

limitations of composition, or the arrangement of the lines and masses, starts to make the same kind of things, there is trouble. And it is solely because they work on the principle that it is the masses that make the picture instead of on the principle that the masses are only the setting for the real picture. Unless there is a picture to commence with, and a reason for the view existing on paper, no amount of skilful handling of masses will ever make anything that is pleasing.

But I have just been reading this over, and it seems to me that I find that I have shown a tendency to stray from the point that I started out with the intention of impressing.

Why have so many heavy masses at all. It is not absolutely necessary that we should? No, it certainly is not. The fact of the matter is that the heavy mass photograph is simply having a run at present, just the same as double breasted vests did a year or so ago. Personally I do not like them. Why not go back to the old way just once in a while at least and make something light and sketchy—something that will relieve the eyes of those people who, like me, are over-powered with all this blackness and all these "effects." I do not see why not!

**HAND WORK IN PHOTOGRAPHY.**—In sincerity in photography, the first essential is that the work should be a photograph, a literal transcript of nature. Hand work, however, is permissible within reasonable limits, provided it is used as a help to the securing of some effect that is aimed at, for here it is often possible to get a truer picture than could be produced by straight photography. It is the light rays under our judgment and good taste which produce the picture, while we with our limited means of modification endeavor to bring the photograph into harmony with our idea of what the scene should be to be at its best. So that you will readily see that by literal it is meant that the picture is to be the effect under which the picture was made, and not merely an effect however pleasing, for the simple reason that it is not possible to start with a free hand. "Stand out in the fields with a fistfull of brushes and you may paint your dreams if you can; but when you stick your head under that black cloth, stick to facts, because you must."

\*

On May 8th last the freshmen of Columbia University, New York, engaged Falk, the photographer, to come and make a number of pictures of them in a large group. The sophomores of the University decided that they could not with dignity allow such an event to take place and planned to storm the "freshies" with enough eggs to thoroughly convince them that they ought not to do such a thing. To avoid this the photographer was given his instructions to be on the ground at nine o'clock in the morning and to have everything ready to proceed at once to business. Unfortunately, at the last minute, the "sophs" got wind of the plan and calling together a force of about forty strong, proceeded to the scene of action, with their supply of ammunition. On reaching the ground where the "freshies" were displaying their smiling countenances to be took, the challengers placed themselves between the camera and the group and proceeded to cut up capers. In the vain hope that they would ultimately depart in peace, the "freshies" waited patiently and the camera man tried to look pleasant on his own hook. Finally driven to desperation the freshmen made a rush at their tormentors, who escaped through a new building. A few minutes later, just as the freshmen had arranged themselves into another pose, and the operator was again getting ready to do duty, the sophomores again appeared and commenced a bombardment. Their fire was quickly answered and for a period of perhaps five minutes a terrible battle raged. After

peace was restored and when the proceedings were ready to go on it was discovered that during the turmoil some unprincipled "soph" had made off with the lens, the result being that the photographer was forced to withdraw, which he did amid the derisive hoots of the belligerents. The date of the operation has been indefinitely postponed.

\*

### Correspondence.

Correspondence should be addressed to H. McBean Johnston, P.O. Box 651, Sarnia, Ont., Canada.

Harold C. Austin, Ridgeway, Ont.—See the reply in last month's *ROD AND GUN IN CANADA* with reference to your query on pyrogallie acid and its use. If then your inquiry is not satisfactorily answered, write to me again.

Willmott.—The address of the New York Camera Club is No. 3 East 29th St., New York City. If you contemplate a visit to that city it will be well worth your while to go up there.

T.A.R., Montreal.—I would be inclined to think that if you were to mount the picture that you enclose on a piece of dark board that the contrasts, which are weak anyway, would be better brought out. If you take your negative now that it is dry, and after wetting it, dry it over again in a current of warm air, you will find that it will result in it being made stronger than it now is. If that does not intensify it enough, I am afraid you will have to use a mercury bath or some other means of intensifying. I would like to have you send me a print off it after you have done it over, and also explanations of what method you adopted, with full data concerning it.

Geo. A. Wilson.—If, in the photographing of high buildings, you make use of the spring back of your camera, you will not be troubled by the lines sloping in at the top. To use it, swing the top of the ground glass toward the lens and then focus about half way up the building with the largest stop. Next insert the smallest stop in order that you may get the necessary sharpness, and make the exposure. The side wing is rarely used. You will get a better picture if you can manage to take it from half way up a building which stands opposite, provided your lens is of a wide enough angle to admit of your doing this.

W. H. L.—(1) No. (2) It is possible to do it as you say, but you will get surer results if you stick to the plan usually adopted. (3) By all means. That is the only way. Any other way would fog the plate beyond repair.

### A Sad State of Affairs.

TO THE EDITOR OF *ROD AND GUN*:

One thing *ROD AND GUN* should take up and make an energetic kick about, that is the fact that the Quebec Government has been stupid enough to issue thirty licenses to seine or gillnet fish in the lakes of Sherbrooke county. The result will be ruin to all fishing in those lakes until they are restocked unless the licenses are revoked this year and not reissued. While at Magog a few weeks ago, I saw a party of six that had twenty-seven grey trout or lunge with them, averaging in weight from 5 to 12½ pounds. These were only the morning's catch. They had been at Brompton Lake for about a week and had averaged over 200 lbs. of these fish per day, and could have caught more had they been able to keep them.

For the insignificant sum of \$10.00 each, or \$300.00 in all, our Government is apparently willing to destroy the fishing in these lakes for all time to come. It seems hard to believe, but is a fact nevertheless. You ought to take the matter up.

Granby, Que.

N. A. MEYER.