WAS FRANK CLARK REBUKED?

— Denies the Soft Impediment—Is a Candidate for Re-Election—The Miami Metropolis Refuses to Apologize and Hits Back.

Mr. Clark's Letter

EARLY this morning, Robert E. Clark, of the Republican primary and general campaign organizations, met the editors of the Miami Metropolis and declared that the paper was misrepresenting the views of the Republican party, and that it was impediment to the future success of the party to allow the paper to continue in its present position.
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