

Wed. 6/1/99.

AL/1545

32 ADDISON ROAD,

KENSINGTON, W.

Private

Dear Mrs Fawcett.

I want you to write privately to Arthur. I know he is in favour of no-men being aldermen, on the ground that they can then sit without a certified election.

Finlay is against it, because he says it makes the whole thing ridiculous (I have told him he is an ass!) He asked me if I wd be

content with their being Council-  
cillors of the sd of wd. to be  
 $\frac{1}{2}$  a loaf, & that I did not  
think honourable office, would  
of much, as the voting po-  
wers are the same. How-  
ever Mrs Stanbury pointed  
out to me the very point, I  
hear Arthur likes, that  
we sh. lose the services  
of certain women who will  
stand if there were no  
contests. I believe it is  
rather doubtful whether

they can be elected Alder-  
men. I understand Albert  
says they can. Friday tho'  
not sure, thinks not. In fact  
the whole question of the  
election of women, slipped  
the notice of the framers of  
the Bill.

I want to notice  
the point that their eligibility  
as Aldermen is dubious,  
but merely to say, that you  
hope as their position of  
Councilors is assured (wh.  
it is) while the honou of  
the thing is nothing, we  
sh. value it as enabling  
us perhaps to get the

services of certain women  
who might not otherwise  
stand. I might instance  
Miss O. Hill. The point  
is clearly going to be pressed  
in the House by friends &  
foe. I send you a letter of  
mine you may not have seen  
Don't return it. There is  
~~another~~ another stupid 'note'  
today in the Standard, & I  
have written another short  
letter, but doubt their putting  
it in. Monday before Easter  
is the day fixed for the 2<sup>nd</sup>  
reading - for us all round, he  
Salisbury is keenly

AL/1545 cont

52 ADDISON ROAD,  
KENSINGTON, W.

is always a brick!

I was deeply interested  
in the Vacc. article. I mean  
to get Arthur to read it.

I find the press cutting  
I meant to send you, has  
accidentally been destroyed