

emies of the administration say. Unfriendly coppers were placed in the two districts, where vice has had its sway for years. Then if a kick comes

on the way things are run the administration can "clean up the force" by firing a few captains who are not liked.

## MARY McDOWELL OF STOCKYARDS DISTRICT TELLS WHY SHE'S FOR WILSON

Mary McDowell of the University of Chicago settlement, "back of the yards," joined the Wilson Independence league today. As a worker for the minimum wage laws, 8-hour day, city sanitation, Miss McDowell is known in Illinois and Chicago to thousands. Four years ago she was a live, fighting Progressive backer of Roosevelt. She tells here why she's for Wilson now:

By Mary McDowell

I am going to cast my first presidential vote for Mr. Wilson—not because I am a Democrat, but because I am an independent—and this is a time to forget parties.

I have come to this conclusion after long consideration, consultation and reading of papers mostly critical of Wilson policies.

I have considered the "mistakes and blunders" and balanced them with his accomplishments, some of which seem to me remarkable.

No president since Lincoln has had such tremendous problems thrust at him from every angle; many decisions had to be made without precedents. He made some mistakes. He proved himself human.

But there was one supreme and irrecoverable mistake Mr. Wilson did not make, and for this I give him my vote. Mr. Wilson did not pick Mexico when it was "ripe for our picking." South America, Europe and Mexico needed to have proof given them that as a nation we were not for aggression, although a group among us is working all the time for preparedness for this purpose.

Mr. Wilson stood the test in the face of an aggressive, organized and commercialized public opinion. In

his Mexican policy, with all its questionable mistakes, he stood always against a "war for aggression" and a "war for the protection of private interests."

In his painful and difficult negotiations with the European belligerents he has not adopted the cheap policy of "bluffing," nor has he involved us in war. He has endeavored throughout to stand for constructive internationalism. His declaration at the meeting of the League to Enforce Peace, that he believes it to be America's obligation to lead in the establishment of an international organization for the preservation of the world's peace marks a new departure in American diplomacy.

Mr. Wilson's legislative program is remarkable. The rural credits law and the federal reserve act, excellent as I know them to be, are not measures the necessity for which I have learned from my own experience. The need for a workman's compensation act, however, is brought home to me almost daily. Mr. Wilson's leadership has given up a law covering the federal service. He has recognized through the amendment of the anti-trust act that labor is not a commodity.

The child labor law, which Mr. Beveridge urged a Republican congress to pass five or six years ago, should win for Mr. Wilson the support of all women who have worked for its passage in state and nation for many years. It is the entering wedge in national legislation looking toward the establishment of "social and industrial justice" for which we Progressives labored in 1912.

I read with new hope Mr. Wilson's statement that the justice of the