

to see such a poor exhibition of photographs, leaving out entirely the question of art. In the matter of judging the technical points of photography, such as lighting, posing, chemical effect, etc., they were entirely overlooked; not wilfully so, I would not say, but simply because the judges did not understand in any degree what constituted a good photograph. This is the conclusion I am forced to after seeing the manner in which the prizes were awarded. One of the exhibitors, Messrs. Murray & Co., of Brockville, had on the whole a very good exhibit of photography in nearly all its branches. He was particularly fortunate in receiving the lion's share of what was going. I am not reflecting on Mr. Murray's work when I say that he did not deserve the number of first prize tickets he received. In the matter of portraits, there was a sameness pervading the whole exhibit. There was little or no variation from one style, and really only one style of portrait was exhibited, namely, figures from cabinet size to $6\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. In the whole of Mr. Murray's exhibit there was not one study of a head, and all photographers know that in the posing and lighting of a head lies the most difficult part of portrait photography. Yet Mr. Murray takes first prize in portraits, when a competitor (C. S. Cochran, of Hamilton), who has a collection of portraits comprising figures and heads ranging from cabinet size to life size, has to be content with second place. This is where the judges erred. They saw a large exhibit on one hand that did *not* embrace all the points of portraiture, and a smaller exhibit on the other hand that embraced nearly all the points of portrait photography, and awarded the first prize to the one that was least entitled to it.

In the class of landscape photography the same error occurred. The judges evidently did not take into consideration, as they ought to have done, the composition of a picture, the quality of the negatives, and the class of prints upon which they had to pass judgment. These are particularly necessary and essential points to bear in mind when judging is taking place, but they were entirely overlooked. They awarded first place to Messrs. Murray & Co., second to Messrs. Thomson & Co., of Vancouver, B. C., and no place to the Toronto Photo Co. and F. Micklethwaite, of Toronto. It would take too much time to enter into the respective merits of all the exhibits in this class, but one thing certain, is, the prizes were by no means correctly awarded. It gives me the impression that the judges had a certain time allotted to them in which to distribute prize cards, and they distributed them indiscriminately, without any consideration as to the merits of the exhibits.

It is useless for me to attempt to pass judgment on the other branches in which exhibits were made. I would only be forced to tell the truth about them, and in these cases it would not be very flattering. I was very much disappointed in the whole exhibition of photography; particularly so, when I know that there are photographers in every part of Canada who can turn out work that is open to the keenest kind of criticism. Why they do not come forward and exhibit, even if they do not win a prize, is something I cannot understand. The expense is very little, and the reward sometimes is a great deal. In this, as in all other things, let the best man win.

Yours truly,

X. Y. Z.