

BUTLER CITIZEN

JOHN H. & W. C. NEBLEY, PROP'RS. Entered at the Postoffice at Butler as second-class matter.

Republican State Ticket.

FOR GOVERNOR. JAMES A. BEAVER, of Centre county. FOR JUDGE OF SUPREME COURT. WILLIAM H. RAWLE, of Philadelphia.

COUNTY TICKET.

FOR CONGRESS. J. D. MCJUNKIN, Butler. FOR ASSEMBLY. WILLIAM P. BRAHAM, Mercer township. JOSEPH T. DONLY, Butler.

FOR JURY COMMISSIONER. ROBERT MCCLUNG, Fairview township.

GABRIELI, the illustrious Italian patriot is dead, aged 75.

REPUBLICANS of Venango county have renominated the Hon. J. W. Lee for the State Senate, and W. P. Smith, Henry James and W. J. Hulings, for the Assembly.

GUITEAU is beginning to realize the situation. He has permitted a clergyman to his cell and listened to prayer. He says his only hope now is in President Arthur for a pardon.

A NUMBER of delegates throughout the State decline to return and give new life to the Harrisburg Convention, believing it dead and without power to act. This is our view of the matter.

The Petrolia Record of the 10th inst. in referring to the Congressional nomination for this district, says very truly, that, "According to the rule that has been followed in this district for the last ten years the nomination belongs to Butler county."

The advice of Hon. John Cessna, late Chairman of the State Committee; of Thomas M. Marshall, and of others, in support of the policy of a new State Convention, will be seen in our paper this week, following and sustaining the letter of the Hon. Geo. Lear.

MR. ACHESON, a delegate from Washington County to the late Harrisburg State Convention, refuses to attend the recalled Convention of the 21st inst. He considers it a defunct body, having adjourned sine die, and says you might as well attempt to recall the Continental Congress as it.

The Republicans of Crawford county held their County Convention last Wednesday. The result of the primaries of the previous day showed a majority in the County of near 700 for the Hon. W. B. Roberts for Congress. Messrs. Tyler and Derrickson, old members, and Messrs. Slocum and Oliver, were the successful candidates for the Assembly.

The Convention passed a resolution favoring a new State Convention, for the purpose of reconciling present difficulties in the State, by the nomination of one State ticket upon which both wings of the party could unite. Neither of the present State tickets were endorsed, or in anywise referred to, except as above.

GENERAL LEAR'S LETTER. The earnest attention of the Republicans of this county is directed to the letter of the Hon. George Lear, found in another place.

Mr. Lear was the President of what is known as the Harrisburg Republican State Convention, of May 10, and it is this fact that gives to his letter a special importance. It seems he was requested to recall that Convention, for the purpose of filling the vacancy on the ticket made by the Hon. Thomas M. Marshall, of Pittsburgh, declining to accept the nomination for Congressman-at-Large on it. This recall he refused to make, on the ground that the old Convention over which he presided, had adjourned sine die, (without day), and thus was dead, neither he or anybody else having power to re-assemble it. Then Mr. Cooper, Chairman of the State Committee appointed by that old Convention, takes upon himself the power to recall it, fixing June 21, as the time. This then brings forth the letter of Mr. Lear, in which he discusses the whole situation. He argues for a new Convention. We have been doing the same, ever since the second Republican State Convention was held, known now as the Philadelphia Convention of May 24. We believe with Gen. Lear that this is the only road out of the trouble in which the party finds itself. Let both Chairmen of the State Committee unite in this call for a new Convention; and also let the candidates, as now on both State tickets, unite in requesting this call for a new Convention. This will secure but one ticket, and union and harmony will follow. The Republican party can elect one State ticket, but it cannot elect two. Any other course than union now will be blindness and folly, and certain defeat.

We give the opinions of other eminent Republicans also on this matter, all agreeing with Mr. Lear. If there should be any of the old delegates who obey the Cooper call, which they need not and should not do, then let them, instead of filling any vacancy, proceed to find out the way to harmony and union, and propose it in the interest of but one ticket and peace. If they lead in this direction we have no doubt all questions can be amicably adjusted and but one State ticket be before the party.

LEAR'S LETTER TO COOPER.

An Open Letter in which the Harrisburg Chairman Explains Sound Logic and Sound Sense to the Benefit of Republicans.

Hon. George Lear, Chairman of the Harrisburg Convention, furnished The Press with the following open letter to Chairman Cooper: DOYLESTOWN, Pa., June 3, 1882. My Dear Sirs:—Mr. E. G. Harrison, the Bucks county member of the Republican State Committee, has forwarded to me your notice of a call upon the delegates to the Republican State Convention held at Harrisburg on the 10th of May, to meet again on the 21st of June, for the purpose of nominating a Congressman-at-Large, purporting to be by order of the State Committee, and signed by you as Chairman. Mr. Harrison informs me that, although the notice is within three-fourths of an hour's ride of the Harrisburg Headquarters, and always willing to attend any meeting of the Committee, he had no notice of any such meeting as that one was held.

Until I received this information, I supposed there had been a call for the meeting of the Convention ordered by the Committee, although in my view of the matter it is not important whether the order by the Committee was actual or constructive. My reasons for not recognizing and obeying any such call are already partially understood; but as I shall not attend the Convention, I propose to state them more fully, and as an explanation for my absence, and especially the delegates, I will communicate with you through the medium of the public press.

The reasons are based both upon principle and policy, and grow out of the peculiar political complications of this campaign. The Republican party of the State is divided into two sections, one under the Regular organization, and the other on an Independent basis; and while the former has the prestige of regularity according to ancient customs, the latter is of sufficient magnitude to be feared, and of such substantial character as to command respect.

And what is remarkable about these two branches of the party, they both subscribe to the same political faith, cherish the same principles of public policy, and equally admire the achievements and are proud of the history of the great Republican party; and, moreover, they have both placed in nomination candidates for State offices whose characters are without reproach, and whose qualifications are above the common.

Under such circumstances what is the difficulty which separates them? THE PEACE CONFERENCE DISREGARDED. The principal, if not the only, question between the contending parties which have caused this unfortunate division are the modes of making appointments to offices and the manner of selecting delegates to nominating conventions. It is not so much charged that official duties are imperfectly or improperly performed as that the appointments are made in the interests of increasing or perpetuating their power, and that conventions for the nomination of candidates are packed with delegates for the same purpose by methods inconsistent with a fair representation of the Republican masses, and that such conventions do not express the just sentiments of the people.

The justness of these allegations were recognized and admitted by the Peace Conference, to which you were a party, by the declaration of a new code of party principles, and the adoption of new rules and regulations for the selection and government of delegates to nominating conventions, which principles and regulations were adopted as part of the platform by the Regular Convention, held at Harrisburg May 10. They were presented to the party as a peace offering in answer to the charges of favoritism, partiality and injustice, and they were sanctioned and adopted with the same unanimity with which the candidates were nominated, and were proclaimed to the people that their rights would be respected, and that they should be heard at the nominating conventions as well as at the polls. Good faith requires that this compact between that Convention and the people shall be rigorously maintained in letter and spirit. Any other course will be equivalent to an attempt to obtain votes under false pretenses, and would be tantamount to the voters as an insult to their intelligence and a fraud upon their rights.

Having nominated a ticket and adopted a platform containing the rules above referred to, the Convention adjourned sine die, and passed out of existence. Among the rules it was resolved and ordered that delegates to nominating conventions should be elected in the several districts as candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives are nominated. Within two weeks after the adjournment of the Convention there was a vacancy on the ticket by the declination of Mr. Marshall, and the question was at once asked, how shall we fill it? The answer which I gave was that it must be done by a new convention composed of delegates elected under the rules adopted by the old one, and I gave notice that if any other course was attempted there would be trouble.

THE COMMITTEE ACTING WITHOUT POWER. The State Committee is a body created by and subordinate to the convention, and, in carrying out the members to reconvene after their terms have expired, and when they are powerless to act of their own volition, the creature assumes to be greater than its creator, and to have the power to galvanize a defunct body into a spasmodic existence to perform a particular act under circumstances of instructions. It now becomes a question for each delegate to decide for himself whether he is willing to obey the call and by his act to give credence to and confirm the charge which has been industriously circulated that the new rules were adopted only as a bait for votes, and intended as a cheat and a fraud upon the Republican voters of the State, and that the vote which he gave for the platform was an act of insincerity on his part. Whatever use any other member of the party may feel at liberty to make of the action of the Convention in adopting these rules, it is requiring too much to ask the delegates who were parties to their adoption to stultify themselves by repudiating them upon the first opportunity.

So far as I am concerned, I propose to keep faith with the people to whom we made the pledge that they should have a fair opportunity to be represented in nominating conventions, and I am unable to see why every man should not carry the same good faith and fair dealing into politics which he practices in business, and which substantial and successful business men everywhere find not only to accord with their conscientious convictions, but to insure to their interests a decided advantage to pursue.

Even so, no reason why a caucus should be a tournament of sharp practices and political tricks, to beguile and deceive the people, especially in the Republican party. The substantial strength of that party lies in the vast business and financial interests which can be preserved only by its success, and which would be jeopardized, if not destroyed, by Republican defeat. These considerations have sustained the party for years, even in defiance of the ambitious projects and base uses which designing men have made of this assured and inherent strength.

GOOD ADVICE TO SENATOR COOPER. Like a man of robust constitution, the politicians, assuming that they were the party, have presumed upon their inherent strength and vitality to make overdrains upon its resources until it has shown symptoms of prostration. For this reason the party is inclined to remove every just cause of dissatisfaction; and, recognizing that fact, the new rules were adopted, and in addition to their eminent fairness and the imperative demand upon everyone concerned in their adoption to sustain them, they should be put in practical effect at the first opportunity as it is admitted, and the duty to enforce them is as apparent as it is imperative. It is the one question above all others upon which the public mind is sensitive—Should we actively aggravate or earnestly strive to allay this irritation? I am not in favor of submitting to unreasonable demands; but it is wise to appreciate the importance of the inevitable, and it is politic as well as just to be consistent and straightforward.

What was last year a mere fissure is now a broad chasm. It is wiser to take the full measure of our weakness than to over-estimate our strength. I have no doubt it is true that you have seen but few people who are in favor of a new convention, and I have seen only one, and that you are not in favor of it, and this probably results from the fact that people who talk to us on the subject tell us what they think we would like to hear. It is sometimes wholesome to hear what we do not like, and, therefore, I write you this letter. Too much confidence sometimes begets recklessness, and the most salutary lessons are often taught by the communication of unpleasant truths.

THE POLITICIANS NOT THE PARTY. The absence of any one to speak a few unpleasant truths to Senator Cameron at his conference with his friends when he was in Philadelphia recently was a misfortune; but he called to my attention only those of his way of thinking and acting, or such as his peculiar manner subdued into silence.

By order of J. D. McJunkin, Chairman. THOMAS V. COOPER, Chief Clerkman. What would be the effect of such a proclamation, and how many would obey the call? It would be a repetition of the boast of Owen Glendower, who said he could "call spirits from the vasty deep"; but they would not come. And yet all intelligent people read, and all in that way, and understand it. Do you think that this shattered party at a time when it had nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed? And is this to be the parallel to the people at a time when it has nearly shaken loose from Cameronism, and emancipated itself from the yoke, can stand this renewal of supercilious dictation? Is there no man in the State to be consulted, and but one to be obeyed