many persons who own vacant land would prefer to have it cultivated instead of lying idle and unproductive, and that a very limited area will suffice to raise enough vegetables to contribute largely to the support of a family through the winter. It proves, too, that very many of the destitute people in tenement-houses are willing to work and can be made to support themselves with a very little help advanced as a loan. Besides this, the project offers a natural plan for giving to the people who dwell in stifling tenement-houses opportunity to work for themselves in the open air and under healthful conditions. It gives mothers the advantage of taking their children out of the heated houses and giving them a taste of rural life. It enables the superannuated and partially crippled to support themselves. In addition to these advantages, the entire scheme has a substantial business basis, with none of the odious and depressing suggestions of a charity.

Naturally, however, the educational side of this vacant-lot farming will have a special interest to readers of a journal devoted to the art of cultivating the soil . . . In every city where this vacant-lot farming has been successful the soil has been cultivated in accordance with the teachings of science . . . Every process from the very beginning to the end was carefully supervised, so that this vacant-lot farming, apart from its direct pecuniary profit, had a much more important function as a school of agriculture . . .

We cannot but assume that many of these tenement-house farmers who have had the advantage of this year of schooling will discover that there is a happier and wholesomer life for them outside of the congested districts of great cities . . . If, under capable instruction, agriculture can be made profitable in city lots, and if the good example of experiment stations is visible in better farming all about them, why should not actual instruction in agriculture be made a part of the curriculum of rural common schools? . . .


SENTIMENTALISM AND TREE-FELLING.

A writer in a late number of the Springfield Republican finds his sensibilities wounded by the tone of Mrs. Van Rensselaer's book, entitled, Art Out-of-doors, and especially by the advice to cut down trees, given in the chapter entitled "A Word for the Axe." It is not our purpose to enter into any defense of the book, which must stand on its own merits, any farther than to say that we know of no work where more sound doctrine on the subjects treated is given in the same space. On several occasions, however, Garden and Forest has advised the cutting down of trees, and a good many of them, in pleasure-grounds and elsewhere, and have been met with this same protest made by the writer in the Republican that no true lover of nature would think of such sacrilege. Now, we have no inclination to retort upon a critic of this sort that his own love of nature may be conventional and fictitious. We have no doubt that this writer, and many other good people who are distressed whenever they see or hear of the felling of a tree, love nature most sincerely after a sentimental fashion. But we believe that many people, whose practices they condemn, love nature quite as sincerely, and in a much more robust, and certainly more intelligent, way . . .

[Editorial. Garden and Forest 6 (1893): 311]