

lision with the print publishers, who, by the way, frequently commence proceedings utterly regardless of the law, which gives them protection *only* in those cases where they comply with its requisitions.

The first remark I wish to make on the case is this, that out of the hundreds of photographs bought of me by King, alias Hyams, alias Hymams (of "gentlemanly appearance," as one reporter writes, who must mix in strange society if he insists on the correctness of his standard of gentility), not one solitary photograph was produced, though, strange to say, several twice as large as mine were exhibited to the Court, and were stated distinctly *not* to have been obtained from me, but which, nevertheless, were handed about and alluded to from time to time in such a manner as must have almost induced some of the jury to imagine they were mine, or, to say the least, had something to do with the case. And how far this succeeds may be inferred from the fact that in one of the newspaper reports they were actually stated to have been bought of me! Now where did these photographs come from? They were dug out of the fire which destroyed Her Majesty's Theatre and Mr. Graves's shop, says plaintiff. But how, I ask, did it happen that these particular photographs escaped the fire, while *all* mine were consumed, and this although Mr. Graves positively declared all these illegal photographs were kept in *one* receptacle at the end of his shop, and which he facetiously termed the "Pirate's locker"?

Secondly, observe the great care used by Messrs. Graves that no confusion shall arise as to the particular spoil obtained from different "pirates." See what extraordinary precautions they adopt to prevent the possibility of confounding the innocent with the guilty. You will please notice Messrs. Graves's *modus operandi* recognizes in the fullest manner the justness of that saying so familiar to lawyers; viz., that it is "better ninety-nine guilty men should escape than one who is innocent should suffer." And how do they accomplish this desirable object in my case? As follows:—These illegal photographs, said to have been got from me, are carried about by King during the devious voyage which brought him to Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, &c., and which occupied over *two months*, and all the time he is visiting the various depots for sale of these things, and buying goods by fifties and hundreds, relieving the monotony of his delightful calling by getting drunk once or twice a week (I have his own word for the truth of this, and that he never told a lie in his life). In due course, this agent of the eminent publishers arrives in London, and hands over the contraband to the admiral, and all the pictures are put away in the *same* desk for the present. But when the process of classification commences, we can easily imagine the method pursued to distinguish photographs got from "men of straw" from photographs got from people able to pay substantial damages.

Thirdly, it seems to me there is no difference in principle between a spy of King's type and the irrepressible Fenian informer, and that, as the uncorroborated evidence of the latter would not be listened to for a moment, so in these cases no jury could be asked to convict in the absence of *eye-witness* testimony. But what really happens in my case? King called *alone*, and was never accompanied by his accomplice upon one of the eight or ten occasions I saw him; and even King himself stated that Cattermole, his confederate, was with him on *one* occasion only, and then did not enter my house. Cattermole's evidence amounted to this: that having searched King and watched him into my house from a *distance*, so as to avoid observation, he awaits his return, and King then shows him a parcel of photographs he had bought, including those which were the subject of this action. Now, whatever could have possessed Mr. Graves to imagine for a moment that a jury would convict any respectable man upon such a tinkering tale as this, when, to say nothing of the extreme improbability of Cattermole refuting himself, King had only to employ a third confederate (whose existence need not be alluded to) to accomplish the whole transaction, and cheat his own friend into the bargain?

But I must not further trespass on your space, and will only add that the judge who tried the case most emphatically denounced the stratagem used by plaintiff, describing it as a "system that no just mind could approve;" and the jury sufficiently testified their sense of the unmistakable difference between a "a tissue of lies"—to use the judge's own words—and the truth, by handing down, in less than twelve minutes, their verdict for—Yours obediently,
THE DEFENDANT,

MR. BOVEY'S MODE OF TONING.

DEAR SIR,—It is with pleasure I have read Mr. Bovey's description of toning, and I must, before proceeding, individually thank him for the many proofs he has given of his love for our beautiful art by making known to his brother photographers his practical experience in many of its details, and particularly for his inviting discussion on his last process of toning. Taking advantage of that invitation, I will ask him a few questions. Of course photographers require a process by which they can always depend upon producing the *tone* they wish; therefore it is necessary to have one in which the component parts of the toning bath will not be changed (with the exception of the loss of gold); and this brings me to the first question. Mr. Bovey says he prefers his prints *not* to be washed from all free nitrate of silver. If that is the case, how can he depend upon the exact amount of silver that remains in the print? Because, if more remains in one than in the other, there will be, of course, a difference of tone in the finished print: and will not every one he tones in that state alter his bath by the formation of "nitrate of soda"? I would ask, also, what effect the salt so formed has upon the action of his bath? And does not the formation of chloride of silver over the surface of the print prevent the gold from being deposited on those parts of the picture on which it is required? for my experience has taught me that where *any* deposit of chloride of silver on the surface takes place, I never get the clearness and depth required. This, of course, has been with the acetate and sulphocyanide baths, as I described to you a little time since, and which answer admirably. I can depend upon every lot of prints coming out the same. I know I use a great deal of gold, but I also know that the gold used is on my pictures, and therefore the *more* there is on them the *more permanent* the prints must be.—I am, dear sir, yours truly,
G. H. BRITTON.

10, High Street, Forest Hill, July 8th, 1868.

LANDSCAPE BACKGROUNDS TO PORTRAITS.

DEAR SIR,—It has occurred to me that a much more simple and convenient method of taking figures and groups with natural backgrounds than that proposed by Mr. Burgess in your last number, or by any of the usual plans of double printing, would be to take the landscape on a carte-sized plate, and enlarge it on canvas or paper to 7 by 6 feet. This, I imagine, may be done without difficulty, as it would not require to be sharp; indeed, sharpness would be a defect. This background might be used for various groups, whereas by any other method a fresh one would be required for each.

The foreground is very easily arranged from weeds, stones, or other natural objects, in the studio.—I am, dear sir, yours truly,
BAYNHAM JONES.

Cheltenham, 14th July, 1868.

Talk in the Studio.

PERMANGANATE INTENSIFIER.—At a recent meeting of the Philadelphia Photographic Society Mr. Fassitt made a communication respecting the use of our permanganate intensifier. He found great advantage in the use of the chemically pure instead of the commercial article. The solution he used was 3 or 4 grains to the ounce of water, and was of a fine dark rose colour. To prevent the loss of intensity consequent upon varnishing the negative, Mr. Fassitt recommended flowing the plate with gum water. The greatest care was, he thought, necessary in washing the negative after intensifying.

IMPROVED DIPPERS.—A photographer miles from home has sometimes been placed *hors de combat* by discovering that his dipper had been left at home, or by breaking a glass one. We have heard of a forked twig being made to do successful duty in such a case. Our Philadelphia contemporary says that Mr. Garrett uses dippers made out of hickory wood, and finds them unequalled.

THE WEATHER AND PHOTOGRAPHY.—We have heard various complaints of photographic difficulties arising from the extremely hot weather, and also of its depressing influence on professional photography. The American photographers are complaining from precisely the opposite cause. We find it