correspondence clearly does not. That raises the question of whether or not the correspondence was a ‘blind’ to ensure that the new lodge came into being without the embarrassment of Freemasonry being seen to involve itself not just in politics but in party politics.

We believe that the answer to that question has to be yes. Such a conclusion receives support from the way in which, once the lodge had been consecrated and its character was clear, the ‘open door’ badge, agreed with such difficulty, was dropped and replaced by 1930 with the design used today, incorporating the portcullis of the House of Commons.®9 Moreover, it is striking that, apart from Henry Burton, a fellow provincial officer of Dunnico, none of the Conservative and Liberal MPs who were at that time...
freemasons, such as Thomas Shaw, Kingsley Wood, and Harry Crookshank joined the lodge, although they sometimes visited its meetings. It might seem as if Colville Smith, Appleton and Rockliff were in grave danger of mixing Freemasonry and politics, but we have to put the event in the context of its time. Clearly, like many others, the rulers of Freemasonry were apprehensive about the prospect of a Labour government in 1929 and may have felt that there was a risk that the new government would take a dim view of Freemasonry. They evidently considered it judicious to build bridges with the labour movement, and New Welcome Lodge was intended to ensure that Freemasonry had some ‘friends in court’.

In that sense the formation of New Welcome Lodge is understandable — although strictly speaking it could be claimed that it offended against the principle of Freemasonry not involving itself in politics or allying itself to one particular party. Presumably the justification was that in promoting the New Welcome Lodge the founders were not allying themselves to a particular party, but were ensuring that Freemasonry remained inclusive and was not excluding a particular group because of their political allegiance. To have admitted that, either within Freemasonry or in public, would have been counterproductive, hence the smoke screen of the formal correspondence. Once the lodge had been established, the founders felt more confident about declaring their motives. Rockliff stated in 1930 that:

The Lodge had put an end to suspicions about Masonry which had existed in the minds of some people, and which were entirely groundless; but the creation of their Lodge and its existence for 12 months had dispelled them, and in that respect he was conscious that they had done very good work indeed.

Whether there had been incidences of lodges blackballing Labour MPs the masonic records do not reveal. Similarly there is no documentary evidence that the idea for the lodge came from the then Prince of Wales. He was an active freemason from 1919 until his accession to the throne in 1936, and he continued his active connection for a number of years after the Abdication and remained a member of a lodge until his death. The suggestion would certainly fit with his known comments on social conditions. As the heir to the throne any suggestion he made relating to Freemasonry would certainly have been taken seriously.

In 1931, however, there had been a further ‘political earthquake’. At the General Election following the formation of the National Government, Labour parliamentary representation was reduced to 52. At the first meeting of the lodge after the election, Sir Robert Young, who had himself lost his seat at the election, remarked that:

The Lodge was unique, in that of the Officers, only two were not defeated Members of Parliament. A few months ago they could point with pride to the large number of MPs in their Lodge; now their only claim to distinction was the number of ex-MPs.

The potential pool of members for New Welcome Lodge had shrunk dramatically. In 1932, only one MP (Ernest Hicks) was initiated in the lodge and in 1933 two (James Milner and William Dobbie). The lodge membership was sustained by Labour MPs who were already members of other masonic lodges, such as Harry Nathan, and by the initiation of Transport House officials and former MPs such as Ben Tillett. In 1934, no MP came forward to be initiated. According to the anniversary brochure of the
lodge, Dunnico suggested that there should be a discussion ‘concerning the Parliamentary nature of the Lodge’ and an emergency meeting was held on 19 June 1934 at the Piccadilly Hotel. In the usual opaque way of twentieth-century lodge minutes those for that meeting simply record ‘that there was much frank discussion and the W[orshipful] M[aster] summed up the situation which was concurred with by all present as an honourable understanding’.  

It must be assumed that the ‘honourable understanding’ was that for the future members of the lodge could be sitting MPs of any party or work in some capacity in the Palace of Westminster, for from that meeting all subsequent members of the lodge have fulfilled one of those criteria. The initiations in 1935 and 1936 were mostly of staff of the House of Commons, although one significant Labour figure, Robert Morrison, was initiated in 1936. The first Conservative MP to be initiated in the lodge was Sir Walter Liddall in 1937. By 1940, sitting members of all three main parties were in the lodge and, since the Second World War, the membership of the lodge has been chiefly drawn from the staff of the Palace of Westminster.

As we have seen, Dalton’s information about the membership of New Welcome Lodge was accurate. How much credence then should be given to his claim that a masonic bloc vote helped defeat Morrison and ensured Greenwood’s appointment as Deputy Leader of the Labour Party? The meeting of the lodge in November 1935 which excited Dalton’s alarm was in fact reported in detail in the masonic newspaper, the *Freemason*. The purpose of the meeting was to install William Warne, the solicitor to Pearl Assurance who had been one of the founders of the lodge, as master, rather than to compare notes about the leadership election. The dinner after the meeting was held at the Connaught Rooms, and offered, according to the *Freemason*, ‘a feast of oratory’. As treasurer, Arthur Greenwood was one of the speakers at the dinner. Greenwood followed masonic protocol by avoiding any direct political reference in his speech, but he used this as a source of humour. ‘Thirty one million people during the past few weeks had been indulging in a general election’, he declared, ‘but, of course, the lodge had no knowledge of it’. Greenwood added that ‘The lodge was especially a parliamentary lodge, but its membership was not confined to any political party, but was open to those whose duties were in connection with the House of Commons. They had tried to confine its activities exclusively to the House of Commons, but somehow or other they found themselves with two members of the House of Lords’. Greenwood concluded by strongly affirming that ‘The members, whatever political views they held, had endeavoured to uphold all the traditions of Masonry, and he was convinced they had succeeded’. A number of distinguished masonic visitors attended the meeting, including a representative from New South Wales and members of Warne’s mother lodge, Insuranto. This again illustrates how the meeting was far from being a gathering of a Labour coterie to discuss the forthcoming Labour leadership election.

To judge from the report in the *Freemason*, not only was there no overt political discussion at this meeting, but there would have been little time for any plotting in a packed evening of masonic ritual, dinner and lengthy speeches. This would perhaps not have been enough to convince Dalton that there had not been any masonic manoeuvres against Morrison, but closer analysis of the voting figures suggest that the
masonic influence was unlikely to have been decisive in the outcome of the election. Only ten members of the lodge (including Greenwood himself) were Labour MPs in November 1935, a tiny proportion of Labour’s total parliamentary strength of 154. The vote for Greenwood in the first round of the leadership election was 33, and it seems that of these 30 switched to Attlee. At least twenty of those who voted for Greenwood and then Attlee were not members of New Welcome. In short, by whatever permutation of the voting figures, there were simply not enough sitting MPs who were members of New Welcome to have influenced the outcome one way or the other. Even if all the members of New Welcome had supported Morrison in the first ballot, he still would have secured fewer votes than Attlee. In any case, as has been seen, the lodge was at this time beginning to lose its predominantly Labour Party character. It appears that, far from being the ‘scandal’ suggested by Dalton, New Welcome Lodge was instead, as Arthur Greenwood put it in a speech on the occasion when Frederick Roberts and others received the masonic degree of Fellow Craft, ‘a haven where [members of the lodge] could cut clean away from politics and come together in a spirit of real brotherhood’.

APPENDIX ONE

Correspondence supporting the petition for the establishment of New Welcome Lodge

The following letters from William Appleton and Percy Rockcliff to Sir Philip Colville Smith are preserved with the petition for New Welcome Lodge in the Library and Museum of Freemasonry, London.

1

Letter from Appleton to Colville Smith, 5 December 1928

Please let me say how much I appreciated the conversation we had on Friday evening last.

Since then, I have talked very frankly with a fellow Mason who mixes very freely amongst the ordinary workmen. We have come to no definite conclusions because we are faced with questions of expense and also the more important question of securing the right type of men. Perhaps after further consideration and enquiry, I might write you again.

2

Letter from Rockcliff to Colville Smith, 15 January 1929

Bro. W.A. Appleton and myself are giving earnest thought to the subject of the proposed new Lodge and have compiled a list of names for final selection. I am also hoping to be able to draft at an early date the memorandum in support of the granting of a charter thereto.

I trust to be in a position to write you further within the next fortnight.
At the recent consecration of the High Cross Chapter, a ceremony at which you assisted, the Rev. Prebendary Perry, P[ast] G[rand] C[haplain], in the course of the oration, spoke of the difficulty, particularly in non-rural areas, of spreading the practice of Masonry amongst the less wealthy members of the community. Later in the evening, you also adverted to the subject and expressed the very definite opinion that Masonry would not only exercise a beneficent influence upon social outlooks, but would also provide opportunities for the expression and gratification of certain very human, but entirely commendable instincts. The Right Worshipful P[rovincial] G[rand] M[aster] also expressed interest in, and approval of, the desire to develop our Order in the direction indicated.

What was said that evening has been seriously considered by brethren who are anxious to promote the aims adumbrated at the High Cross consecration. One has already volunteered to meet the costs of foundation, and out of very extensive Masonic experience, has made many suggestions for the economic administration of the Lodge, if and when it is constituted.

Economic administration is, indeed, a matter of serious importance if the better social type of manual and clerical worker is to be encouraged. Many of these would, undoubtedly, welcome Masonry, and would enter without importunity, but they have families to bring up, and it seems certain that Grand Lodge would regard as contrary to the spirit of Masonry, any course which might be detrimental to the children of such men.

It is hoped, that by paying the Tyler a fee per meeting, to eliminate his usual profit on the purchase of clothing; and, by care, in other directions, to bring down the first year costs to new entrants to a sum not exceeding £5 5/-; this to include;

(a) Initiation fee (covering Grand Lodge dues)
(b) Clothing when M[aster] M[ason]
(c) First year’s subscription to the Lodge

It is suggested that the Lodge shall be named the Lodge of Citizenship; or, alternatively, the Citizenship Lodge; but those who are seeking to crystallise the idea adumbrated on the night of the High Cross consecration, would gladly consider names which experience suggests would be more suitable.

It is recognised that the annual subscription must necessarily be kept at a low figure and that, since meetings must be fairly frequent if the new Lodge is to achieve something of its purpose within a reasonable measure of time, the menu provided, following the meetings, must be of that simple and homely character which is, even today, associated with some provincial, and many rural Lodges.

It is also recognised that the securing of dining facilities in Central London may present some difficulty, in view of the character of the meal to be provided, but the business and personal influence of those associated with the formation of the Lodge, will, it is believed, enable this difficulty (if it be such) to be overcome. Assuming it to be requisite to partake of a meal at a place apart from the meeting place of the Lodge, it is hoped that
Grand Lodge would be able to offer accommodation for the latter, if necessary, in the Temple at a reasonable fee.

One other matter has been present in the minds of the intending Founders, namely the support to be given to the Masonic Institutions. It is understood that no undue claim has been made upon the resources of those Institutions by members of the Army and Navy Lodges, and every endeavour will be made to inculcate, amongst those who join the new Lodge, the spirit of self-help and benevolence through the formation of a Masonic Charitable Association (or the utilisation of an existing one), and the collection of contributions thereto, within the means of the contributors, at stated (short) periods.

It is hoped that the foregoing will be sufficient to secure the promise of a Charter following upon the presentation of a Petition in the usual way. If, however, further information is required, W Bro. Percy Rockliff Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies (Secretary to the Joint Committee of Approved Societies and well-known in the Friendly Society world — the thrifty section of the industrial community) and myself would be glad to confer on the subject with the authorities at Freemasons’ Hall.

It is believed that the Insuranto Lodge No. 3733 would, if required, sponsor the new Lodge.

In conclusion, the promoters trust that Grand Lodge would give the new Lodge a good ‘send-off’ by the presence, at its consecration, of some of the principal officers, and thereafter continue to show, by attendance at its meetings, sustained interest in its future progress on the course mapped out for itself.

4

Letter from Rockliff to Colville Smith, 5 February 1929

The idea underlying the formation of the proposed Lodge is to bring home to the industrial section of the community the principles and tenets of the Craft.

It is doubtless true that, in rural areas, social barriers are to some extent broken down in certain lodges which exist in those areas. But, as regards great centres of population, the same position can hardly be said to obtain.

It is recognised that a Lodge of the character proposed, if centred in London, would be to some extent localised as regards the area from which it could draw recruits without involving its members in substantial travelling expenses. It has, however, been shewn by the Epworth Lodge, for example, that offshoots into the provinces of a successful Lodge, having a definite purpose are both possible and popular; and this is anticipated as regards the Lodge of Citizenship.

The type of recruits to Masonry which it would be the aim of the new Lodge to attract are persons who, by permeating the ranks of the industrial classes, would become missioners for and exemplars of the advantages which Masonry confers, not only upon its members, but upon those with whom its members come into daily contact — ‘So that when a man is said to be a Mason the world may know etc...’
Moreover it is strongly felt by the promoters that Masonry would exercise a steadying influence (‘as citizens of the world’) upon those who are brought within its fold, and help to render nugatory any unsettling influences which might be at work in factories and elsewhere.

5

Letter from Percy Rockcliff accompanying the formal petition for New Welcome Lodge, 1 August 1929

In sending you the enclosed petition for a new lodge — the Lodge of Citizenship — I beg to say that some of the signatories thereto were impressed, at a recent Consecration, by an oration delivered by a Past Grand Chaplain, in which he referred particularly to the difficulty of spreading a knowledge of the principles and practice of Freemasonry amongst other than wealthy members of the community in crowded urban areas.

It is felt by the promoters of the new lodge that, with the upward trend in Lodge fees which has been observed for some years past, desirable citizens, who would welcome association with the Craft, have been deterred from joining.

The aim of the promoters of the lodge will be to preserve such a dignity about its proceedings as to make membership of it desirable and, at the same time, to practise such economies on its administrative side as to enable its fees to be maintained at a reasonable figure.

It is intended to use the facilities afforded by one of the Masonic Benevolent Associations to ensure easy, yet withal systematic, support by the Lodge members of the Charitable Institutions connected with the Craft.

In order also that those entering into association with Masonry through the lodge, may not be debarred for a long period from serving the lodge, it has been agreed by the Founders that, apart from the first Worshipful Master (whose selection is necessary because no Founder other than a Past Master has served the office of Warden for a year), no one who has already passed the Chair shall proceed through the Chair of the new Lodge. This fact in a measure accounts for the restriction which the Founders have imposed upon themselves and their friends as regards the number of Founders.

With respect to the name chosen for the new Lodge, if any difficulty is presented thereby, may I submit as alternatives

(a) The 1929 Lodge (to mark the year of its founding)
(b) The Civitas Britannicus Lodge (there is already a Civitas and several Britannic Lodges — but no combination of the two)
(c) The New Citizen Lodge (There is already one Citizen Lodge).

APPENDIX TWO

Membership of New Welcome Lodge No. 5139, 1929–1939.

Details of membership are taken from the register of the United Grand Lodge of England. When a member is initiated into a lodge, or becomes a joining member from
another lodge, the lodge secretary is required to send the appropriate form to Grand Lodge so that the individual can be registered as a member of that lodge. Information in the Grand Lodge register is derived from these returns. Additional information about masonic offices is taken from reports in the masonic newspaper The Freemason, from the returns made by the lodge, and from the brochure issued in March 1980 by New Welcome Lodge to celebrate its fiftieth anniversary. Information about public offices is taken from Who's Who, Times obituaries and Michael Stenton and Stephen Lees (eds.), Who’s Who of British Members of Parliament: a Biographical Dictionary of the House of Commons, Hassocks, Harvester Press, 1976–1981, unless otherwise stated. To give an idea of the changes in the character of the lodge, the following is a list of members of lodge in the order in which they joined the lodge. *Founders*: Rockcliff; Rev. H. Dunnico; Short; Royle; Smith; G. W. Canter; J. W. Bowen; Burnes; Makepeace; Sitch; Warne. 1929: Young; Shillaker; Compton; Henderson. 1930: Tout; Lindsay; Holmes; Wilshire; McKeigue; Hayes; R. Bowen; Stambois; Kershaw; G. W. G. Canter; Gilpin; Ammon; Ames. 1931: Malone; Greenwood; Haycock; Roberts; Bellamy; Mason; Mills; J. P. Gardner, sen.; Muff; Adams; H. R. Dunnico; Bradley; Burton; Kenworthy; Sandell; Howell; Williams; Rosbotham; Hughes. 1932: Tillett; Hicks; Pusey; Tracey; Gibson. 1933: Kinnoull; Milner; J. P. Gardner, jun.; Nathan; Dobbie. 1934: Spence. 1935: Keir; Bellenger; Wilding; Lush; De Silva. 1936: Bowtell; Bolting; Morrison. 1937: Frankel; Goodman; Liddall. 1938: Truelove; Silkin; Robbins; Smith; Cant. 1939: Ashby; Isaacs.

**Adams, Albert Madge.** Initiated, 17 Apr. 1931. Described in Grand Lodge register as a commercial traveller of Earlsfield, age 47.


Bellamy, Albert MP, CBE, JP (1870–1931). Initiated, 13 Feb. 1931. Report of his initiation in The Freemason, 7 Mar. 1931, pp. 573–4. Railway engine-driver. Pres. of the Amalgamated Soc. of Railway Servants in 1911 and played an important part in the railwaymen’s strike of that year. First Pres. of NUR, 1913. Unsuccessful candidate for General Sec. of the NUR in 1917, the year in which he retired as Pres. Member of various War Pensions tribunals, 1917–27. Labour parliamentary candidate at Wakefield, 1918, 1922. Labour MP for Ashton-under-Lyne, 1928–31. Parliamentary Private Sec. to Rt. Hon. F. O. Roberts, Minister of Pensions, 1929–31. Roberts was initiated as a freemason at the same meeting of the lodge as Bellamy, and it was presumably for this reason that Bellamy decided to join the lodge. He was already extremely ill by the time he was initiated and died six weeks later.


Bolting, Ernest Charles MBE. Initiated, 13 Mar. 1936. WM, 1954. Also member of Fairmead Lodge No. 6894, Loughton, of which he was WM. House of Commons messenger.


Burnes, Charles William (d. 1945). A founder of lodge. Initiated in Insuranto Lodge No. 3733, 3 Jan. 1916 (where he was proposed by Rockliff), and WM, Insuranto Lodge, 1929. L[ondon] R[ank]. Formerly Sec. of Hearts of Oak Benefit Soc. (retired by 1929).


De Silva, Albert Edward. Initiated, 10 May 1935. Parliamentary clerk of W. Kensington, age 34.


Joined Newbury Park Lodge No. 4458 shortly after its foundation in 1922 and was
WM, 1931. Chaplain of Janus Lodge No. 4456, Loughton. Master of Isthmian Lodge
UGLE. Obituary in *The Freemason’s Chronicle*, 10 Oct. 1953, p. 116. Left school at the
age of 10 to work in factory, but, teaching himself, obtained a scholarship at Nottingham
University. Became a baptist minister in 1902. Pres., Liverpool Free Church Council,
1914. Pres., Liverpool Labour Party and Liverpool Fabian Soc. Labour MP for Consett
(Durham) 1922–1931. Deputy Speaker and Deputy Chairman of House of Commons
Committee of Ways and Means 1929–31. Unsuccessfully contested Wednesbury as
National Labour candidate in 1935. Sec. of the International Peace Soc. from 1916,
and Hon. Warden of the Robert Browning Settlement, Southwark, from 1932.

**Dunnico, Herbert Rathbone** DL, JP (1910–82). Initiated, 8 May 1931. Only son of
Rev. Herbert Dunnico. A special dispensation was obtained so that he could be initiated
before the age of 21 while his father was WM of New Welcome Lodge. A report of his
UGLE. Past Z., Pitsea Chapter No. 4387, Essex. Assistant Prov. Grand Master of Mark
Masons, Essex, 1969–76, and held office in various other masonic orders. At the time of
his initiation, his father’s parliamentary sec. Warden, Robert Browning Settlement,
Commissioner of Inland Revenue from 1950.

**Frankel, Daniel** MP (1900–88). Joining member, 8 Jan. 1937. WM, 1950–1. Mayor of
Stepney, 1928–9. Member, LCC for Mile End, 1931–46. Labour MP for Mile End,
1935–45.

**Gardner, James Patrick** MP, JP (1883–1937). Initiated in New Welcome Lodge,
13 Mar. 1931. An architectural sculptor. Member of Hammersmith Borough Council

**Gardner, James Pius**. Initiated, 10 Mar. 1933. Described in the Grand Lodge register
as an insurance official, age 30, of Hammersmith. Apparently, the son of James Patrick
Gardner.

**Gibson, George** CH (1885–1953). Initiated, 8 Jul. 1932. Leaving Scotland to seek work
in England, he became an attendant at a mental hospital near Manchester. From 1913,
General Sec., National Asylum Workers’ Union. First General Sec. of COHSE on
its formation in 1946. Member of General Council, TUC, 1928–48, and Chairman,
1940–1.

**Gilpin, George Frederick** MBE. Initiated, 9 May 1930. WM, 1939–41. LGR. House
of Commons clerk.

Unionist parliamentary candidate at Bromley and Bow (against George Lansbury), 1929.


the Bedfordshire National Health Insurance Comm., 1912–48. Member of the National Savings Comm., 1916–45. Pres., National Incorporated Beneficent Soc. and Counties Benevolent Ass. Local Director, Commercial Union Assurance. Royle was Pres. of the New Tabernacle Provident Soc., of which Rockcliff was Sec., at the time of the establishment of New Welcome Lodge.\footnote{74}

**Sandell, Frederick James** BEM. Initiated, 2 Jun. 1931. House of Commons messenger.


**Sitch, Charles Henry** MP, JP (1887–1960).\footnote{77} A founder of the lodge. Initiated in Yarborough Lodge No. 554, 15 Mar. 1925. Studied at Ruskin College, where he was supported by a grant from the Chainmakers’ Ass. established by his father. Played a prominent part in trade union organisation in the Black Country before the First World War, serving as Sec. of the Hand-hammered Chain Branch of the National Federation of Women Workers, Sec. of the Anchormenss, Shackle and Shipping Tacklemakers Ass., and President of the South Staffordshire and Worcestershire Federation of Trades Councils. Succeeded his father as Sec. of the Chainmakers’ and Strikers’ Association in 1923. Elected Liberal member of Rowley Regis District Council, 1913, but resigned from Liberal party in 1916. Labour MP for Kingswinford (Staffordshire), 1918–31. His electoral defeat meant that his personal income was reduced to a mere £2 per week. In 1933, convicted of defrauding the funds of the Chainmakers’ Association and sent to prison for nine months. From 1937 until his death he was employed as a local organiser by *Reynolds’ News* (afterwards *Sunday Citizen*).


Stambois, Charles Edward Montague. Initiated, 11 Apr. 1930. Described in Grand Lodge register as cognac shipper aged 43 of Marlow. Stambois was a Russian émigré who was naturalised on 22 Sep. 1921. He contributed an article on ‘The Great Cognac Brandies’ to Harper’s Wine and Spirit Gazette in 1933. Presumably joined New Welcome Lodge to assist with catering arrangements.


Williams, Robert (1881–1936). Initiated, 10 Jul. 1931. Described in the Grand Lodge Register as ‘Publicity Officer’, age 50, resident in Kensington, and in a report of the meeting in The Freemason (1 Aug. 1931, p. 79) as publicity manager of the Daily Herald. Williams did not appear again after his initiation and automatically ceased membership on 14 July 1933, having paid no subscriptions to the lodge. Williams was at this time living on the charity of friends and perhaps was unable to afford the costs of membership of New Welcome lodge. A port labourer from Swansea, Williams was active in the National Amalgamated Labourers Union and was elected to Swansea Council in 1910. He became the first full-time Sec. of the National Transport Workers Federation in 1912. Williams sought during the period to 1918 to promote consolidated industrial representation in the transport industry. He welcomed the Russian revolution and opposed British military intervention in Russia. Stood as Labour parliamentary candidate in Aberafan in 1918, but joined the Communist party in 1920. Expelled from Communist party in 1921 after failing to support miners’ strike. From 1922, General Manager of Daily Herald, but lost this position in 1930 when TUC ceased to be sole proprietor. Wrote in support of National Government from 1931. Made precarious living as freelance journalist from 1931 and committed suicide in 1936.

Wilshire, Frederick Allan (1868–1944). Joining member from Tyndall Lodge No. 1363, Downend, and Western Circuit Lodge No. 3154, 14 Mar. 1930. Had little formal education, leaving school at 14. Had a successful career as a professional musician in the West Country before deciding in his late forties to read for the Bar. Called to the Bar in 1914 and joined the Western Circuit. Sat frequently as deputy crown court judge and deputy recorder, eventually being appointed Recorder of Bridgwater. President of the Bristol and District Brotherhood Federation, Pres. of Bristol and Clifton Dickens Federation, and President of Bristol Monday Musical Club. Presumably joined New Welcome Lodge to assist with entertainment.
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