

# Letters

## ST. JOHN'S PAID ALL MARKING

I thoroughly enjoyed John Butt's *PAID ALL* and *POSTAGE PAID* article in the November/December issues of *TOPICS*. However, I would like to add a bit of information to help clear up an inaccuracy for members. The first usage of the St. John's *PAID ALL* marking, so far recorded, was on September 24, 1897. Members wishing to see an illustration should refer to my update on these markings in the July/August 1991 issue of the *Newfie Newsletter*.

Dean W. Mario  
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

## POSTMARK SOURCE CORRECTION

In the January-February 1992 issue of *BNA TOPICS* I wrote a short note on a postmark for which a photocopy was found in the material Paul Hughes was using in his work on postmarks. In error I credited Paul's source as Tom Hillman. Just prior to the printing of this issue I came across a letter from Paul to me in which he wrote that Cimon Morin and the Canadian Postal Archives were the source. The Canadian Postal Archives and Cimon have been invaluable to researchers and deserve the highest credit for their help.

I tried to do the correct thing. I goofed. I apologize.

Jeffrey Switt

## VICTORIA R.P.O. CANCEL CORRECTION

Re: my letter in Nov./Dec. '91 *TOPICS*, and the Victoria R.P.O. cancel, Dr. A.D. Campbell has pointed out that this was used in Victoria County Ontario, not Victoria B.C. The *D&S* reference book (and *Shaw Canadian Transportation Postmark*, #187) does not state the province, and the error of assuming B.C. is mine.

I apologize to the members for any confusion

regarding this, and wish to thank Dr. Campbell for this information. The new book on fancy cancels will contain a provincial indicator for this (and all other items), and will thus hopefully eliminate some of this type of confusion. This is a fine example of how constructive criticism benefits all (even if I do have a *bit of egg on my face*); such should be encouraged.

Dave Lacelle  
Ottawa, Ontario

## PERFORATIONS

My compliments to George Arken on the recent article on perforations (*TOPICS* Jan/Feb 1992).

A truly *landmark article* that deserves to be read by all in the stamp trade. Finally the *11½ x 12 myth* is put to its proper final resting place. For some collectors out there this may sound petty however a well-known auctioneer has told me he has had collectors return lots because they were not *true 11½ x 12's* and that he didn't want 11.6 perf. How sad... the collector is searching for an item that does not exist and if it does it can be considered *re-perforated until proven otherwise!*

I've used both *Instanta* and *Kiusalas* (yes I double checked my *Instanta* and of course knew the conversions). I just naturally collected 11.6 x 11.9 or 11.6 x 12.1 combinations. I totally agree with the article in its entirety. There is only one really odd exception on the 5¢ LQ of 1875. It really does exist 11.75 x 12.0 - but most of the time it is on the much more common 11.6 x 11.9/12.1 combinations. The true 11.75 x 12.0 is quite scarce. I have two and know of a third example (I looked for 10 years - so they're not very plentiful). I honestly have no idea why the 5¢ LQ would break the rule but there are a lot of odd perfs on this value. (No chance mine are re-perforated).

Again, congratulations on a fine article.

Dr. Jim Watt  
Hamilton, Ontario