

FILE NO. 134016

Protest

OF

Seattle League of Women Voters

vs proposed amendment

relating to employment of married women.

FILED DEC 24 1931

BY

ADDRESS

H. W. CARROLL

CITY COMPTROLLER AND EX-OFFICIO CITY CLERK

BY

CHURCH

DEPUTY

ACTION OF THE COUNCIL

REFERRED

DEC 28 1931

REFERRED

REPORTED

REPORTED

REF. FOR ORD.

JAN 4 1932

TO

JUDICIARY

TO

REPORT ADOPTED

REPORT ADOPTED

C. B.

ORD.

DISPOSITION

ON FILE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. President:

Your

JUDICIARY

Committee

to which was referred the within Protest

would respectfully report that we have considered the same and respectfully recommend that it be placed on file

CHAIRMAN

CHAIRMAN

WASHINGTON LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

463 STUART BUILDING

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

December 21, 1931

State Officers:

MRS. L. G. MURRAY, President
1402 East Sixty-Fifth St., Seattle
MRS. E. S. GOODWIN, Vice-President
MRS. F. M. APPEGATE, Vice-President
MRS. S. W. THURSTON, Secretary
MRS. ROSA KLINGENBERG, Treasurer

To the Honorable Members
Of the City Council,
Seattle, Washington

Gentlemen:

All women's organizations as well as women and men in general are deeply concerned in the proposed measure concerning the non-employment by the City of any husband whose wife is gainfully employed or of any wife whose husband is gainfully employed.

We ask you to consider very carefully this whole question before you place such a dark-ages' question before the voters of Seattle. The passage of such a measure would put Seattle so far back in the scale of common sense justice it would require years to recover its prestige among the up-and-coming cities of the United States. Nothing harms a city so much as the jeers and laughter of its sister cities and these would be ours in full measure were this proposed ordinance to pass.

It savors of class legislation and is most decidedly unfair for a municipality to say who shall and who shall not work. It would affect not only the City Hall employees but what about the street car men, the engineers, the firemen, policemen and park employees? Must these men, too, lose their jobs because their wives are trying to help out in the present crisis by doing work that others want done? It is not the way to end unemployment and Seattle should not set this example but work out a plan that will build up and not tear down.

We are very willing that the ex-service men - the majority of them - should have everything that is honestly coming to them, but to the "professional" ex-service man, the lobbyist, the one who plays upon the fact that he was overseas and therefore demands everything as his just dues we are not so sympathetic. We listen to him, but we also think at the same time.

Sincerely yours, *Kara A. Dickinson,*
(Mrs. E.O. Dickinson)

President Seattle League of
Women Voters