Eupepsia TABLETS

PROMOTE DIGESTION AND CURE DYSPEPSIA!

Your money back if they fail to give immediate relief and cure permanently Indigestion, Dyspepsia and all troubles arising from disordered conditions of the stomach.

Price 50c a box. Every box contains two weeks' treatment. Druggists sell them. Forwarded by mail, if desired, on receipt of 50c in postage stamps by

THE EUPEPSIA CO.,
323 CLARK AVENUE, St. Louis, MO.

JUDGE TAFT HEADS NEW COMMISSION.

Will Go to the Philippines to Establish Civil Government There.

DEWEY AND OTIS OUT OF IT.

Messrs. Denby and Worcester May Accept Reappointment—Taft to Be the First Civil Governor.

Washington, Feb. 6—The President to-day appointed Judge William H. Taft of Cincinnati and United States Judge of the Sixth Judicial Circuit, to be president of the new Philippine Commission. Judge Taft's place on the bench will be filled by the appointment of Judge Henry F. Severens of Grand Rapids, Mich. Those announcements were made at the close of the Cabinet meeting to-day.

Judge Taft has been in Washington several days, presumable coming at the request of the President. This morning he called at the White House a little before 10 o'clock, in company with Judge William R. Day, former Secretary of State, and later president of the Paris Peace Commission. They remained with the President until the Cabinet meeting, at 11 o'clock, and joined him again after the Cabinet had adjourned.

On leaving the White House Judge Taft stated that the consideration of which he had been appointed president would call for the Philippines soon after March 4, and its special mission would be the establishment of a civil government for the islands. Further than that he was not at liberty to speak.

It is understood that the other members of the commission will be nominated within a very short time, and that the special instructions which will guide them in the discharge of their duties will be prepared at as early a day as possible.

The appointment of this commission is carrying out the suggestions of the present Philippine commission, which soon will go out of existence. Some of the members of the old commission, it is said, will be appointed on the new one.

There will be five members on the new commission, and all of them will be civilians. Mr. Worcester, president of the existing commission, has declined, for business reasons, to remain on the commission. Judge Taft will be president in his place. Dr. Denby and Professor Worcester have been invited to accept reappointments, but so far have not signified their acceptance. Admiral Dewey will come home from Manila, and General Otis will retire soon after his return.

Secretary Root said to-day that no instructions had been framed for the new commission as yet, but it would be easy to derive from the instructions set out in the President's message on the subject what the instructions would be.

Judge Taft also called at the War Department to-day, but as a long talk with Secretary Root ensued, the purpose of the visit could not be learned. It was generally understood, however, that Judge Taft desired to secure information as to the status of the Philippine Commission, so that he could be prepared to discuss the question with the President. He will not allow the use of his name to be used for the presidency, but says that Postum Food Coffee has strengthened and benefited him when under severe mental strain. I find it an excellent.

Professor Lowell of the Syracuse University says: I cannot drink coffee and Postum Food Coffee which has a nourishing influence for any one doing brain and nerve work." Mr. Williams of Weber, produces dizziness, dullness, nervous with me. I recommend much pure Postum Food Coffee where people drink and a true healthy condition. You do not use me mine in public!" Rev. Dr. Wm. H. Ryder, Syracuse, N. Y.

No Standing in Court.

[illegible]

INSURGENTS SHOW RENEWED ACTIVITY.

They Attack a Battalion of the Forty-Seventh Infantry at Legaspi.

CONVENT TURNED INTO A FORT.

Major Shipton Defending Himself While Awaiting Re-enforcements—Forty Fifth Infantry Also Suffers Losses.

Manila, Feb. 6—The insurgents attacked the First Battalion of the Forty-Seventh Infantry near Nasi, A Major and a Captain were wounded and one Sergeant killed, but details of the engagement are lacking.

Ships arriving from Lemapo report that the insurgent General Pilar concentrated a large force about the top of the town and made a sharp night attack on Major Shipton's battalion of the Forty-seventh Infantry, which occupied a large convent as a fort, the barracks and a battery. Pilar's losses are unknown.

A Corporal and four men, who, prowling the outlying near Malboatar cemetery, disappeared and are supposed to have been captured. A search party looking for them was ambushed and a Corporal killed.

GENERAL WHEATON'S REPORT.

Washington, Feb. 6—The War Department has made public the report of General Lloyd Wheaton upon his operations from Sub Piddan southward last November. The report is made up of an account of the succession of conflicts with the insurgents, turning from a small skirmish to a battle wherein the insurgents had 2000 men engaged. The expedition was composed of 2500 men, and was supported by the navy in landing parties. Sa Pelosa, General Wheaton says that the cooperation of the navy was most gratifying.

Opposition was encountered from the very beginning, the insurgents firing from their trenches upon the landing parties and requiring shelling by the naval vessels to silence them. As soon as General Wheaton landed, however, they retreated upon Infanta, making feeble resistance.

On November 9 Major March, with one battalion of the Twenty-third, attacked the enemy, 600 strong, under Colonel Carlos on the Mangubtas road. Killed seventy insurgents, including the Colonel, wounded a large number and dispersed the force so that it never reassembled.

On November 11 Colonel Hare, with eleven companies and one Gatling, attacked the enemy, 1200 to 1500 strong, fully intrenched at San Jacinto. The men had to march through water up to their waists. The enemy made an unusually spirited resistance, but was broken and completely smashed within three hours, with a loss of 18 killed.

The force fled northward. It was in this battle that Major Logan was killed. He commanded the central battalion, and most of the American killed and wounded fell near Logan. General Wheaton says:

"The conduct of Major Logan was most gallant and greatly worthy of his name."

In conclusion General Wheaton particularizes mentions the Thirty-third Infantry Volunteers for gallant and efficient service, saying:

"The accuracy of their fire makes them one of the most formidable regiments in the service."

Colonel Hobbs and his Thirteenth Infantry are also commended, while for gallant conduct the report names Colonel Hare, Lieutenant Colonel Harrison, Major March, Captain J. F. Green, Twenty-third Infantry, and Major John A. Logan.

Officers mentioned for valuable service are Captain Travis, Captain Iron, Third Infantry, Captain Holland, Twenty-sixth Infantry; Lieutenant Smith, Twenty-fifth Infantry; Lieutenant Bush, Thirteenth Infantry; Lieutenant Healy, Thirty-third Infantry; Captain Fowler, Thirty-third Infantry, and Lieutenant Stickle, Corps of Engineers.

DANGEROUSLY WOUNDED.

Captain Smith, Now in Cuba, Target for a Filipino Bullet.

Stamford, Conn, Feb. 6—The wife of Captain H. D. Smith of this city, an officer in the Nineteenth Infantry, now in the Philippines, received a cablegram to-day stating that her husband had been dangerously wounded at Cuba.

Captain Smith is a graduate of West Point, and for several years was professor of mathematics at the Military Academy.

WAGES ADVANCED.

Ten Cents Per Ton Granted Tioga, Pa., Anthracite Miners.

Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 6—John Mitchell, president of the United Mine Workers of America, was informed to-day that the anthracite miners of Tioga, Pa., have been granted an advance of 10 cents per ton for mining. Over 1000 of them have been on a strike for several weeks.

The Executive Council of the U. M. W. adjourned today after a three days' session. President Mitchell is pleased over the work of the past three weeks, and will issue a formal statement covering the scope and magnitude of the new interstate agreement.

WANTED IN CHICAGO.

Dallas, Tex., Detective Makes an Important Arrest.

REPUBLIC SPECIAL.

Dallas, Tex., Feb. 6—Detective Ramsey of the Dallas Police Department to-night arrested A. M. Woolfolk, wanted in Chicago on a charge of bank robbery. Woolfolk was a clerk in a bank, and is charged with having stolen $2500 of Government bonds and sold them to a Chicago pawnbroker.

The prisoner admits that he is the man wanted, and has agreed to return to Chicago without requisition proceedings. The Chicago authorities have notified Chief of Police Cornwell of Dallas that an officer will be sent at once for Woolfolk.

SOME OPPOSITION TO CANAL TREATY.

Several of the Senators and Representatives Disapprove the Neutrality Clauses.

OTHERS EXPRESS APPROVAL.

They Think Our Warships Would Be a Sufficient Defense Without Fortifying the Interoceanic Canal.

SPECIAL DISPATCH.

Washington, Feb. 6—Disappointed railroad of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty permitting the construction of an interoceanic canal by the United States need not be expected.

Enough opposition has developed to the provision prohibiting the construction of fortifications in the entrances to the proposed canal to prevent its passage and thus delay action on the treaty. A careful canvass made of the Senate today does not indicate, however, that this opposition is sufficiently strong to secure the adoption of an amendment providing for fortification.

A meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations has been called for to-morrow to consider the treaty. Leaders of this committee are quite willing to accept the treaty as it stands, but the opposition is so strong enough opposition to delay a report for some other week.

It is urged by those who oppose the treaty in its present form, that a strictly neutral canal would, in case of war between the United States and another Power, invite an attack upon our Pacific Coast cities, which, owing to their location, have been comparatively free from this danger in the past. Permanent fortifications are not considered to be absolutely necessary, but it is argued that the United States should be left free to blockade the canal in case of war against a hostile fleet.

This objection is not supported by the advocates of the treaty, who, however, base the ground that the American navy, with bases on the Pacific and at San Juan, may be depended upon to dispose of a hostile fleet whenever the occasion shall arise, without violating the neutrality of the canal.

Discussion over the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to-day revealed the division on the Nicaraguan canal bill, but it is the opinion of Messrs. Morgan, Allen and other leaders in the Senate and Mr. Hepburn and his associates in the House, that it will not prevent the final passage of the bill this session. If the treaty is ratified in its present shape, an amendment will have to be made to the pending bill eliminating the provisions contemplating the erection of fortifications at the terminus of the canal. If that course occurs, it will be over these amendments.

Senator Morgan, the author of the pending bill in the Senate, says there is no necessity for a formal amendment of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Fortifications Not Essential.

"There are some men in the Senate," he said, "who would propose an amendment to the Ten Commandments if they were sent in here by God Almighty himself. I do not believe any material amendment to the pending treaty is required to protect our rights in the canal. All this talk about fortifying the canal to protect our interests in case of war is, to say the least, nonsense, and should not receive serious consideration.

"It is not contemplated to make the site of the proposed canal an international battlefield. No hostile Power is going to seize the canal as the principal point of attack upon the United States. If it is the intention of our Government and the friends and promoters of the canal to convert it into a fortification, we might as well abandon all further interest in the project. Any foreign Power making war on the United States would not locate hostile operations on the canal. They would, in all reasonable probability, make an attack on our commercial and business centers further up the coast.

"I cannot see," added Senator Morgan, "that Great Britain has cashed any advantage over the United States in the new treaty. According to my understanding of it, it is exactly the same as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Under language, we have absolute control over the canal, in full accord with the almost unanimous demand of the American people. Whatever rights or privileges in connection with the building of or the administration of the canal when completed, England may have had under the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty she proposes to relinquish, and we give her no equivalent in return."

Senator Aldrich of Rhode Island, leader of the Republicans in the Senate, says he does not see any substantial force in the contention that the treaty should be amended so as to authorize the United States to erect permanent fortifications for the canal.

"What is the object," said Senator Aldrich, "of our great naval establishment if it is not intended to protect our great national interests, and, if need be, to defend our great ships and harbor defenses? We afford better protection to the canal and our coast cities generally than the most formidable fortifications that engineering skill can erect.

"If a hostile fleet intended to make war on the United States it would hardly concentrate its efforts on the canal, knowing full well that it would have to first pass a powerful American fleet in the West Indies."

"I doubt very much if Nicaragua and Costa Rica would be willing to permit us to erect fortifications on their territory and maintain an armed force on the banks of the canal. It would be a constant menace to these two Governments and would invite unending complications."

Senator Lodge said the treaty "would bear close scrutiny."

Representative Hepburn, chairman of the House committee in charge of the Nicaraguan Canal bill, said he thought that he did not care to discuss the treaty and the bearings on the canal until he had had an opportunity to study it and determine just what its provisions meant.

Partnership With England.

Representative Champ Clark said: "The treaty appears to me to be a partnership arrangement entered into by the admiralty lawyers with England, which is perfectly willing that we should build the canal and maintain it, providing we keep the ditch open for her benefit as well as for our own benefit, or rather, for her benefit. In fact, surrender our control over it."

Representative Hugh A. Dinsmore, ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said: "The treaty is a concession to Great Britain which I think not to be made. The canal should be built, owned and controlled by this Government absolutely. I am opposed to any concession in this business. The House should insist upon the absolute independence of the American mind control of the canal when it has been built. This Government should preserve the right to settle its own affairs with none to step in and say what it shall do. The Nicaragua Canal is not a mere speculating business, but a great national project, and should be constructed, operated and protected as such."

Representative Henry S. Williams said: "The House will pass a Nicaragua Canal bill in spite of the treaty, which interferes seriously with the bill as I understand it, that is, as proposed by the House. What the Republican leaders will do about it I do not know, but it is safe to predict they will accept that which the administration wants even though it be to the humiliation of Americans."

Representative Albert S. Berry said: "I would oppose the treaty because it is a great, big concession to a rival power that concedes in return our right to build, maintain and police the canal, and at the same time debars us from bring a gun through except by consent of our partner. If the canal is to be free to all nations at all times and open to all ships, our ownership and control will be little more than a sham."

Representative W. D. Daly: "The administration proposes to hand us completely over to Great Britain. As I understand it the great waterway was to be a peculiarly American institution. As I understand it, there is proposed a copartnership arrangement in which, by the terms of the treaty, we are to furnish all the brains and money now, and in future Great Britain and other silly nations may forever enjoy the fruits of our schemes and work. The treaty seems to be a jug-handle arrangement and ought to be rejected."

Senator Mason: "Now that the text of the treaty has been made public, I feel that I am at perfect liberty to criticise it as much as I please. I am for an American canal on all that word implies. I am for a canal built by American money, protected by the American Government and fortified by American guns, manned by American sailors, the boys who know how to shoot and who are always right on the spot when the time comes to shoot. I have read the text of this treaty carefully, and I cannot see where the United States is gaining anything by it. Great Britain is the gainer of it, of course, I should.

"It is merely another scheme of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. We have agreed to a change in the ownership of the proposed canal. We put up the money for the big ditch, but Britain knows and the world knows that we shall have no alliance in the form of war vessels, when we really want the canal and which it ought to be of more importance to us. This proposed treaty is to be ratified, I suppose, in the belief that the United States will not be bound by any agreement that does not suit its convenience. Why, we have a treaty with Spain, which we in the United States thought we had, but Spain has not yet ratified it, and we are now in a war with Spain. Suppose we should make a treaty with Great Britain, and Great Britain should refuse to ratify it, what would be the result? Why, we would be in a war with Great Britain. I am not willing to be a party to such a transaction."

Senator Elkins of West Virginia: "I am inclined to think that the Senate will not make any material amendment to the treaty. I think that they will simply agree to it and let it go. Great Britain ought to be satisfied with it, as it gives her all she asks. We have the right to build the canal and control it, and we can do what we please with it in time of war. I am in favor of the canal being built by the United States, and I am satisfied that the treaty will not be amended, for we are in make that a matter of pride."

Senator Fairbanks said: "I am not ready to express an opinion on the treaty, but I think that the Senate will not be disposed to amend the treaty in any material respect. It seems there is a demand for action in the matter of the canal. Some days ago I received from my mailbag of Senators by Senator Morgan, which I understand, was sent to Senators from every state in the Union. I have not had time to read it, but I understand it is a very able argument in favor of the Nicaragua Canal. It has not been possible to secure the passage of a bill providing for the construction of the canal, but I think it will be reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations in the near future. The view of the Department of State, I think, have been communicated to the committee. I have not been informed as to the exact nature of the amendments to be proposed by the committee, but I suppose they will be in the nature of a substitute for the Nicaragua Canal bill. The Senate will, I suppose, be guided by the action of the committee in the matter. I have not had time to read the text of the treaty, but I understand that it is