

our readers will be actively engaged in devising means whereby the excessive brilliancy of the light may be more evenly distributed throughout their studies. One of the best diffusers for this purpose is ordinary white tissue paper stretched upon light wooden frames and fitted beneath the skylight. Some operators will perhaps favor the application of a semi-obscure paint direct to the glass; a good paint for this purpose is made by mixing starch, zinc white, gelatine, and milk. The proportions are not of great importance but the best way to make the paint is to mix about three ounces of starch in a little milk or water and add about a quart of boiling milk and an ounce of gelatine previously dissolved in hot water; finally add as much zinc white in powder as may be required. It is best to apply this mixture when cold and "dab" the work with the end of the brush, which will distribute the paint evenly without streaks. It may be easily removed in the fall with a little hot water.

MORE CONCERNING COPYRIGHT.

WE have on former occasions tried to impress our readers with the vital importance of registering their copyright in photograms that are likely to prove of more than passing importance, and we published in a former number a concise article upon the method of securing such registration in Canada.

We have since received numerous complaints from subscribers who have been victimized by pirate publishers.

One of these firms of pirates began by buying a few photograms of a prominent Canadian city at a cost of about twenty-five cents each and then published them as photo engravings in

"Souvenir" form at about ten cents the book.

We do not mean to say the photograms thus collected at so little expense were by any means excellent views, and the reproductions were even worse, but still—put upon the market at so low a price—they were sold and must have injured the sale of the original photograms. We have no battle with publishers of these books so long as they pursue their business in a straightforward manner and give the photographers, whose works they appropriate, *adequate* remuneration and proper acknowledgment of authorship.

But we have no sympathy with the meanness of those marauding pirates who infest certain cities and rob hard-working photographers of the results of their labors. It is all very well for these people to say they bought and paid for the views they republish, we admit that they did so—but they did not thereby acquire the right to republish those views and sell them in opposition to their original authors.

Such miserable pirates are too sordid to engage a photographer to make a special series for them; they prefer to rob an already poorly paid class of men—men who have to depend for their living upon the sale of views taken during the short summer months.

These same parasitical publishers seem to be imbued with a natural inborn baseness that prevents them from giving the men they rob credit for being the authors of the original photograms, whereas if they had the decency to publish the names and addresses of the photographers we might consider it in the light of a redeeming act of grace.

How often do we see even in the public press such titles as "Minne-ha Cathedral, *From a Photograph.*"