

**Old Churchyards in Towns.**

From 'Notes of a Tour,' in *Gardeners' Monthly*.  
 "In New York the yards of St. Paul's and Trinity churches, by a little judicious management had been converted into perfect fairy spots. Here, instead of hauling away the bones of their ancestors, and selling the ground for building lots, as is too often the case in our large cities, the grave mounds had been carefully graded down and flower grounds had been made between the stones and the monuments. These beds are very neatly planted with a fine selection of flowering and foliage plants, &c. Along the banks, where it was very dry, the English ivy had been planted, and double and single Portulacca sown. The plants were in a very flourishing condition, the bright flowers of the Portulacca contrasting with the dark leaves of the ivy, producing a very pretty effect. I afterwards learned that a gardener was employed to look after both churchyards, and, judging from the appearance of the plants, he must be kept pretty busy."

Could not something be done here similar to that in New York? In advocating the improvement of our agriculture, we have not forgotten the beauty of our gardens and homes, and we desire to encourage the beautiful as well as useful through the land. The planting of shade trees in town and country is undoubtedly a step in the right direction, and such flower gardens in the middle of our towns as those mentioned in New York would nurture in the minds of the young a love for the beauties of nature, and their loveliness would cheer many a heart. In this city there are at least two places well suited for such a purpose. Nearly opposite the Post Office, in the very heart of the city, is one plot that might at little expense be made a beautiful flower garden, such as that described in the *Gardeners' Monthly*. On North Street is another site that might be so improved.

**Manufacturers and the Patrons of Husbandry.**

The principal manager of one of our best agricultural implement manufactories called at our office a few days since and enquired of us in what way the Grange movement was to be met by manufacturers. He stated that the working capital of that establishment was held largely in the States, and that the profits from the investment were not as remunerative as investments of capital in the States. The present workings do not show a profit of over 10 per cent.

The whole business, we believe, is worked as advantageously as any reliable implement factory in Canada. The Patrons of Husbandry are asking for terms. He said they would be most happy to give liberal terms to them if they could dispense with the agents now employed. He thought the agents would still be necessary, as the Patrons would require implements to be put in working order, and sometimes kept in order.

The Patrons of Husbandry might procure machinery cheaper if they would effect sales and attend to the working of machinery. He believed it would be a much greater loss to farmers if some of our manufactories were closed. He would be most willing to aid and assist any measure for the benefit of farmers, but the manufacturers must leave or close their establishments.

At the present time farmers are making quite as much for money invested as implement makers are, and had not half the risk to run. His arguments were so sound and just that we at once agreed with him, and consider that the Patrons of Husbandry in Canada will do no good to themselves or the country by interfering with manufacturers of reliability. Our impression is that the Patrons of Husbandry will do about as much injury as good to the country by interfering with the general trade. The Patrons might possibly have lower

prices for one or two years; then up would go the prices higher than ever.

We are satisfied that the Patrons will not obviate the necessity of agents. In cases where exorbitant prices are charged they might combine and do good, but they will be wise not to interfere in the legitimate trade, in which only a fair profit is made.

**Garden, Orchard and Forest.**

**Half Hardy Trees and Wind Shelter.**

Every once and a while we come across a statement that this tree or that is not hardy. There is no doubt that so far as temperature is concerned, the trees referred to will stand all the cold they are likely to meet with in the regions referred to, but still the trees die.

It may be as well to remind our friends who lose their trees, that it is not so much frost as wind which destroys them. Death is the result of the whipping out of the juices of the tree, and not by the freezing of its cells and it is no proof that because a tree dies in an exposed windy place, that "it is not hardy" in the deponent's latitude. That trees die under different circumstances, where they were thought hardy, is no wonder to those who are familiar with trees. Indeed it is rather a wonder that so many live that do. Generally it is the tree nature to be gregarious. They grow up in forests thousands together, and by natural protection hardly know what wind is. The falling leaves protect the young plants, so that in the severest winter's day, one may go into the dense woods and hardly find frost an inch below the surface. So that trees growing in woods have a double chance. They are kept from severe waste of their juices by their mutual protection from wind; and the roots, without much hindrance from frosty ground, draw in moisture all the winter through, and thus supply what little waste there may be. How different is this from a tree's usual fate. Set out alone, to battle with the winds unaided, and with the frost encasing every root, so that all the moisture they can take up has to be thawed by their own internal heat from the frozen ground, why should not large numbers perish? It is not in the nature of things to be otherwise, and it shows rather a limited acquaintance with plant life when the loss occasions any surprise.

In the suburbs of Philadelphia is a settlement formed by some of the highest classes of citizens of this city, known as Chestnut Hill. It is a high and bleak spot, some two hundred feet above the level of the Delaware; and with a valley of some six or eight miles wide in front and around it, it is particularly exposed to bleak north, north-east and north-west winds. The writer knew it some twenty-five years ago, when barely a tree was found over its surface, except where a sheltered inlet or so kept off the worst winds; and every farmer remarked as if it were as true as gospel, that trees would not grow on Chestnut Hill. But trees or no trees, it is a delightful spot, whereon to catch the beautiful summer breezes. It is just the spot for summer-burnt Philadelphians to have beautiful summer residences. A railroad was led to it, and improvements began. One of the first of these improvers was Col. Cephas G. Childs, one of the heroes of the Mexican war, and a highly intelligent horticulturist. He took in the idea of shelter at once. Trees were planted almost as thick as they could stand together; and besides this, very common and hardy trees were set thickly outside of all. The Hemlock Spruces, which, single and alone would have been easily killed, were set thick together; and together they grew up without any injury to leaf or bud, and finally made a good shelter for all the rest. It was a rich treat to go there in subsequent years and see the rare trees growing. Deodar Cedars, Abies Smithiana, Hollies, Yew, and such like, which the average Philadelphian horticulturist will tell you "are not hardy here," flourished like weeds, though everybody's exposed trees died as regularly as they were tested.

But there is not a place in the whole country but might do as well. The coldest places on the bleakest Western prairie, by thick planting of the valuable trees; and planting the shelter belts of Larch or other wind-proof trees, might have everything we have,—everything we call half hardy,—everything in fact that any reasonable horticulturist could desire.

To be sure, much has been done in this direction in the West. The agricultural papers and agricultural writers have written over and over again as to the necessity of shelter belts, before much can be done; but when we read, as we continually do, of experiments with these trees or those, and the conclusions come to, that "they are not hardy west," when we know it is all a matter of wind and not of frost, we see how much more is to be done in pushing a knowledge of the shelter idea, before those regions can half enjoy a full pleasure of horticulture, and it is in the hope of reinforcing our Western friends who have labored so long in this field, that we have been moved to pen this article.

**A Nut Garden in England.**

Previous to the year 1855, Mr. Webb grew nuts in a small way, much as his neighbor did, but finding the demand for them increasing, and the price rising in the market, he planted all the spare ground he had, about ten acres, with nut trees, and these are now in full bearing, with nut trees, and these are planted diagonally, about eight feet apart, two rows of nuts and one of fruit trees alternating, 640 trees being planted to the acre. The ten acres are divided off into quarters, by grass paths, these paths on either side being edged with rows of Strawberries, and in their season with wallflowers, and Narcissus, etc. While the trees were small, the ground was kept clean with the hoe; it was dug once a year for the first seven years, and it has only been manured once since the trees were put in, though for several years Mr. Webb has taken off good crops of potatoes. The only dressing that he gives to the ground is rotter leaf-mould, a large stock of which he has generally on hand for this purpose. By growing Potatoes and such like crops on the ground while the trees are getting up, a fair return for the original outlay is received. It is only when the trees come into full bearing and attain a good size, which takes about seven years, that the nut plantation pays, and then the returns are more than cent. per cent., and go on increasing. On this subject Mr. Webb says, of the 460 trees bear at the rate of 1s. each, £32 per acre per annum is secured; and if they should bear 10s. each tree, it would amount to the almost fabulous sum of £320 per acre; and it is not too much to suppose that they will yield even more than that, for as a proof of it he "had six individuals a quarter of a day gathering the nuts from one tree, and they were all witnesses to the weight—110 lbs. of cob nuts." Nuts are such bearers six years out of seven, and always saleable, Mr. Webb has come to the conclusion that no crop can be planted that will yield so much money per acre. "Compared with land for building purposes, it will yield ten times the profit without any expense after the first few years, and then but trifling." I am here citing Mr. Webb's opinion; it is obvious that the reader must himself test their correctness. The nut trees have grown into a perfect thicket, though in many instances they have been beaten in height by the fruit trees. Of the latter only really first-class sorts are grown, and many of these this year carried enormous crops. The last season Mr. Webb considered very a moderate one for nuts, but the crops were very evenly distributed, and, I thought plentiful. In a good season as many as from 1500 to 1800 lbs. of nuts have been picked in a day. When gathered they are stored in barrels of 100 lbs weight each, and kept in a barn until sent away to market. Mr. Webb has raised a number of new nuts, which he calls Cub Filberts, remarkable for their size, excellent quality, and free-bearing properties, and it is these really fine sorts that he has particularly planted.—"Gardener's Chronicle."

**Pruning the Apple Tree.**

"So much has been said and written about the form of the apple tree, that it seems almost as a universally acknowledged law that that tree must have an open vase, or an upturned umbrella form, and he who undertakes to say the contrary must appear like a heretic. Nevertheless since everything has two sides, I venture to make few objections to it.

1st. It is natural for that tree, if left to itself till it comes to maturity, to never assume that form, but rather the reverse.

2d. The idea to give the tree in that form more light and air seems to me more imaginary than real; for the natural roundish shape brings more surface to the sun than the hollowed out form.

3d. After the tree is cut out to the form, it is constantly taxed to fill up all the gaps, and the industrious pruner must always be on the alert to clear out. This I call a murderous war on the