

THE EVENING ADVOCATE.

Official Organ of The Fishermen's Protective Union of Newfoundland.

Vo. V. No. 145.

THE EVENING ADVOCATE ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND, SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1918.

Price : One Cent.

British and French Anticipate German Onslaught by Successful Drives Czech-Slovaks Outbreak Hinders Germany's Removal of Prisoners From Russia

ANXIOUS TO GET WAR PRISONERS

Moscow, Wednesday.—(By the Associated Press)—Owing to the Czech-Slovak outbreak with the complete stoppage it has brought about in traffic on the trans-Siberian railway and on a goodly portion of the eastern railway, the German plans to rush war prisoners homeward are failing of realization. On the area affected by the Czech-Slovak military operations extending from Samara on the Volga to Novo Nikolaiensk beyond Omsk, there are about 300,000 German and

Austrian able-bodied prisoners, 20,000 in Siberia, 45,000 in Turkestan, and the remainder in the Provinces of Perm Ufa and Crenburg. Of that number there are about 17,000 officers whom the Austrians are particularly eager to repatriate. More than half the number of prisoners are employed in the mines, in factories, or in the fields. Many hundreds thousands were similarly engaged in the Ukraine and in the Don region where the German advance set them free.

CAPT. BOB BARTLETT HONOURED

OTTAWA, June 29.—It will be remembered that Captain Bartlett commanded the motor schooner Karluk on which the Stefansson expedition left Victoria in the spring of 1913 to explore in the Beaufort Sea and the Arctic regions. The ship was caught in the ice and during the winter of 1913-14 drifted across the Arctic Ocean and was finally crushed and sank some distance north of Herald Island. Captain Bartlett took charge of the survivors in the ice camp and part in the sledge expedition toward led them safely to Wrangel Island, the North Pole, as this famous discovery was accompanied by one Eskimo. He then undertook the dangerous journey further north than any other British trip across the straits to the Siberian subject.

GET THEIR BLOWS IN FIRST

The British in Flanders, and the French further south apparently have anticipated the proposed drive towards the Channel ports or Paris, and struck first. A comparatively large number of prisoners and machine guns were left in the hands of the Allied troops. The attack of the British was delivered about midday between Hazebrouck and Bethune on a front of nearly three and a half miles over territory which the Germans recently have been deluging with shells. Altogether the attack was productive of an average gain of ground of nearly a mile and included the taking of several hamlets. It is not improbable the enemy in a proposed offensive in this region had set their hearts on the capture of Stomer and the railway running thence to Calais and then to Dunkirk. The stroke of the French troops was over a still greater front, four and a half miles, and they at points penetrated enemy positions to a goodly depth. At some points a mile and a quarter. The evident intention as further to block the gateway to Paris through the Villers otterets region. Although the points of attack were separated by about one hundred miles the manoeuvres seemingly had been well considered by General Foch, the Allied Commander in Chief, and they were carried out synchronously. The strategy of the double stroke is apparent when it is revealed that a successful German thrust where the British struck would have menaced the Channel ports, or a similar movement in the south could have placed the French capital in jeopardy. The Berlin official report issued Friday evening made note of the Allied thrusts, declaring the Germans were busy in attempts to repulse them. That the Allied and French are not to be caught napping by the Germans is indicated by the aerial actions that are in progress over and behind the battle lines. A British official statement says that in air fighting Thursday 29 enemy airplanes were accounted for, 20 of them destroyed and others forced down out of control of their pilots. Fourteen of our machines failed to return to their base. There is considerable fighting between the Austrians and the Italians in the mountain regions on the Italian front, but quiet prevails along the Piave River across which the enemy was driven by the Italians early in the week. Unofficial reports are to the effect that troublesome events are in evidence in Russia.

The British Attack

WITH THE BRITISH ARMY IN FRANCE, June 29.—Large, hurricane onslaught of British troops east of the Forest of Nieppe today and some 250 of the more fortunate have been collected in the prisoner cages before noon. The front of the attack was six thousand yards in length and lay approximately between Vieux Berquin to the north and Pont Tournai which is two thousand yards north of Merville; on the south west of Merville the British and German lines have been jammed up a bit against the edge of the Nieppe Forest in places, with the result that the British felt a lack of elbow room for operations, it was in order to acquire more leeway that today's assault was projected, the objective settled upon lay along the winding little stream known as Plate Pecque, which bowed out toward the east in self-circle back of the German lines.

Italy's Fine Morale

PARIS, June 29.—(Havas Agency)—Premier Clemenceau on Thursday visited the Italian troops in the region of Rheims. The Premier congratulated them on their fine morale, and the brilliant success they have achieved on the French front.

Italian Official

ROME, June 28.—British troops on the Asiago Plateau yesterday penetrated the Austro-Hungarian trenches and inflicted losses on their occupants and brought back prisoners, it was announced today by the Italian War Office.

Age Not Extended

WASHINGTON, June 29.—Immediate extension of the present army draft age limits, 21 to 31 years, was overwhelmingly defeated today in the Senate. The amendment, proposed by Senator Bayl of Mexico, to the \$12,000,000,000 army appropriation bill to make the limits 20 and 40 years, and all compromises suggested for different minimums and maximums were voted down. Settlement of this controversy cleared the way for the passage of the huge appropriation measure, probably tomorrow.

Paris Raided

PARIS, June 29.—Some enemy airplanes flew in the direction of Paris yesterday evening. A few bombs were dropped, three were the victims. The alarm was sounded at 11.30 and all clear signal at 12.30 o'clock this morning.

TWO THOUSAND ARE CONDEMNED

2000 of Military in Hungary Are Condemned to Death For Mutiny

PARIS, June 28.—There have been rebellious outbreaks among the garrisons of the cities of Győr and Pecs, Hungary, as the result of which two thousand of the military involved in the mutiny have been condemned to death, according to reports received by the Matin today. Both Austria and Hungary are affected by the revolutionary movement which is said to be in progress on a large scale in Austria, the newspapers advice declare. The spirit of revolt is said to be strongly offensive in the army. Violent demonstrations are reported to have occurred in numerous cities. Pecs is the Hungarian name for the city of Funckirchen, 105 miles south of Budapest. It has a population of about 45,000. Győr, more commonly known as Baab, is a city of more than 28,000 population, 67 miles northwest of Budapest.

The French Advance

WITH THE FRENCH ARMY IN FRANCE, June 29.—(By the Associated Press)—The first notable activity for some time on this front occurred early this morning when the French executed a particularly successful local operation to the southwest of Soissons and on the borders of the Forest of Villers-otterets, where we recapitulated several positions whose continual possession would have permitted the enemy to prepare a future offensive. The French attack occurred at dawn along a front of six thousand yards and the fighting proceeded throughout the day. By late afternoon when the despatch was filed the French had advanced considerably, taking a number of prisoners and more were coming in. The Allied troops had reached the outskirts of the Fosse base, Cutry and St. Pierre Aigle, where a most determined struggle was progressing. The Germans had been ejected from a position of the Forest of Villers Cotterets, southward to St. Pierre Aigle. The French artillery was completely dominating the enemy guns.

Move Cautiously

LONDON, June 29.—The Westminster Gazette in a long editorial today commenting on the appeal of Kerensky, former Russian Premier, for Allied assistance in Russia, urges the Allies to move cautiously in anything approaching intervention. "We can't be surprised if the Allied Governments particularly President Wilson desire the ground to be carefully explored first," the paper declared.

Appeal to Pacifists

LONDON, June 29.—Lord Rots, Cecil British Minister of Blocade in a statement to-day characterized in the recent speech of Dr. Von Kuehlmann, the German Foreign Secretary, as being vague in phraseology and intended to appeal to the pacifist elements in the countries at war with Germany. He intimated that his analysis of Dr. Von Kuehlmann's remarks also was that of the British Government. We recognized the speech as being directed largely in all countries, especially England, to encourage those inclined to be war weary to believe that tolerable terms might be secured and that if these terms were not accepted, the war would go on indefinitely.

The Irish League

NEW YORK, June 29.—Resolutions asking the United States to assist in bringing about freedom for Ireland were adopted at a meeting here last night by the Irish Progressive League. Fifteen hundred persons attended the meeting which was described as "loud protest against the whole infamous rule of England."

A Church Society

OTTAWA, Ont., June 29.—Incorporation has been granted to the Catholic Church Society of Canada with headquarters at Toronto. The declared objects of the Society include "to spread information about Catholic truth and to make better known the faith, practices, and history of the Catholic Church."

Assisting Russia

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 28.—Plans for sending a commission to Russia to assist that country economically and industrially have advanced to a point where it is possible to announce on official authority that the personnel of the commission is being discussed.

The Berlin Official

BERLIN, June 28.—The Germans are busy in attempts to repulse vigorous attacks by the Allied armies north of the Lys and south of the Aisne, says the official statement.

Wants Dominions to Press For Home Rule

LONDON, June 28.—The British Labor Conference at its concluding session here today passed a resolution calling on the Dominion statesmen now sitting in the conference in London, to insist on the British Government settling the Irish question by granting to Ireland a large measure of Home Rule.

BOLSHEVIKI ARE NOW OUT OF IT

Kerensky the Man of the Future in Russia

LONDON, June 28.—According to unconfirmed reports to-day the Bolshevik Government in Moscow has been overthrown, says a despatch to the Exchange Telegraph Co. from Copenhagen. Moscow, the report added, has been captured by General Korniloff, supported by German troops. Advice from the same sources asserts that Grand Duke Nicholas has been proclaimed Emperor, Nikolai Lenin, the Premier, and Leon Trotsky, the Minister of War, were said to have fled to the Murman coast. General Kaledines is said to have co-operated with General Korniloff in the capture of Moscow. The Copenhagen newspapers, the Agency despatch adds, give prominence to a Berlin despatch quoting the Tages Zeitung of that city as follows. "It is believed here that the Bolshevik Government will soon be overthrown and that Kerensky is the man of the future in Russia."

Wholesome

Palatable

Economical

Island Brand BONELESS and FLAKED CODFISH

--- Packed by ---

Newfoundland Packing Company, Inc.

At their plant in Bay Bulls.

--- Sold by ---

THE LEADING GROCERY STORS.
IN ST. JOHN'S AND ELSEWHERE.

Is the Nation Now Organizing for Peace?

Now is the Time to Begin the Mighty and Complete Task of Re-Construction.

LONDON, June 27. (via Reuters' Ottawa Agency)—At a luncheon given by the London Chamber of Commerce. Premier Hughes of Australia, said the Allies were facing the supreme crisis of the war. The next few weeks were pregnant with tremendous possibilities. German militarists fully recognized that they must either achieve a decisive victory now or continue a hopeless struggle against daily increasing odds. It would be foolish to underestimate the immediate danger, but it was clear that the enemy was becoming increasingly anxious. The speech of Von Kuehlmann, the German Foreign Secretary, was a clear admission that the recent enemy offensive had been but barren in its gains and that military success, if not impossible, was farther off than ever, and unless victory was gained politically Germany must prepare for a long war. The change in the German tone, Premier Hughes opined, was due to a realization of America's great effort. The Germans also knew that the Anglo-French armies were confidently awaiting the next onslaught. While the much vaunted Austrian offensive had spent itself and any day might see the Austria armies in headlong rout, and the civil population openly rebelling. Germany had completely lost command of the air and the failure of its submarine campaign was obvious. Great Britain's mastery of the sea was more complete than ever. Referring to the economic situation Premier Hughes recalled that during his previous visit he had urged the need of empire organization and emphasized the folly of Great Britain's reverting to the fiscal and economic methods on which she had hitherto relied so long. We longed for peace, but was Great Britain any better prepared for peace than it had been for war. But for the war Germany would have destroyed our trade by peaceful penetration and reduced us and most of our Allies to a state of economic vassalage. The war revealed that our industrial and commercial greatness was honeycombed by German influence and control. Two things were necessary to enable us to hold our own, first the ability to defend ourselves against our enemies, second the ability to produce wealth and develop our economic resources of labor and capital so as to support a number of virile and happy people. (Applause). Any policy ignoring the intimate relationship between national safety and economic welfare, said Mr. Hughes, was doomed sooner or later to destroy the nation adopting it. Hitherto, however, Great Britain had treated these two essentials as separate entities. A country's economic safety and development rested upon the organization covering every part of the national economic spheres. Germany's progress under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the rise of Germany and that economic position arising from the British policy was responsible for the war. Zimmermann has said "the Secret of our success lies, apart from organizing and training our working classes, in the fact that England and other countries which are great producers of raw materials have granted to us the open door and allowed us to draw upon their vast resources of raw materials. If this permission is withdrawn we shall at one stroke become once more the Germany of 1880." Raw materials, said Mr. Hughes, were the basis of German industry. Germany could never have risen to commercial eminence without Anglo-Saxon cotton, wool and copper. So called Britons who favored the open door policy were mostly the very men whose counsels had brought Britain and the Empire to the brink of destruction in 1914 by the failure to recognize the German menaces. (Cheers). After urging an insistent and most vigorous war against pacifists who conspicuously or unconsciously were under such a policy had been phenomenal. Germany was to-day preparing for peace as she did for war. Germany was the best organized nation. Great Britain's policy, except as regards to navy, was a policy of Laissez faire, nevertheless we are superior to Germany in initiative and resources. Has Great Britain organized for peace? That was the great question, said Mr. Hughes, unless Britain was to sink into a third rate nation after the war. He was glad to know that since he had last been here something had been done to organize our industries and prepare for peace. He was not criticizing what had been done. Mr. Hughes emphasized the danger in which Britain's commerce and industry would stand after the war unless we at least were as well organized as other nations. Reconstruction after the war would be a mighty and complex task. There would be a colossal demobilization of many millions of men and women. Unemployment of labour and capital would create a crisis shaking the national fabric to its foundation unless there was effective organization. Something had been done and more was being done in order to ensure a sufficiency of food and raw material, but hitherto no definite policy, fiscal or economic, had been declared. No national organization had been established, no machinery had been created, to deal with the many inevitable problems. This ought to be done without delay. (Cheers). It will be too late to do it after the war when confusion would reign supreme. Mr. Hughes proceeded to castigate the credulous section who still considered a departure from the policy of the open door would end in the national disaster, despite the sinister object lessons of the Brest-Litovsk and Roumania treaties. He contrasted the sickening folly of these doctrinaires and visionaries as agents of Germany with the robust truth of the German evil. Zimmermann showed that British short-sightedness was responsible for the