

cost of what would be a fair remuneration for making it. There *must* be a chemical analysis of guano made, before we can ascertain its value, and its result should be shown. The merchant who sells, knows no more about its worth than the farmer who buys, and both may be deceived in regard to it. The smell gives no indication of its value, and we can no more judge from its appearance, what the quantity of its valuable constituents may be, than we can of the quality of the contents by looking at the outside of a barrel.

Since, then, neither the buyer nor seller can know, the State should ascertain and show the quantity of its valuable constituents.

In reference to the inspection of gypsum, the same argument holds good. This is a sulphate of lime, with two equivalents of water. The rock from which it is obtained, owes its value to the quantity of sulphate of lime in it, and in buying what is sold for gypsum, we wish the barrel as free from any other less valuable substance as it possibly can be, we should only pay for the barrel in proportion to the quantity of gypsum which it contains. Is that which is sold as gypsum, pure gypsum? or does the quantity of it vary very greatly in different barrels?

Let the following analyses answer:

Report of the analysis of ten different specimens of gypsum, to show its agricultural value.

No. 1,	
Contained of—	
Sand,	5.77 pr ct.
Lime, as carbonate,	16.41
Alumina, with a trace of iron,	3.66
Lime, as sulphate, i. e., gypsum,	74.10
No. 2,	
Contained of—	
Sand,	10.60
Lime, as carbonate,	17.25
Clay and iron,	1.36
Gypsum,	70.79
No. 3,	
Contained of—	
Sand,	4.50
Clay and iron,	2.28
Lime, as carbonate,	4.00
Gypsum,	89.20
Specimen E, contained of—	
Sand,	13.68
Iron and clay,	5.29
Lime as carbonate,	21.59
Gypsum,	59.40
Specimen R, contained of—	
Sand,	4.65