

farmer with less than fifteen cows, to buy. We would stand a greater chance of getting better seeding and harvesting machinery, better cultivators, and better spray-outfits. Not only would this institution improve farm machinery, but it would safeguard the farmer from having inferior machinery sold to him. Machinery brought out by the manufacturers would be tested and its exact merits and demerits published by the government—just as is done with farm crops. Here is another condition that could be changed with extremely beneficial results to the farmer. Probably the serious drawback of having so many different makes of the various kinds of farm machinery has never occurred to you. You have reasoned that the more we have the more we have to choose from.

I will show you what this Institution could do. It would take all the good points of the Massey-Harris, the McCormick, the Deering, the Frost & Wood and others, and put them all into one improved binder. All the manufacturers would then make just this one improved binder. Probably the Massey-Harris Co. could make knotters more economically than the International Harvester Co; probably the latter could make rollers or wheels or some other parts more economically than the Massey-Harris Co. In any case, the parts of the binder being standardized, they would be made with the greatest economy, and the price of the binder would be reduced,

beside the new improvement brought in. Then the manufacturers instead of having to advertise a number of different binders would advertise only one binder, thus the cost would be still further reduced. When a farmer wanted to get a repair for his binder he could go to the nearest agent and, whether a Massey-Harris agent or some other agent, the farmer could get just the very part he wanted.

Now supposing all our farm machinery were standardized like that, you see what a tremendous gain it would be to the farmer. It is true the manufacturers would need a little educating; we would need new legislation in patents, but the United States government has proved the value and feasibility of standardization in their new "Liberty" motor truck, and in their new "Liberty" aeroplane.

If we only had started such an institution as I have mentioned, twenty-five years ago, how much better position for the production of food might we have been in now. But it is never too late to mend; better farm machinery will do just as much for us in peace as in war. Do you realize that it is machinery that has enabled the manufacturer to turn out a hundred articles instead of one; that it is machinery that has enabled him to reduce the work hours of his employees, raise their wages and yet grow rich himself. Yes, it is machinery that has done this and it will do the very same for the farmer.

"The larder of every loyal household in the city would be absolutely wheatless within a week, if your men, and women, could realize how near famine has come to robbing the Allies of their right to victory in this war. . . . I know that if we do not send over 6,000,000 barrels of flour each month for the next nine months, we are going to lose this war."—Hon. Everett Colby.

"It's all very well to shout for suffrage, but suffrage brings its own responsibilities."—M. U. W.
