

MAIL FROM OUR MEMBERS

First class is third rate

In your ". . . and some doodles by The Editor", in the May issue of *BNA Topics*, you spoke of a postal official saying that if you mailed *Topics* first class it would arrive earlier. Don't you believe it. I have often mailed material in envelopes similar to the ones *Topics* is mailed out in. I have marked it first class, but to no avail! It still gets the same treatment that third class mail receives.

I mentioned this to our postmaster, who was visiting us one night. Also that *Topics*, which is mailed from Toronto, never gets to me under one week. Sometimes as late as three weeks!! This is the rule, not the exception.

He said, "Oh well, third class mail." "But," I said, "three weeks from Toronto?" I told him that third class mail should not be delayed more than that day's delivery of first class mail, after that it should come first. If the post office doesn't want to do this it shouldn't accept it. We receive junk mail faster than that.

I mentioned to him that I thought the fault was the delivery men. They treat anything other than envelopes as third class, regardless as to how it is marked. He didn't deny it either. I receive more assortment of mail on Friday than any day of the week. As though the mailman is cleaning out his bin for the week.

— Albert Dawson

A limit should be set . . .

In view of the recent decision from Ottawa to decrease the number of new issues this year, I feel like adding my ten cents' worth (that's inflation!):

I was very happy to see the announcement in the press that Canadian philately would not degrade itself with yet more numerous new issues. I realize most collectors did not object to the inflated new issue program, but there is a limit to which, I believe, new issues should be set at. When postal emissions became as numerous as newspaper publication dates, there is not much difference in their monetary and artistic value (no slur on journalism intended).

— Michael T. Brolly

"The Labrador Mails" — again!

I just got around to reading the February 1974 issue of *Topics*; to my amazement you have published an article on page 27, title *The Labrador Mails*, by R. A. J. Miller. I have never before read such unadulterated nonsense in *Topics*. Why publish this type of trash? Regretfully written.

— Charles P. de Volpe

Self-Stick mounts

Re *Mounting Stamps*, Lloyd A. Mackum, page 109 *Topics*, May 1974:

I had the same trouble with the transparent mounts, either singles or blocks, finally I found a solution. I use "Self Stick" mounts, no moisture required, come in various sizes. Select the required size, cut to cover stamp then close left side with a small piece of 1/4 inch Scotch tape on outside of mount. Stamps can be removed and replaced from top or right side.

— E. W. de Laroque

York St. Squared Circles

More information on the York Street squared circles (see the July-August article in Dr. Moffatt's column).

I have a copy of York Street with time mark 6.30 dated Fe 9 00. Max Rosenthal has a clear 7.00 with the same date. The 6.30 slug was in poor condition. As no later markings with 6.30 were found we believe that it was discontinued and 7.00 was substituted on FE 9 00 and used until FE 20 00. On the following two days the 00 was deleted and 7.PM was used on FE 23 to the end of the square circle period.

— N. A. Pelletier

The Peter Harris Theory

I disagree with Peter Harris in his statement of description of paper types on new issues. How can the *non-user* of a lamp define a fluorescent white paper? I also think that for the sheet stamps (of the 1967 issue in particular), there can only be *one* "hibright", with no percentage of grading of fluorescence; the hibrights all have to be 100 per cent, and anything less is a farce.

(Continued on page 169)