

Revenue Review

Deer Me

My thanks to Roy Holcroft for sending me this Bow Hunters License [fig 1]. This is a little of what Roy had to say about it: A Bow Hunters License was issued by the Victorian Fisheries and Wildlife Service, Victoria, Australia. These were required to hunt deer in Victoria with bow and arrow. They were issued in very small numbers between 1976- 1981 [less than 500] These had no force or effect until such time as a current Deer revenue was attached. These game stamps were purchased for \$10.00 from any post office and had to be date stamped. The licence had to be carried at all times while hunting and so very few ever survived the year. These game stamps are collector's items on their own and are scarce used, now days rarely seen at all on a bow hunter's licence. I also have numbers 039 of 1978, 247 of 1980 and 313 of 1981. Brilliant Roy, many thanks for sharing this.

Railway Perfs

As we know [that is if you collect and follow] Queensland Railways the 1927 issue was rouletted 6½-13. The railway stamps of Mainland Australia, Ingles 1980. Make a note in one of the supplements that this series should be split into two groups rouletted and perforated, it is unclear how this came about, maybe Owen Ingles was talking about the punched out hyphen hole [I spoke about this type of separation in October 2006 Revenue Review] I have not seen a full set of 'round hole' perforations on this issue nor heard of any recordings of same. But a very nice 2/6d has turned up [fig 2] from Nambour station, now you may be sitting there saying to yourself I have plenty of perforated values, can I ask you go check your stock, I think you will find although some may look perforated they are in fact oblong roulette also square roulette exists on this issue. If by chance you do have a round hole perforation please pass on this information so it can be recorded.

Scarce Kiwi Answer

Re the New Zealand arms 35/- query from the February Revenue Review, David Smitham from across the ditch writes: Take the NZ 1/3 arms type stamp - the lowest denomination of the series which

was mainly used for postal purposes. This was initially issued in a ghastly lemon yellow colour in 1931. Due to the difficulty of reading the denomination [and maybe also to the unsightly nature of used examples!] the colour was changed in 1931 to an orange yellow. The 1/3d colour remained unchanged for 24 years. However, the new [orange yellow] colour was the same colour as the 35/- arms stamp. Given that the 35/- stamps were more likely to be used for fiscal purposes rather than postal there are relatively more of this used type around. The only problem was that in those days the lighting in post offices was not as good as it is in today's post offices. Somewhere along the line a post office clerk mistakenly sold a 35/- arms stamp for 1/3d! After all both stamps were of the same size and were printed in the same colour. The £1/13/9d discrepancy would have been discovered when next the postal clerk tried to balance his stock with his till take. To circumvent this problem it was decided to overprint high value arms type stamps in black so that irrespective of the lighting conditions in any post office or stamp duties office no such [costly] mistake would occur again. That is why the 35/- orange yellow arms type stamps can be found with and without the overprint. Eventually in 1955 the 1/3d arms type stamp was reprinted with its value indicated in black in the upper and lower voids surrounding the NZ coat of arms, and a year later the denomination lettering's colour was erroneously changed to blue. I trust that this helps explain your mystery?

Which Catalogue

I am concerned about some dealers writing reviews for revenue catalogues, the content of which is no where near their field of stamp dealing let alone knowledge, as Alexander Pope once said "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing". They may arrive at the fact "this book is quite heavy so it must be good" this of course is total nonsense but I have heard of this happening, a bit like the literature judge at an exhibition saying this is a heavy book, give it a gold! Well all that glitters... and all that. I am [as all of you would have guessed] talking again about the series of very expensive books published by G & R Philately, this series is far to heavy to throw into your bag when trotting off to the local stamp club, the edition



Fig. 1



Fig. 2



Fig. 4

I have shows a lot of the overprints have been computer generated or taken from other publications. The Stamp Duty book stops short of listing all known issues, to me, and according to feedback from readers a total waste of money, again I see my name has been used in the acknowledgments so if the publisher is reading this get my name out of it. The email printed in the book never replies, not even an ISBN number. I am not sure about the legalities of publishing without an ISBN, and we have APTA dealers selling it, oh dear. I have even seen people trying to sell them in online chat rooms [desperation tactics I guess?] don't get sucked in. On the front cover and in the 'Scope' it says 'Specialist listing' now that has to be, and is a totally dangerous and misleading statement, the pricing of items is all over the place I guess it is the publishers guesstimate, this is a self published, in the lounge room book, parroting a lot of the wrong information of the past, as I said back in May 07 Revenue Review, save your money and wait for Barefoot 2008 which, if it is not out by the time this is on the shelves it can't be far away, remember 99.9% of eBay users quote from Barefoot. Some auction houses simply quote from G & R books which can sometimes lead to misinformation being listed in auction catalogues. If I owned this business I would be offering a full refund on all the books sold out there, maybe republish with the correct graphics and information and offer a direct swap then destroy the earlier copies, and while your there correct the spiral binding as mine is falling apart and I have only opened it less than 10 times. Talking of auction houses misdescribing revenues, I still have readers write to me: "are we to believe what auction houses write in the descriptions where revenues are concerned" all I can say is, do your own homework [not using G&R books] because many auction houses are still getting it wrong, some are improving, some are using the 'phone or email a friend' [finally], and did that take some doing. If the wrong or misleading information is published in books, auction house catalogues and un-knowledgeable dealers and collectors follow it, we are all up the creek, without a, you know what!

Is It or Isn't It

Most of you know I like to rave on about nice revenue documents

small enough to fit nicely onto an exhibit page, again most of you know they rarely come along, as 99% of revenues have been taken off the documents. New South Wales is no exception I know I have mentioned a couple of 1865 crackers in the last few months but lets not forget the humble 'Fiscal Postal'. The Stamp Duties Act 1865 [29 Vic. No. 6] along with the Postal Extension Act of 1873 [36 Vic. No. 15] authorised the use of postage stamps for revenue purposes from 1 May 1873 till Federation in 1901. One of the more sexy pieces I have acquired is fig 3, a fire insurance renewal for £2000 paying 5/- duty, in this case 3d in £100 of insurance, made up of 3 x 2d Prussian Blue revenues of 1885 with the rare perf 11 and 9 x 6d Mauve revenues of 1882 perf 10. I believe this is the largest multiple on document. Is it or isn't it. Can any reader better it? Don't you just love to see the pen cancel!

More Holes

As mentioned in March Revenue Review the Perfin Club of New Zealand and Australia have a web site home page, this can be accessed from my web site. They have a sample journal link and all you want to know about perfin on this page, please check it out you may even want to join. You do realise you can never ever complete a perfin collection, as you will always have more holes in your collection than stamps! [Ok an oldie but a goodie]. Finally as promised, some more Victorian beer duty specimen revenues [figs 4 & 5]

Gremlins

March Revenue Review fig 4 was minus the Mauve colour line now shown in fig 6 this month, it appears Kevin and the team are so efficient the graphic artist mistakenly removed it thinking it was an error and wanted to clean it up.

I can be contacted by mail: P O Box 66
Springwood 4127 Queensland or an Email
link from my web site <http://users.bigpond.net.au/dave1/index>



Fig. 3



Fig. 5



Fig. 6