

THE DAILY GLOBE

IS PUBLISHED EVERY DAY AT NEWSPAPER ROW,

COR. FOURTH AND MINNESOTA STS.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF ST. PAUL.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

Payable in Advance.

Daily and Sunday, per Month \$5.00

Daily and Sunday, Six Months \$27.50

Daily and Sunday, One Year \$50.00

Daily Only, per Month \$1.40

Daily Only, Six Months \$7.25

Daily Only, One Year \$14.00

Sunday Only, One Year \$15.00

Weekly, One Year \$10.00

Address all letters and telegrams to THE GLOBE, St. Paul, Minn.

ADVERTISING OFFICE, ROOM 461, TEMPLE COURT BUILDING, NEW YORK.

WASHINGTON BUREAU, 1405 F ST. N. W.

Complete files of the Globe always kept on hand for reference.

WEATHER FOR TODAY.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—Forecast for Wednesday: Minnesota—Severe local thunderstorms; much cooler in southwest portion; winds shifting to westerly.

Wisconsin—Probably severe local thunderstorms; brisk and high southerly winds, shifting to westerly; cooler in southern and western portions.

North and South Dakota—Local thunderstorms; partly cloudy weather; westerly winds; cooler in eastern portion of South Dakota.

Montana—Local showers, followed by fair weather; northwesterly winds; warmer in northwest portion.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

United States Department of Agriculture, Weather Bureau, Washington, Aug. 4, 8:48 p. m. Local Time, 8 p. m. 75th Meridian Time.—Observations taken at the same moment of time at all stations.

TEMPERATURES.

Place. Temp. Wind. Min. Max. St. Paul. 52. 50. 42. 52.

Duluth. 58. 56. 48. 60. Duluth. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Huron. 58. 56. 48. 60. Huron. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Williston. 58. 56. 48. 60. Williston. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60. Sioux Falls. 58. 56. 48. 60.

Democratic than under Republican rule. Democratic principles, wherever we get back to them, lie at the foundation of good government. Neither has the Globe any hesitation about saying that a fusion between political parties is generally to be condemned. If they stand for the same ideas, one party will do. If they represent different ideas, then they can come together only at some sacrifice of principle; and the predominant motive must always be in such cases a division of the places in the gift of the people. Fusion, as the past has proved, as the future will prove again, is not an element of strength. And as to issues, free silver has no more to do with a state election in Minnesota or with the administration of the state's affairs than has the opinion of the governor-elect upon infant damnation or upon the authorship of the Shakespeare plays. Aside from this plank, the platform speaks well and boldly for the people; though we should have preferred to find its declarations less general and more specific. In the singular contest now opened, and especially after the demonstration against the sound money Democrats, every voter will exercise the liberty of individual choice in his selection of candidates for the various offices. Considering the blending of parties, the deliberate rearrangement of slates on both sides, and the utter disregard of party lines exhibited by candidates and convention, party ties will sit loosely and each man can follow his conscience.

MATCHES AND BISCUITS. One of the heaviest failures on "change, since Jay Cooke went to the wall twenty-three years ago, is that of the Moores, of Chicago and New York, whose smash has sent a thrill of fear through the speculative centers. We have had big failures in wheat deals where men took a short cut to wealth by trying to take all the wheat offered and were deluged by it, but this is a failure resulting from too much biscuits and matches. It involves not only the principals, but their brokers, and will strike hard the pockets of many wealthy men who backed their faith in the stocks with their money. Meanwhile, "change is filled with men wondering whether the break will go farther, and, if so, how far, and who and how many will be involved. The failure marks the culmination of one of the largest speculative ventures, based on an apparently invulnerable foundation. What could be safer than investments in the stock of the Diamond Match trust, holding a monopoly of the markets of this country in an article of indispensable use? Add to this the ownership of patents taken out abroad also, which, by the superiority of their process of manufacture, gave the trust the command of the foreign markets, enabling them to obtain from the French government a contract for the use of its devices at a rental of \$100,000 a year. What could be safer than that? No wonder that the managers thought that their \$11,000,000 of capital stock was but a reasonable valuation of such a property. No wonder the Moores, who financed the trust, felt that such a stock, so buttressed, paying dividends that made the stock a good investment at 130 to 170, was worth a good deal more, and that a big fortune awaited the successful promoting that would make it worth more. To this process they brought their skill and experience and exploited shrewdly the advantages in hand and in prospect until they made the investing public, eager for quick and big returns, hungry for shares as high as 248.

Then they imagined they had in the Biscuit trust stocks another thing out of which big money might be made in skillful hands. That, too, was a close monopoly, dividing with the American Biscuit company the entire country, with an inflated stock, but one capable of having value pumped into it. It was engaged in making a staple article with an immense market and a demand limited only by the dining tables of its territory. So the Moores began exploiting Biscuits along with their Matches, trusting to the power of the monopoly to compel the consumers to make good the values they chose to push the shares to. The rapacity that the trusts were born of infected the men who dealt in their stocks. There is no limit to money making when one has only to increase prices; the limit is reached, as many an adventurer in speculation has found to his cost, when more is offered than can be taken, for the compensating disadvantage is that all must be taken that is offered on the rise. Unfortunately for the Moores and their friends, from unexpected quarters came stock holders by men who thought the limit of the game was about reached. They could not keep up their margins and failed. Another name is added to the long list of our Napoleons of finance. The case calls for neither sympathy nor condolence. The consumers of biscuits and matches were being fleeced by the trust. A scheme to stretch the fleece was gone into. It failed and ruined the schemers. The trusts remain and flourish.

CONCERNING REGULARITY. It has been beautiful and instructive to observe the agonies of those Democrats who have made up their minds to support Bryan and Sewall and the Chicago platform when they brought themselves to contemplate the party irregularity of their old associates who had made up their minds, on the contrary, not to do anything of the kind. The inquiry of a Democrat who would not vote for a candidate labeled Democrat passed their comprehension. The crowning crime of all, however, in their estimation, was that a refusal to stand by the work of the Chicago convention might possibly assist in the election of Republicans to office. That was the unthinkable and unforgivable sin. Nobody, they have told us roundly and repeatedly, had any right to use the name of Democrat who would not stand by the work of the Chicago convention. The important offices were left vacant, and the full understanding that the state committee should place on the ticket the names presented by the Populist convention. By the same arrangement one presidential elector is a bolting free silver Republican, and the others are to be equally divided between the Democrats and the Populists.

The Globe has no hesitation in saying that it believes that the future of Minnesota would be brighter under

he be not dreaming; for, in looking over the list of those whom they delight to honor, and of those to whom they have assigned the management of their affairs, he finds that even those who pretend to be Democrats are distinctly in a minority. The ruling hand of this part of the country, at least, is the hand of the pledged and tried Republican. Mr. John Lind, the nominee of the combination for governor of Minnesota, whatever may be his other qualities, is, and pretends to be, a thorough-going Republican. He differs, it is true, with his party on the question of the free coinage of silver. But he will not assert that he has left it. He declares, with Senator Teller, that it is the party which has left him. He is still a Republican, and waiting only for the party to come back to the faith that he still maintains and cherishes.

The same thing is true in a still more marked degree of Mr. Charles A. Towne, who solicits the suffrages of the Democrats of the Sixth district of this state. He, too, is a pronounced Republican. He, too, for the moment, has cut loose from his party, while the financial question is at the front. He has never asserted, and will not assert, we imagine, that he is, or can become, any more of a Democrat than he has always been. He consents for the present to accept the assistance of Democratic votes if they are offered to him on a silver platform; but he is a Democrat only as far as Democracy and free silver have been tied up in the same package, and he owes no other allegiance, and will give no other assistance to the party of that ancient name. The same statement holds with reference to Mr. Frank A. Day, who is the candidate expecting to receive the support of the Democrats of the Second district. He has been one of the prominent Republicans of the state, and he is just as much a Republican today as he ever was. All of these men are rabid protectionists. Some of them would even try to out-McKinley McKinley himself. They are saturated with the paternalistic theory of government. They are Republicans to the very core of the spinal marrow, and are not even whitewashed with a thin coating of Democracy.

Now, if a man who refuses to vote for Mr. Bryan is not "regular" in his Democracy, because he is giving aid and comfort to the Republican cause, what on earth are we to say of the man who, while supporting enthusiastically a Republican for governor and a Republican for his representative in congress, claims that he is the only original, simple, pure, life-everlasting Democratic Immortelle? Where does his regularity come in? And where are we at this year, anyhow? Who are the regulars and who are the irregulars? Where have the Democratic candidates all gone to? With tickets made up in the proportion of about five bolting Republicans, four Populists and one Democrat for every ten places that are to be filled, it strikes us that the less said about "regularity" in the Democratic faith the better. It is a queer year in politics; representing the break-up of party foundations. But if there is any reproach against any Democrat for giving up his party ticket, or for assisting to elect a Republican, it certainly does not lie in the mouth of those who have themselves nominated Republicans for their own candidates to utter it.

ANSWERS ITSELF. We do not think it necessary to reply to any length to the communication published elsewhere on "The price of silver bullion under free coinage." To a careful reader it will carry with it its own reply and refutation. The writer, who is thoroughly in earnest and who, we doubt not, means to be fair, confuses two exceedingly different things. He quotes the Globe as saying that under free coinage the nine owners could force their product upon their debtors under a legal tender act in payment of obligations at the rate of \$1.29 per ounce. This is true. A little further on, however, he glides gently into a very different statement, namely, "that under free coinage silver will be worth \$1.29 an ounce." These two propositions may seem the same to him, or he may have been deceived by a mere verbal similarity; but one by no means follows from the other. That silver bullion, as a whole, would rise under free coinage to \$1.29 per ounce, we not only do not believe, but we think that the contrary is as well demonstrated as any fact which "es in the future can be. The Globe has already shown how, under the operation of the Sherman purchase act, in 1890, which absorbed practically the entire product of this country, the market price of bullion went on falling. We presume that, under free coinage, the price of silver would rise somewhat above its present value. Just how far, no one can say in advance. But that the vast stocks of the metal already on hand and the stimulated additions to production could be doubled in value, although not obtaining access to the mints, by reason of the insufficient facilities for coinage, is more than improbable. The advantage of the bullion producer would lie in the fact that he could get his silver coin and then pay debts with it at the rate of \$1.29 per ounce. He could do that the same if the price of silver bullion remained in the market at 69 cents per ounce. The injustice of it where the creditor is concerned is clearly apparent.

To use another illustration, congress might pass a law enacting that all bricklayers and carpenters employed on federal buildings throughout the country should receive \$10 per day in wages. They would then, unquestionably, get \$10. It would be so much additional in their pockets, but it would be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers. It would create an artificial distinction between them and other private workers similarly engaged under private wages, but it would not raise the wages of bricklayers and carpenters not engaged by the government to \$10 per day, or advance them perceptibly over the current market rate. It would be as unjust to say, in such a case, that the wage rate in these employments was \$10 per diem,

simply because a certain favored class could get it by order of the government, as it is to say, in the other case, that "silver would advance to \$1.29 per ounce," because a certain favored class was authorized by the government to take that much for it from other people.

"The Colorado silver miner's dollar" is made out of "silver" that he digs from the earth, and for which it is proposed that the government should authorize him to acquire twice its market value. "The Minnesota farmer's dollar" is obtained by exchange for the products of his soil, which the government does not enhance in price or authorize him to charge any "more" for than anybody else. Money, in the wide sense of the term in which, with the wonderful machinery of exchanges all over the world, we might consider it, is not "American" or "British," or local or national, in any sense, but international. That is why we cannot upset the world's standard at our pleasure. Of all the logical fallacies that lie at the bottom of the free coinage movement we think that the assumption that silver would forthwith advance in the market to a \$1.29 per ounce is least warranted by facts, or by the results of past experience.

EXTENDING THE LOOP. The ordinance introduced last night relative to an extension of the loop by the street railway company to Broadway revives a subject whose persistent agitation shows that the people are deeply interested. The project has now been under consideration for a long time, and has before it the approval of the people's representatives. There is a very general desire, especially on the part of our business interests, to see the loop extended so as to carry the lines that use it through the heart of the wholesale district. Some thousands of persons would find their convenience better served, while the mere fact of a nearer approach to the union depot would be of itself no slight gain. It is practically certain that the change will be made sooner or later, because it is in the interest of a completer and a more satisfactory service. Since this is true, it might as well be made at once, before the progress of repaving has added to the difficulty and cost. While the concessions asked by the street railway company in return are excessive, some basis of agreement can no doubt be reached. We believe that if a vote were to be taken a large majority of our people would favor the proposed extension of the loop; while the representative business men of the district, lying below Jackson street are practically solid in its favor. The city authorities should leave nothing in their power undone to promote an improvement that is so earnestly desired and is believed to be so strongly in the public interest.

DOWN ON BRYAN. Georgia Populists Want a Candidate of Their Own. ATLANTA, Ga., Aug. 4.—Statements made by the leaders of the People's party who are assembled here for the state convention show that Senator Jones' interview, which the Southern Populists consider a repudiation of themselves, has completely changed the situation. The People's party leadership here today announced that they will endorse the St. Louis platform, and Watson's nomination, but will call for the nomination of a Populist in place of Bryan. On national affairs, the platform will probably endorse the St. Louis platform, deprecate the fact that the People's party has not been met in the same spirit as it displayed toward the Democrats in the nomination of Bryan, and call upon the national committee to put out a straight-out Populist candidate for president. On state questions, it will declare for free silver and an honest count and a state dispensary law.

THIRTY SOUND STATES. All Are to Be Represented at the Indianapolis Conference. INDIANAPOLIS, Aug. 4.—It was today definitely settled that the meeting of the national committee of the gold standard Democrats here Friday shall be held in the city of Indianapolis. The Commercial club, Ex-Congressman W. D. Bynum, the Indiana member of the executive committee, has received consent from the members of the committee that the change from one of the hotels to the club rooms shall be made. The members of the committee are engaged in rooms at the hotels. The members of the assembly held by the Democrats of the party of the country will be represented by men whose opinions will be regarded as valuable. Mr. Bynum here today announced that the original estimate of thirty states still held good, and that the representation would be here to attend the Independent Democratic gold meeting.

Two Badger Nominees. BELLOIT, Wis., Aug. 4.—H. A. Cooper was nominated by the Republican First district convention today. WEST SUPERIOR, Wis., Aug. 4.—John J. Jenkins was nominated by the Republicans of the Tenth district this afternoon.

Medics Will Meet. Special to the Globe. OWATONNA, Minn., Aug. 4.—The Southern Minnesota Medical association will meet here on Thursday in its annual session.

WITH INTENT TO AMUSE. He—There is one thing that always goes to my head whenever I touch it. She—What that? He—My hat.—Harper's Weekly.

"Why," asked the casual observer, "did you shoot that tenderfoot?" "Because," replied the chairman of the Civic Federation, always glad to supply reasonable information, "the would otherwise have died of consumption, and we are the only ones who could have saved his health resort, you know."—Detroit Free Press.

Did not speak for Bryan. NOT ABLE TO SAY WHAT THE BOY ORATOR INTENDS DOING. FAULKNER FEARS A CLASS ISSUE. He Charges the Republican Campaign Managers With Foreing It on the Country.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—The Democratic congressional committee headquarters have become a rendezvous for Democratic leaders up to the national headquarters are established. Chairman Jones was at work there early on his mail. Later Chairman Faulkner, of the congressional committee was joined by Senator Gorman, Senator Stewart, ex-Gov. Black, president of the association of Democratic clubs, Chairman Chilton, of the West Virginia state committee, and Representative Capehart, of West Virginia. The talk was on general politics, although Senators Gorman and Faulkner went into secret session on certain branches of campaign work. Mr. Faulkner and his associates expressed satisfaction with the results in Alabama and at Brunswick, Md., yesterday, where the Democrats carried the town. In speaking of the general status of the campaign, Chairman Faulkner said: "I am beginning to fear that our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between corporations and wealth on one hand, and the poor people on the other—in short, a class issue. That is the danger ahead, and we have not sought such an issue. We have been willing to discuss an economic question. But our opponents will force the issue away from one economic question and make it an issue between