

The meeting then adjourned until 3 p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The afternoon session being called to order at 3 o'clock,

Mr. C. E. Hopkins, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the manufacturer of Omega paper, was called on for a fifteen-minute talk, and responded with a very interesting description of his new "Vici" paper.

Secretary Poole then read a contributed paper from R. D. Bayley, of Battle Creek, Mich., the first president and the instigator of the association, on "Light and Shade," which was interesting and instructive.

LIGHT AND SHADE.

By. R. D. BAYLEY.

In the first place, brethren, allow me utterly to disclaim all idea of trying to teach those who already know more than I do. To you, gentlemen of the art photographic who have for years known and practised all I am about to write, I must apologize for occupying your time. For those, however, who, like myself, are merely humble learners, I wish to throw out a few hints that may be found useful.

I have chosen for a subject "Light and Shade on the Face." Have you not often looked at a beautiful photograph and wondered how it was made? I have. Such exquisite softness and brilliancy combined, how was it ever obtained? And then turning to our own every-day productions, we have decided that it must be "in the subject," or in something else that *we* could not help.

Now, suppose for a change we throw the blame on ourselves, and admit that what we see is the result of careful, skilful work.

In what does the skill consist?

In lighting.

In timing.

In developing.

I want to speak a few words on the first of these three subjects.

You will find one of two prominent evils in most ordinary photographs. Either they are flat, uninteresting-looking things, or else they are harsh, black and white. I have made both

kinds, and for the life of me I can't tell which is the worst.

Let us in imagination work together for a few minutes.

Place your sitter under the light and make all the necessary arrangements; expose a plate, and we will go in the dark room together and develop. The high lights begin to appear; gradually all the lighted side of the face comes up, but the shadow side hangs fire. "Ah!" we say, "*under-exposure.*"

Now, one of the first principles hammered into us was, *expose for the shadows, let the lights take care of themselves.*

So we expose another plate on our victim and lengthen the time. Once more we develop. The lights come out quickly, followed in due course by the shadows. We develop till all detail is out and the negative is dense enough, and then let our sitter go. And yet, strange to say, the photograph is not a good one. The shadows are out all right, but how about the high lights? They are blacked up—no detail, no snap, no life.

When the prints are made they show one of two evils—either the lights have no life, or the shadows are black as ink, perhaps both.

We are very apt to look on such a print and say: "The negative was under-exposed, or it was developed too far."

So next time we try to cure the evil. First we don't develop so far, and what do we get? A mean, thin, under-done negative, that will give weak red or grey prints.

Next time we vow we *will* have softness, and so we double the exposure, and we get a picture that would make *the very angels weep*, it is so flat and muddy, so bad, in fact, that we fly back to the chalk and blacking as a great relief.

What is the matter? A very simple thing. There is too much contrast in the lighting.

The lights and shadows do not photograph properly in the same time, and you might keep on varying the exposure for ever and still you would not obtain a good negative.