

SECURITY ENDORSEMENT & PERFIN SOCIETY OF G.B.

NEWS-SHEET

No. 58 July 1964

Subscription 10/- per annum.

PRESIDENT : C.Jennings  
SEC/EDITOR : R.Bowman  
PACKET.SUP : J.Rucklidge  
CAT.EDITOR : B.Tomkins  
LIBRARIAN : F.Summers

SUGGESTION TIME

From a membership of over 70 we received just one letter in response to our-request for suggestions and criticisms. Does this mean that we are completely satisfying the remainder?

The one letter that did appear came from Mr Smith, who started by express in appreciation of the articles etc. which have been published in recent months, and then went on to make the following specific points;

"Identities. It is unfortunate that we do not find and publish more of these. The new Catalogue now being issued gives us very little new information. There must be many of our membership who know, or could investigate, details of possible users of certain dies.

Use of 'Faked' Perfins. I reiterate my protest (see News Sheet, January this year) about the continued use of the L&S/Ld die. The first strike on four ½d QE was interesting and good fun, if you like, but to continue the use (on current issues) a die which went out of use years ago, is sheer bad form, and confusing issues of falsities.

B.P.A. Our philatelic 'Standing' would be greatly enhanced by affiliation to the B.P.A. I have urged this many times and understood that when we had adopted a set form of rules and elected a committee this matter would be carried through."

In answer to Mr Smith's third point, as Secretary I must take the responsibility for not applying for affiliation to the B.P.A. sooner than I did, however, this was done a few weeks ago and I am now awaiting confirmation etc.

Can we have other views on the first two points made by Mr Smith, or any other points for that matter?

NOMINATIONS FOR OFFICERS

Again very little response has been forthcoming, two letters only. Can we have more please - you can nominate yourself if you wish, and do not forget that all offices are open not only the committee. SEND YOUR NOMINATION NOW!

EDITORIAL JOTTINGS

\* The dispute with Reading Post Office over the News Sheet has not really got us anywhere. Their interpretation of the regulations is still that staples constitute a fixing that must be broken for inspection of the contents and, therefore, our doing this makes the bulletin liable to letter postage rates.

It is obvious that other interpretations can be placed on the rules for at least two receiving post offices deleted the hand stamp surcharge of the Reading office. One member was told on enquiring at his head post office that the Reading office had made a mistake. It is equally obvious that henceforth we shall have to use envelopes. Incidentally, if this month's issue is franked 4½d it is because of the temporary suspension of printed paper rate caused by the recent strike of the postal employees.

\* Mr Eades has taken me to task over two points in last month's instalment of the Local Government Perfins, he writes, "Devonshire Indeed! I would like to draw your attention to the fact that we have no 'shires' in Wessex. I was going to send you a photograph of a sign outside my house which bears the legend County of Devon but it was so dirty - and had two corners broken off - that I was ashamed to do so. I am not unaware that there are such things as the 'Earl of Devonshire' and 'Devonshire Place' - especially No. 41 - however we must excuse them':

Mr Eades is, of course, quite right, the fault is entirely mine and I am suitably repentent. However I still like Devonshire cream call it what you will.

The second point was with respect to my comment that no longer does Axminster possess a carpet factory. Apparently they do. The original inventor of the Axminster process died some 100 years ago taking the secret of his dyes with him and the factory closed down. Between the two wars, however, a local man started another factory and 'Axminster' carpets are again being made there. These carpets have a red line running down the backing, presumably to distinguish them from other 'Axminster' carpets made elsewhere.

Again I must give way to one more knowledgeable than myself. Normally I obtain my notes on the towns and counties etc., from the particular council's handbook or from Encyclopaedia Britannica at the local Library. In this case however, it came from the Children's Britannica published about two years ago. Had I gone to the Library I would probably have obtained the same information, for their edition of the full Britannica is a 1912 one.

THIS ISSUES CONTENTS

This month's issue contains, two pages of general interest, Official Perfins Worksheet No. 11, Pages 14, 15 and 16 concluding Mr Nelson's article on Sloper (2 sheets), Methods of Collecting and Mounting Perfins - 4, 4.10 Durham - of the Council perfins listing (2 sheets), Four pages of 'M' Identities which replace previous undated 'M' pages.



## CHAPTER 6 - Sloper's Competitors

Joseph Sloper died on the 18th June 1890 after which his perforating business was carried on under the name J. Sloper & Co (later J. Sloper & Co., Ltd.) by his two sons Percy and Eustace. The Post Office at 20 King William Street was then run quite separately, the letter receiver being a man called Baker. When 20 King William Street was demolished - to make way for a new building in 1914 the firm moved to 22 Budge Row, E.C.4. This office was destroyed during the bombing of London in 1941, and new offices were found at New Bridge Street House near Blackfriars Bridge, where the firm remains to this day.

Whilst there can be no doubt that Slopers have been the leading firm of stamp perforators ever since 1868, there have been a number of others at various, times. During the years from 1880 -1900, when there were probably more different perfins in use than at any other time, there were three other stamp perforators in London with businesses of a size approaching that of Sloper. These were Hancock, (whom I have already mentioned) Allchin, and Braham. Others included James Parsley, the postmaster at 163 Peckham Park Road, S.E., Albert Luff at 26 Ivy Lane, E.C., and the postmasters at Coleman Street, E.C., and Upper Thames Street, E.C.

As mentioned previously, Francis Hancock was Sloper's first and most serious rival.- In 1886 a group of business men, seeing an opportunity of making some profit, persuaded Hancock to sell his business. A company-known as the Initial Perforating Company was then formed to acquire the business, Hancock receiving £1,000 in cash and 100 shares of £10 each in the Company. Hancock's services a Managing Director were retained at £100 per year and a certain share of the profits. The company took over all Hancock's goodwill and plant, the latter comprising, "6 perforating presses, 1 vice, about 2,000 perforating pins (3 sorts), 552 perforating dies, sundry tools and a work bench". The business was successful for several years, but, about 1892, Hancock died and thereafter business gradually declined and the Company was struck off in 1898.

Sidney Allchin, the postmaster at Englands Lane, Hampstead. N.W., first advertised as a stamp perforator in the Post Office London Directory in 1881, but actually commenced business in a small way about 1877, using a machine of his own contrivance. Allchin died in 1883 and his business was carried on by his son as Sidney Allchin & Co. The firm was still trading until as recently as 1937 when it amalgamated with Slopers and moved to 22 Bridge Row. The name Sidney Allchin & Co. was retained for some years but ceased to be used in 1943.

The last of the four, Frank Braham was the postmaster at Tabernacle Street, E.C, and began as a stamp perforator about 1883. Like Sloper and Hancock, he also manufactured hand perforating presses for sale, these being made at his factory in

Hoxton Square, N. Braham was almost certainly a rogue, using his office as postmaster to imply, as Sloper did to a lesser extent, that his perforating business was officially recognised. He pestered London business firms with circulars describing his services, bearing unauthorised facsimiles of postage stamps with perforated initials, and with a coat of arms at the head beside the words "Post Office, Tabernacle Street, London, E.C." In this way, Braham acquired a substantial number of clients, among them Thomas Cook & Son, London Chatham & Dover Railway, James Schoolbred & Co., and the City, Birkbeck, Joint Stock, Union, and London & South Western Banks.

One of Braham's circulars, dated 29th November 1886, arrived at the offices of Bower, Cotton & Bower, Solicitors in Chancery Lane, who sent it to the G.P.O. They said it was misleading, that the Coat of Arms should not have been used, nor should the circular date stamp of the Tabernacle Street Post Office.

The G.P.O., who had already warned Braham not to use the facsimile of the 1d Lilac on his circulars, thereupon advised him that the Coat of Arms should not be used and that his appointment as postmaster would be terminated at once if his stock of circulars were not destroyed, and that a most serious view would be taken of any future misconduct. Braham apologised, agreed to destroy his circulars, and to behave in future, but reported that Sloper was also using a Coat of Arms on his circulars. This was true, in fact Sloper had been using a Coat of Arms for something like ten years, but he had taken the precaution of adding the words "By Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent" - "By Special Appointment". Even so, it seems unlikely that a grant of Letters Patent entitled the grantee to use a Coat of Arms, but the Post Office did not pursue the matter.

To end this chapter - and indeed the article - one further piece of information may be of interest. In March 1897 the Post Office wrote to J. Sloper & Co., asking by what authority they described themselves in their circulars as "Contractors to H.M. Government". They replied as follows :

"Having been contractors to Her Majesty's Stationery Office, supplied perforated initialled stamps to Her Majesty's Office of Works, and perforating machines to most of the Government offices and our name being on the list in H.M.S.O., of persons to be invited to tender for the supply of perforating machines, we venture to think that we have acquired the right to describe ourselves as Contractors to H.M. Government.

The Post Office thereupon wrote to the Office of Works and Stationery Office for confirmation of what Slopers had said. On the 14th June 1897 the Office of Works replied:

"In reply . . . . . I am directed by the First Commissioner of Her Majesty's Office of Works to state . . . . . that this department has at present no transactions with Mr. Sloper and that the Board have for more than a year ceased to use the perforated stamps referred to in his letter. . . . .

The Stationery Office replied that Slopers had not supplied perforating machines to them since 1882 and the G.P.O. then advised Slopers that they must not in future describe themselves as Contractors to the Government.

-----

By R. Maltson - I graduated to perfins by way of stamps and post marks. The modern glut dampened my enthusiasm for stamps, so I reduced my serious collecting to Great Britain and turned to G.B. postmarks. Like Mr Eades, I was fortunate to have available a daily treasure trove of office post. Being a local government office the post contained a fairly high proportion of perfins and my interest was gradually roused to the point of deciding to collect them. All this took place over the last three or four years, and it is only for the last few months that I have seriously collected perfins.

Initially my problems were few. I knew the source of most items from the name of the firm or organisation on the envelope, and being very unartistic I used the pieces from the envelopes to 'write-up' my collection. To mount the stamps, the majority of which were Q.E. 2½d or 3d, I used the mounts which comprise a black base with a transparent flap. With the stamp face downward the perfin showed up perfectly and the stamp could easily be taken out to see the face.

I have naturally acquired quite a number of local government perfins but as the postmarks are the only distinguishing feature between many of these, I have to find a new method of mounting and I am still pondering over this problem.

I found that my biggest problem, however, was knowing in what order to mount known perfins in my more-or-less "permanent" collection. With ordinary stamps one had the catalogue as a guide and thus knew what space was needed and for what items. I hope the Society's identity lists will go a long way towards solving this problem.

Finally, I must add that I was surprised to learn from the news-sheets of the interest in collecting the same perfin on different value stamps. To have one example of each die with any varieties, and to know the name and a few details of the firm or organisation affords me all the satisfaction I seek. If this attitude puzzles collectors of longer standing I must stress that I am only at the "Simplified catalogue" stage of perfins and even stamp watermarks and perforations were once a puzzle to me.

4.10 DURHAM (C)

Durham is probably most famous for its coal which has been mined since Roman times and which provides the livelihood for about 20% of the population.

Another of the County's major industries is shipbuilding with towns like Jarrow, Gateshead, Sunderland, and Hartlepoons producing approximately two fifths of all the ships built in the United Kingdom.

Perfins:- eight different departments possess small hand machines and the perfin types are given below together with a few notes on the present state of the machines.

## (i) CHILDRENS DEPARTMENT.

C.C. H 9,9 (5) Childrens Committee.

Single die machine of unknown make. The first 'C' has lower end pin missing so that it appears to have only 8 holes.

## (ii) SURVEYOR'S DEPARTMENT.

CC/S 2H 8,8/11 (6) County Surveyor's Dept.

Single impression machine giving a good clean perforation Make of machine unknown.

## (iii) LAND AGENT'S DEPARTMENT.

DAC H 11,10,8 (6) Durham Agricultural  
Committees.

Single die machine of unknown make. The pin forming the bar of the 'A' is missing such that the perfin appears to be DVC.

## (iv) TREASURER'S DEPARTMENT.

D.C/A 2H 11,9/10 (6) Durham County Accounts.

A two die machine perforating side by side. The make of machine is not known and no pins appear to be missing although they seem to be so blunt that many of the holes do not get pierced properly.

The designation "County Accountant" was changed to "County Treasurer" in 1947 but the original perforator has continued to be used.

## (v) HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

D.C./H.C. 2H 11,8/12,8 (4½) Durham County Health  
Department.

Six die machine perforating stamps side by side. The manufacturer's and supplier's names are stated on the machine as being, "JUMBO PERFORATING PRESS (Van der Velde Limited)".



"M" IDENTIFICATIONS.

7/64

M	H	11	4½	1. Marconi Wireless & Telegraph Co Ltd. 2. I. & R Morley Co. Leicester 3. T.R. Miller & Son London E. C. 3 4. W. McQueen & Co Ltd. Belfast & London. 5. Maple & Company Ltd. London 6. C& E Morton Ltd. London E.C.3 7. Marshall & Snelgrove. Leeds. 8. H. MacLaine & Company Ltd. London.
M	H	13	5	H. MacLaine & Co (London) Ltd London E.C.3
M	H	13	5½	John Mowlem & Co Ltd London S.W.1
M	H	15	5½	H. MacLaine & Co (London) Ltd London E.C.3
M	H	15	7	Mac Andrews & Co Ltd London E.C.3
*M	H	15	8	Macqueen & Co, London E. C & Stockport.
M	H	15	9½	Wm H. Muller & Co London E.C.
MA	H	13,11	5½	Marble Arch Motor Supplies London S.E.5
MA/B	2H	15,10/13	5½	Metropolitan Asylums Board
M/AC	2H	11/8,7	4½	Mac Scaffolding Metal Agencies Co Ltd. Bristol
MAIN	H	15,10,5,13	4½	R & A Main Ltd. London N 18
MAPLE	S	15,10,9,7,10	4½	) Maple & Co Ltd.
MAPLE	S	15,10,11,7,10	5	) London.
MB	H	11,11	4½	1. Martins Bank Ltd 2. Midland Bank Ltd 3. Mander Bros Ltd, Wolverhampto 4. Moss Bras Ltd. London.
MB	H	13,15	5	1. Midland Bank Ltd 2. Montague Burton Ltd
M.B.	H	13,15	6	) Midland Bank Ltd
M.B/L	2H	15,14/7	6	) London E.C.2
MB/Ld	2H	15,14/7,7	4½	The Mint Birmingham Ltd Birmingham.
MBM/&Co	2H	15,13,15/12,8,6	4½(IIIa)	Marks, Bulteel, Mills & Co. London W. C.
M/BROs..	2H	23/15,7,8,9	5½/5,4½,4½,5	) Mander Brothers
M/BROs..	2H	23/15,8,8,11	6/5,3½,3½,5½	) Wolverhampton.
MBW	H	15,15,16	4	Metropolitan Board of Works London.

MBW	H	15,14,14	5½		Leach & Co Ltd Mark Brown's Wharf London.
MC	H	11,7	4½		The Monotype Corporation Ltd Redhill, Surrey.
		This type has also been used by the Corporations of			Maidstone, Kent. Margate, Kent. Mansfield, Notts. * Middlesborough, Yorks.
MC	S	15,8	5½		Middleton Corporation, Manchester.
M/C	2H	15/8	6		Manchester Corporation.
M&C	H	15,14,9	5½ (IIIb)		Millward Merchandise Ltd Manchester.
M&C/C	2H	11,12,7/7	4½ (Ia)		Malden & Coombe Corporation
Mc.I	H	17,7,5	6,4,6	)	Malcolm McIntyre & Comp.
McI	H	17,7,8	5,3½,5	)	London E.C.
McK/&Co	2H	11,7,9/12,7,4	4½		Mckenna & Co, London S.W.1
MC/L	2H	11,7/6	4½		MacFarlane, Carman & Lewis Wellingborough, Northants
MEB	H	11,9,11	4½		Midlands Electricity Board.
M.E/&Co	2H	17,10/14,8,8	5½		Mann Egerton & Co Ltd Kings Lynn, Norfolk.
M&G	H	11,12,9	4½(Ia)		Manbre & Garton Ltd, London.
M/G.W.R	2H	15/10,16,13	4½		Midland & Great Western Railway.
*MH/A	2H	13,11/7	6/4½		MacCabe Hughes & Alexander Liverpool 2. Ltd
MHW/C	2H	15,11,15/8	6		Matterson, Huxley & Watson. Coventry.
MIC	H	11,4,7	5		Mitchell Inman & Co London.
MIS/L	2H	15,5,10/7	5½		M. Isaacs & Sons Ltd London E. C. 3
MJR	H	16,7,12	4	)	
MJ/R	S	15,7/12	4½	)	Midland Joint Railway.
MK	H	11,9	4½		Machin & Kingley Ltd London E.C.3

					M. 3	7/64
*ML	H	13,8	5½		Macleans Ltd, Brentford, Essex.	
ML	H	13,7	7		Macleans Ltd.,	
M.L	H	15,7	6		Manchester Liners Ltd, Manchester.	
MM	H	13,13	5½		Municipal Mutual Insurance Ltd., London S.W.1	
M/M	2H	17/13	12½ total		Macmillan & Co Ltd London W. C. 2	
MN1/&Co	2H	11,11/12,7,4	4½ (Ia)		McMullen & Co Hertford.	
MN/C	2H	13,14/10	5½		The Mond Nickel Co Ltd London.	
MOSS	H	11,8,9,9	4½	)	H.E.Moss & Company, London E.C.3	
MOSS	H	15,10,10,10	4½	)		
MOSS	H	15,10,10,10	5	)	Newcastle and Liverpool.	
MOY	H	15,10,9	5½		Thomas Moy, Colchester.	
MP	H	11,8	4½		McVitie & Price Ltd London N.W10	
MP	H	13,10	5½		Mather & Platt Ltd Manchester	
M/&/P	3H	11/12/8	4½		McVitie & Price Ltd London N.W.10	
*MP/E	2H	11,8/9	4½		M. P Evans & Co Ltd. London E.C.3	
*M&P/L	2H	15,12,11/7	4½(III)		Morley & Powell, London.	
MR/CoLd	2H	11,10/7,4,6,6	4½		May Roberts & Co Ltd.	
MRM/&Co.	2H	15,12,15/13,9,6	4½(III)		M.R.Meyer & Co. London.	
MR/&S	2H	17,12/13,11	5½(III)		Malcolm Ross & Sons, Manchester	
M...S/C°	2H	15,10/8,4	5		M.Samuel & Co Ltd	
MS/&C°	2H	11,9/12,7,4	4½ (Ia)		Moxey Savon & Co Ltd London E. C. 3	
MS/&C°	2H	15,11/13,8,6	5½(III)		Marshall Suer & Co Gainsborough	
*MS/&D	2H	17,13/13,12	4½(III)		Moses Son & Davis, London.	
MSK	H	11,9,9	4½		Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha Ltd London E. C. 3	
MS/&L	2H	17,10/12,7	4½(IIIa)	)	Manchester, Sheffield & Lincolnshire Railway.	
MS&L	H	15,10,14,7	4 (I)	)		
MS/Ld	2H	15,10/7,7	5½		Moxey Savon & Co Ltd London E. C. 3	

					<u>M. 4</u>	7/64
MS/ML	2H	15,10/15,7	4½		Manbre Sugar & Malt Ltd	
					London.	
MS/WJ	2H	15,10/14,7	5		Midland & South West	
					Junction Railway.	
MT/B	2H	11,6/11	4½	)	Morice, Tozer & Beck Ltd	
MT/B	2H	15,7/14	5	)	London E.C.3	
MT/C	2H	11,6/7	4½		Modern Transport Company,	
					Liverpool.	
MV/Co.	2H	15,9/8,6	5½	)	Metropolitan Vickers	
M.V/Co.	2H	15,9/8,6	5½/5,4½	)	Company Ltd.	
MWB	H	11,12,11	4½	)	Metropolitan Water	
MWB	H	15,14,13	5½	)		
M/WB	2H	15/14,14	5	)	Board.	
MW/B	2H	15,15/14	5½	)	London	
MW/Co	2H	15,15/8,6	5½		The Mirrlees Watson Co Ltd	
					Glasgow.	

\* Not previously catalogued