

THE DAILY EXAMINER.

TERMS:—FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

"This is true Liberty, when Free Born Men, having to advise the Public, may speak free."—EURIPIDES.

SINGLE COPIES TWO CENTS

NEW SERIES.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. ISLAND. WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1889.

VOL. 24.—NO. 110.

The Daily Examiner

Is issued Every Evening by

The Examiner Publishing Co.,

FROM THEIR OFFICE,

"LONDON HOUSE," QUEEN SQUARE,
Charlottetown, P. E. Island.

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION:

Six Months.....\$2 50
Three Months.....1 25
One Month.....0 50

Advertising at most moderate rates.

Contracts may be made for monthly, quarterly, half-yearly or yearly advertisements on application.

ALMANAC FOR APRIL, 1889.

MOON'S CHANGES.

First Quarter, 8th day, 9h., 35.5m., a.m., N.E. below horizon.
Full Moon, 15th day, 6h., 6.1m., p.m., E. (below horizon).
Third Quarter, 22nd day, 9h., 43.3m., a.m., S.W.
New Moon, 29th day, 10h., 53.5m., p.m., N. (below horizon).

DAY OF WEEK	Sun rises	Sun sets	Moon rises	Moon sets	High water	Day's length
1 Monday	5 44	6 23	6 30	11 33	12 39	12 39
2 Tuesday	42	25	6 54	morn	43	43
3 Wednesday	40	26	7 19	0 6	46	46
4 Thursday	38	27	7 48	0 38	49	49
5 Friday	37	29	8 21	1 14	52	52
6 Saturday	35	30	9 5	1 53	56	56
7 Sunday	33	32	9 46	2 38	59	59
8 Monday	31	33	10 38	3 34	62	62
9 Tuesday	29	34	11 35	4 44	5	5
10 Wednesday	27	35	at 29	6 3	8	8
11 Thursday	25	37	1 45	7 16	12	12
12 Friday	23	38	2 56	8 14	15	15
13 Saturday	22	40	4 7	9 1	18	18
14 Sunday	20	41	5 22	9 43	21	21
15 Monday	18	42	6 32	10 22	24	24
16 Tuesday	16	43	7 55	10 59	27	27
17 Wednesday	15	45	9 21	11 40	30	30
18 Thursday	13	46	10 20	at 28	33	33
19 Friday	11	47	11 41	0 58	36	36
20 Saturday	9	48	morn	1 58	39	39
21 Sunday	8	50	0 43	2 56	42	42
22 Monday	6	52	1 36	4 11	46	46
23 Tuesday	4	53	2 14	5 37	49	49
24 Wednesday	2	54	2 53	6 56	52	52
25 Thursday	0	55	3 24	7 59	55	55
26 Friday	4 58	56	3 49	8 46	58	58
27 Saturday	57	58	4 11	9 25	61	61
28 Sunday	56	7	0 4	10 10	64	64
29 Monday	54	1	4 57	10 34	6	6
30 Tuesday	4 52	7 3	5 21	11 7	14	14

SPECULATION.

GEO. A. ROMER,
Banker and Broker,
40 & 42 BROADWAY AND 51 NEW ST.,
New York City.

Stocks, Bonds, Grain, Provisions and Petroleum Bought, Sold and Carried on Margin.
P. S.—Send for explanatory pamphlet.
sept20—dy & wky ly

Glasgow Lead and Color Works,
MONTREAL.

THE "ELEPHANT" BRAND
—OF—
PURE WHITE LEAD

is now manufactured under the control of the original proprietors.
"ELEPHANT" Ready Mixed Paints, made up in all the choicest tints. Every packet is warranted to please. Every shade matched. Order early, as the Spring demand will be great. Only one quality made, the best.

"ELEPHANT" Patent Zinc Paint, snow-white, gives a beautiful and lasting finish.

"ELEPHANT" Water-color Paints supersede kalsomine for walls and ceilings.

"ELEPHANT" Colored Paints, in iron cans and kegs.

"ELEPHANT" Japan Colors, in all the newest and richest colors.

"ELEPHANT" Varnishes and Japans, superior to imported.

"ELEPHANT" Stains and Lacquers for finish and beauty.

"ELEPHANT" on the package is the only guarantee of really good paint.
The newest, most central and best equipped Paint Factory in Canada.
FERGUSON, ALEXANDER & CO
feb2—3rd eod

JAMES A. MORRISON. GEORGE MUSGRAVE

MORRISON & MUSGRAVE,
BROKERS

—AND—
Commission Merchants,
HALIFAX

Consignments of Island produce will receive prompt attention.

REFERENCES: THOMAS FYSHE, Esq., Cashier Bank of Nova Scotia, Halifax; George Macleod, Manager Bank of Nova Scotia Charlottetown.

WARREN & JONES,
TEA MERCHANTS,
1 EAST CHEAP AND 9 & 14 MINGING LANE,
LONDON, ENGLAND.

Represented in Canada by MORRISON & MUSGRAVE, Halifax.
Oct. 24, 1887—

None Cheaper! None Better!

—THAN YOU CAN FIND AT—

PERKINS & STERNS'

White Cottons, Grey Cottons, Print Cottons,
Dress Gingham, Apron Gingham, Shirtings
Bed Ticking, Sheetings, Counterpanes, Table
Linen, Towels, Toilet Covers.

CHEAP CLOTHS, CHEAP TWEEDS, CHEAP CARPETS.

New Kid Gloves and American Straw Hats Just Opened.

Our Stock of Room Paper Takes the Lead.

SEE OUR PATTERNS AND PRICES BEFORE YOU BUY.

PERKINS & STERNS.

Charlottetown, March 12, 1889—dy & wky

HATS!

Received ex S. S. "Stanley."

The Newest Shapes from the Best Makers will
be sold as Cheap as the Cheapest.

See Our Suitings, Trouserings and Overcoatings,
WARRANTED TO FIT AND FIT TO WEAR.

TRUNKS AND VALISES.

A Fine Line of Gents' Furnishings.

D. A. BRUCE,
CUSTOM TAILOR.

Charlottetown, March 13, 1889

The Best Chance

—TO GET THOROUGHLY RELIABLE AND—

GOOD-FITTING GARMENTS,

—IS AT—

B. S. DAVIES & CO'S
Merchant Tailoring Establishment.

ALWAYS A LARGE STOCK TO SELECT FROM,

AT THE LOWEST POSSIBLE CASH PRICES.

MR. KEITH, the popular and efficient Cutter, is at the head of this Department, and with a good staff of workmen you are sure of getting the very best satisfaction when leaving your orders with us.

B. S. DAVIES & CO.,

February 25, 1888—eod & wky

CAMERON BLOCK.

THE DAILY EXAMINER.

APRIL 3, 1889.

The Budget.

THERE can be no doubt that Hon. Messrs. Sullivan, Ferguson and Prowse made a convincing exhibit of the financial state of the Province, in the course of the speeches they delivered last evening; and it may be assumed that Hon. Mr. Yeo and Messrs. Farquharson and Sutherland said, as well as they could, everything, material to the issue, that could be said from the point of view of the Opposition.

The comparison instituted by Mr. Sullivan between that which is and that which might have been—had the Opposition remained in power and continued in their mad career of extravagance and taxation—is particularly worthy of note. Mr. Sullivan showed conclusively that the Government have, in the past nine years, effected reductions in the public expenditure to the total amount of \$810,254.88. This sum has been saved to the Province as a result of the economical administration of affairs by Mr. Sullivan and his colleagues; while refunds and other sums obtained from the Dominion—sums which the Opposition scouted the idea of obtaining, sums which would never have been obtained but for the patriotic efforts of the Government, and may therefore fairly be credited to them—swell the amount to \$1,136,816.63. That is to say, the Province is better off to the tune of over a million dollars than it would have been if the other party had held the reins during the past nine years.

Mr. Sullivan's reference to the debt account was equally happy. He showed that we have now, practically, for the purposes of revenue, a capital sum at Ottawa equal to \$1,527,549.40, or—after deducting the sum withdrawn for the purpose of wiping out the balance against the Province at the end of last year—\$600,000 more than in the year 1878. Compared with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the state of our debt account at Ottawa is highly satisfactory;—and the Province does not now, the Premier said, owe a dollar in the world.

Mr. Sullivan did not, of course, forget to remind the House that while the Government of the Province was in this position as to its finances, the moneys they have saved, the taxes they have not levied, remain in the pockets of the people, or have been used in the purchase of the freehold of their farms, or the improvement of their homesteads, or have been invested in the Savings Bank. He showed that \$1,789,355 were added to the sum on deposit at our Savings Bank during the period in which the Liberal-Conservative party have been in power. To those who maintain that the Province is not in a flourishing state, he presented the fact that there are now in our Savings Bank \$20 for every man, woman and child—an increase of \$17 per head in ten years!

He justified the withdrawal of a sum from Ottawa to cover the amount of the local indebtedness on two grounds: (1) The Government have, by their exertions and in spite of the Opposition, succeeded in obtaining from the Dominion Parliament an annual grant of \$20,000, equal to a capital sum of \$500,000, part of which might well be used in wiping out their local indebtedness; (2) the sum withdrawn is represented by public works paid for out of the Provincial revenues; these public works are of utility to future generations as well as to the present population, and the withdrawal of capital on account of them is, therefore, just and right.

As to the current year, the Premier estimates that the receipts will be: from local sources \$62,020, and from the Dominion \$200,000. These sums will, in his opinion, meet the expenditures.

The Leader of the Opposition did not attempt to controvert Mr. Sullivan's figures as to the saving effected by the Government or the addition that has been made to the capital of the Province at Ottawa, or the prosperity which prevails. Nor did he—as Mr. Ferguson pointed out in the course of a vigorous and eloquent speech—dare to charge the Government with extravagance or mal-administration. But he dwelt upon the fact that in spite of all the efforts of the Government, deficit has succeeded deficit, and maintained that the estimates could not possibly be realized in respect either to revenue or expenditure. He criticised the policy of drawing upon capital and the means employed by the Government to obtain the money by which their accounts with the banks has been squared.

Hon. Mr. Ferguson endorsed the statement of the Premier that the Government had good reason to hope that additional amounts would be obtained from the Dominion as a result of the advocacy of the

Provincial claims; and reminded the House that the policy on which the Government went to the country in 1887 had been carried out. The Government had obtained a large addition to the Provincial subsidy—a sum equal to \$400,000 or \$500,000; and they had only taken a portion of the amount to wipe out their indebtedness to the banks. He thought the people would not complain about repeated operations of the same kind.

To Mr. Sutherland, who contended that the capital of the Province at Ottawa had been lessened, Hon. Mr. Prowse replied, showing that the Province drew \$193,529.77 from Ottawa last year, and \$155,955.85 in 1879; and argued that as the sum annually drawn is greater, the capital on account of which it is drawn cannot be less.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

Manures.

SIR,—Much confusion of ideas exist in consequence of the improper use of the term superphosphate. Properly speaking that term should only be applied to bone or mineral phosphate of lime rendered soluble by sulphuric acid. The result of this process is sulphate of lime and soluble phosphoric acid with a considerable percentage of ammonia in the product when obtained from bones. With us, manufacturers of compounded manures persist in calling their preparations superphosphates, although they may contain soluble phosphoric acid in very small proportions. This practice is misleading and should be immediately abandoned. In England the term phosphate is used as an abbreviation to distinguish the manure containing soluble phosphoric acid from a nitrogenous substance such as nitrate of soda. Mineral superphosphate is sold with a guaranteed analysis, the best quality containing 35 per cent of soluble phosphate or 16 per cent of soluble phosphoric acid.

Sulphate of ammonia contains 24 per cent of ammonia, and is also known as ammonia salts.

Potassium is the metal of potash, as calcium is the metal of lime. The combining proportions of potassium oxide, with sulphuric acid is expressed by the formula K_2SO_4 , which gives nearly 82 per cent of potash. In commerce, potash salts or sulphate of potash vary in quality. Kainit or German potash salts only contain 23 per cent of potash, while high grade sulphate of potash is sometimes guaranteed to contain 90 per cent. In the latter case the sulphuric acid in the combination must have been insufficient to neutralize the alkali. Kainit is largely used in European agriculture, but owing to the incidence of freights it is more economical for Canadian farmers to procure all these materials in the most concentrated forms.

The farmers of Prince Edward Island need not be told that mussel-mud is of great value when applied to our land. Its benefits have been demonstrated on a variety of soils and crops, and under many differing circumstances. It would, however, be quite misleading to claim that it is a complete fertilizer or to advise a repetition of its use on the same land.

The only analyses of mussel-mud which I have seen are those made by Mr. Taylor, to which I referred in my last letter. It is evident from a perusal of this gentleman's pamphlet that he conducted his enquiry with great care, and that he was fully competent for the task he undertook to perform. He selected for his purpose three samples which, from his description of them, may be regarded as fairly representative of the different shell deposits to be found in our bays and rivers.

The average per centage of phosphate of lime found in these samples was 0.05, or one-twentieth of one per cent. Hence in twenty horse loads, or twelve and one-half tons of mussel-mud per acre, the land receives less than 6 lbs. of phosphoric acid, some of which may be insoluble. That some part of the benefits arising from the use of mussel-mud is due to the presence in the mud of even this small portion of phosphate, I cannot doubt; but it would be quite erroneous to suppose that phosphate so meagrely supplied can remain very long in the land, especially as the presence of so much lime enables the plant to make very strong demands on all other materials of plant food.

One English ton of superphosphate contains about 358 lbs. of soluble phosphoric acid. This costs, all charges paid, say \$30 per ton. Divided over 8 acres it will, at a cost of about \$3.75, give 44 lbs. of soluble phosphoric acid per acre, or as much of that article of plant food per acre as is contained in 150 loads of mussel-mud. One ton of superphosphate is equal in phosphoric acid to 800 tons of mussel-mud. This comparison is based on the assumptions that Mr. Taylor's analyses are correct, and that superphosphate of right quality is used.

I do not think I would be doing your correspondent "A Farmer" justice were I to assume that he is not a believer in the use of phosphates for the fertilization of the land. Although he is unknown to me, yet, judging from his writings, I think him too intelligent a man to dispute the universal importance of phosphate manuring. That material is found in the virgin soil in very limited proportions, but no vegetation can take place without it. It is the part of the food of which the smallest quantities are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of its lost fertility through the rainfall as it can in respect of ammonia. The point of doubt with "A Farmer" appears to be whether mussel-mud lands are returned to the soil through the manure-pile; the bulk of the phosphorus being carried away in bone, milk, etc., even when the crop is consumed at home. In the case of phosphates the land cannot recover a single particle of