

the end of August. I would remark here that as fruit trees differ in their habits—some varieties making strong and vigorous shoots, others, under precisely the same treatment, weak and slender—this must be noticed in the final shortening in August, those that are vigorous must not be cut so short as those that are less so. The fact is every variety requires some little modification more or less, which experience alone can teach. Year after year continue on in this manner, taking care to keep your trees in a proper form, open and free for the circulation of air. Be careful in dressing back spurs, and in renewing branches where necessary. The apple, Plum, Cherry, &c., may all be treated in a similar manner for pyramids.

The bush tree, so called, is well adapted for all situations, if the climate be good. It is much to be commended for high, exposed places, not being much subjected to high winds. Some varieties of the pear, the apple, and other fruits are naturally inclined to be bushy and dwarfish: some of the other fruits are likewise so. The horizontal and crooked growing sorts are the best for this purpose and can very easily be brought into shape. The bush tree may be grown from four to six, ten, or twelve feet high, and of a proportionable breadth. Some prefer to have them broader than they are in height: it is as fancy may direct. The bush tree is treated similar to the pyramid in pinching and pruning, but with a difference in training; in this case no leaders are required, all the branches are naturally drawn out, pinched regularly, equally branched, but not crossed in any way. With the bush as with the pyramid sufficient openness must be kept in view.

When I commenced this paper I fully intended to have made a calculation on the produce of one acre, in apples or pears, under the dwarf system, and one under the common or general wide planted standard principle, and to have noticed the comparative value of their fruits; but this I must leave for the present, and conclude with a few remarks on the state of orchards in general throughout the country. I cannot help saying that their condition, with a few exceptions, is anything but creditable; in many cases the fences—imperfect as they are—have to take care of the orchard, and the orchard has to take care of itself. The trees are crowded with saplings, fruitless branches, extracting and exhausting their substance, excluding the light and air so essential for their health and the maturation of their fruits; the old trees full of dead and dying wood, suckers, &c. their trunks and limbs all covered with moss or decayed bark, excellent receptacles for the aphids and other pests;—such a state of affairs is enough to make one say hard things. All orchard owners would find it much to their advantage to keep their orchards clean, their trees free of dead wood and useless saplings; very little time need be spent in doing this, if judiciously gone about. Early in spring take a sharp draw hoe, or some like instrument,

scrape and clean the trunks or stems and limbs of all the moss and dried bark, then wash them over with a thin solution of Gishursts' compound, say six to eight ounces to one gallon of water, or with soft soap, destroy all root suckers and mulch over the roots regularly. A little attention in this way will be amply rewarded.

Hamilton, 20th Jan., 1863.

AT THE DWARF APPLE TREES AGAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AGRICULTURIST.—Well, Mr. Editor, I suppose brother Arnold has been looking very anxiously in every number of your valuable paper for a reply to his last remarks on dwarf apple trees, but the want of time, and not of matter, is my only excuse for not furnishing it before this time. But now, the plough-boy has laid by his plough, and the winter evenings are long,—therefore, Mr. Editor, through your indulgence, we will have another sociable chat with Mr. Arnold about dwarf apple trees.

He first says, he has not time or inclination to devote much more time to it, I suppose for the want of a better foundation to stand upon. He next says he will not defend those nurserymen that have humbugged Mr. Werden. This being admitted, that they have cheated me, this point is gained. Now, Mr. Editor, is it not evident that if they have humbugged me they would do so to others? Rather a grave charge, Mr. Arnold, against the nurserymen, but if so I have abundance of proof from my neighbors, whom I have influenced to get those so-called dwarf trees, but which are now growing large trees, just like mine, and without bearing fruit when small.

Let us turn to Mr. Arnold's defence of dwarf apple trees. I don't deny that the Horticulturists speak of dwarf trees. Rivers, Johnson, and Neill, LL. D., Secretary to the Royal Caledonian Horticultural Society, speak of three kinds of stocks, the French, the English, and the Dutch, and all differ in size. What does this amount to? Why that the more skilful the cultivation the smaller will be the trees. So says the *American Agriculturist*, and so I say. You may recollect that I suggested to Mr. Arnold that he had better get his dwarf trees a little smaller, or we could not call them dwarfs, which you see he has done, and the next time, I suppose, he will have them as small as Mr. Rivers, of England, who had dwarf cherry trees only one foot high bearing a quart of cherries, when a listener put him to the blush by saying that a neighbor had a cherry tree in full bearing which he carried about in his snuff box. Now, Mr. Editor, are we to believe all we read. I gave friend Arnold a hint in my last article how dwarf trees might be made, and how to throw