

Postal Union Congress

Date of issue: 10 MAY 1929



The ninth Postal Union Congress was opened in London on 10 May 1929 by HRH The Prince of Wales. As the formal meeting of the Universal Postal Union held every four years, the congress was attended by representatives of most of the world's major postal authorities. The two previous congresses in Madrid and Stockholm had been marked by special stamps so by the latter half of 1927 discussions had begun within the GPO on the necessity of issuing stamps for the London Congress. Previously the GPO had only issued one commemorative set, to mark the British Empire Exhibition in 1924.

It was known that King George V had very definite views on the matter: he is reported to have told Sir Kenneth Clark, then Director of the National Gallery, shortly before his death:

'I want you to make me a promise. Never allow them to make all those funny issues of stamps like some ridiculous place like San Marino. We invented the postage stamp - all it had on was the sovereign's head and Postage and its value. That's all we want.'

(George V quoted in Kenneth Clark's
ANOTHER PART OF THE WOOD, p. 238)

Nevertheless by May 1928 the idea of stamps to commemorate the PUC Congress seems to have been accepted at the GPO. An undated memorandum indicates the position and the possibilities:

‘Tradition would therefore seem to require some sort of special issue in connection with the London Congress in 1929. There appear to be three possible courses if the desirability of issuing special stamps is conceded:

- (1) A complete new series of British stamps to replace the existing issue.
- (2) A complete issue of special Congress stamps, say from ½d to 1/-.
- (3) Following the Wembley precedent, a limited special issue, say ½d, 1½d and 2½d or ½d, 1d, 1½d and 2½d.’

The first option was dismissed as impractical. The advantage of a limited stamp issue was its potential for raising revenue which could be used towards the cost of hosting the Congress; apparently, the Stockholm Congress had been entirely funded by the Swedish stamps which marked it. The point was made that issuing stamps which were not widely used would be of little postal advantage and benefit only stamp dealers. The fact that the GPO would also benefit enormously was not noted. It was suggested the stamps be available for the duration of the Congress and for a short time thereafter.

A memorandum entitled ‘Special Stamps for London Postal Congress in 1929’ was presented to the Secretary of the Post Office, Sir G Evelyn Murray, for discussion on 11 May 1928 by the Controller of Post Office Stores, H Sparkes. This outlined the possibilities and provided time and cost analysis for each: option (1), twelve months to complete an entire series at a cost of £2,700; option (2), 5½ months to complete an edition of twelve stamps at a cost of £1,500; and option (3), three months to produce three or four special stamps at a cost of £960 with an additional £70 for each new design. Murray appears to have approved the third option, for a limited issue involving the most widely used denominations, ½d, 1d, 1½d and 2½d, but no decisions taken as regards printing or design. It was decided to form a stamp committee, similar to that established for the 1924 issue, which would be responsible for overseeing the production.

A STAMP COMMITTEE

Sir Evelyn Murray wrote to the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, Chairman of the Royal Fine Arts Commission, on 17 May to ask whether it would undertake all responsibility for the designs, or if an ad hoc committee on which the RFAC would be represented might be more appropriate. Lord Crawford’s initial opinion was that stamp production involved so much of a technical nature with which the Commission was unfamiliar that it would be better to form a more competent committee, but which had representation from the Commission to

advise on matters of aesthetics. The Postmaster General (PMG), Sir William Mitchell-Thompson, MP, asked Lord Crawford on 10 July whether he would chair a committee comprising three members of the RFAC, one or two Post Office representatives, and if the King so desired, the Custodian of the Royal Philatelic Collection. Although he declined, Lord Crawford put forward the names of two Commission members, Sir David Cameron and D S McColl, to serve.

While these discussions were taking place, the PMG wrote to King George V's Private Secretary, Lord Stamfordham, on 25 May explaining the background to the Congress and seeking His Majesty's approval in principle for a stamp issue. The King had some reservations, recalling that in 1924 obstacles to stamps had arisen in relation to the Exchequer and Audit Act, 1866. clarification on three points was requested: how long would these stamps be on sale; would they be sold at their face value; would they bear the effigy of the King?

The King's recollections about legal obstacles were mistaken: the objections in 1924 were to a suggestion which came from the King himself that the British Empire Exhibition stamps be sold at a surcharge with the profits going to the King Edward's Hospital fund. It was the PMG's view at the time that charity surcharges required statutory authority as there were legal obstacles to the GPO raising funds for charitable purposes. Since there was no intention of a surcharge for the PUC stamps, the legal matter did not arise.

His Majesty was thus advised on 31 May and informed that the stamps would be on sale during the Congress and for one or two months after. They would be sold at face value, and all artists invited to submit designs would be instructed that the King's head must be included. King George was consulted again at the end of July about the plans for a stamp committee but did not appoint any members himself (in 1924, E D Bacon, Custodian of the Royal Philatelic Collection, was nominated to the committee for the British Empire Exhibition stamps).

Other problems arose regarding the stamp committee. On 19 July, Lord Crawford informed a meeting of the Royal Fine Arts Commission of his discussions with the GPO and the plans for a joint committee. The Commissioners, however, felt that although they lacked the technical expertise to undertake the task on their own, they did not wish to have their views represented on a committee of which they would only have one or two members. Consequently Lord Crawford wrote to the PMG withdrawing the help of the Commission. Such action seems unnecessary since the plans called for equal representation between the GPO and the RFAC, and Lord Crawford had already declined to chair the committee. Furthermore the GPO had made it clear that the Commissioners on the committee would adjudicate on the aesthetic element of the designs, while the GPO would provide the required technical expertise. It appears from Lord Crawford's correspondence that he

approved the idea, but other members of the Commission raised objections in principle so he was forced to withdraw. Sir William Mitchell-Thompson summed up the position quite succinctly in his reply to Lord Crawford:

‘...frankly, I do not understand why your colleagues should feel that the inclusion of other persons, who are concerned with the technical rather than the aesthetic side of the problem, should be a bar to their assisting. It seems to come to this, that the Commission cannot function without expert assistance and will not function with it; this is a very unfortunate impasse, especially as it will mean that in setting up my Committee of taste, I shall, I suppose, have to regard membership of the Royal Commission, which was expressly constituted as arbiters of taste, as a positive disqualification.’

The PMG offered the RFAC a committee with as many of their members as they chose and only two Post Office representatives, hoping it would reconsider, but was unsuccessful. Lord Crawford did, however, suggest several whom he thought might form a committee which would satisfy public opinion: Sir Cecil Harcourt-Smith and F V Burridge, both of whom had served on the 1924 committee; William Rothenstein, Principal of the Royal College of Art; Frank Short, RA, a noted engraver; Robert Anning Bell, RA; Campbell Dodgson, the head of the Print Room at the British Museum or his assistant, Mr Hind; Charles Aitken, head of the Tate Gallery; Oswald Baldron, a Heraldry expert who served on the Royal Mint’s advisory committee; Martin Conway. Having failed to gain the co-operation of the RFAC, Sir Evelyn Murray contacted Sir Cecil Harcourt-Smith on 12 October for advice on the formation of an advisory committee. Sir Cecil agreed to serve on the committee himself and Murray sent letters of invitation to several who had been recommended by Lord Crawford, though not all. By the end of the month the following, rather grandiosely titled, advisory committee had been established:

‘Committee to consider the arrangements for obtaining designs for new postage stamps to be issued in connexion with the forthcoming Congress of the International Postal Union, and to select the design, or designs, which should ultimately be recommended for the King’s approval.

Sir G E P. Murray, KCB (Chairman)

Sir Cecil Harcourt Smith, CVO, LL.D

F V Burridge, OBE

Professor Anning Bell, RA

Sir Frank Short, RA

Campbell Dodgson, CBE.’

A £1 STAMP

During late summer 1928, it was decided to include a high value stamp. Unfortunately the background to this decision is not found in the relevant Post Office Archives files: however, the reason most commonly given in philatelic journals is that the GPO realised it would be in the rather embarrassing position of having a set of special stamps to present to the Congress delegates whose value was a mere 5½d. Consequently it was decided to issue the first £1 stamp since the reign of Edward VII. While this reasoning is plausible, and may have been a factor, it is significant that the income-generating capacity of special issues was highlighted very early in the discussions, so it is likely that a £1 stamp was proposed on financial grounds, generating a much income from the philatelic market. However, the decision was in principle only, with the practicalities of printing and design left for the Committee to decide.

No formal announcement to issue special stamps was made until 8 December when the PMG made a statement in the House of Commons announcing five stamps, ½d, 1d, 1½d, 2½d and £1, to commemorate the Postal Union Congress.

OBTAINING DESIGNS

The first meeting of the PMG's advisory committee was held on 8 November 1928 at GPO headquarters chaired by Sir Evelyn Murray. Its initial task was to propose a list of artists to whom invitations to take part in a competition to design the stamps could be sent. In addition it was asked to consider which printing method would be the best. A number of proposals had been submitted by printing companies with contracts with the GPO, outlining the advantages of various printing methods.

Waterlows proposed the use of a new technique which the company had only recently developed, namely photogravure, which offered greater freedom to designers with larger areas of uniform colour not possible with engraved or recess printing. The Committee considered the options, deciding to wait until designs had been submitted before deciding the printing technique.

This decision in theory would allow each designer to work to a preferred printing method, but in practice restricted the designs to traditional styles as innovation risked rejection on the grounds of cost. Later evidence suggests that it was virtually certain the stamps would be surface-printed; leaving other options open was merely a fall-back position. It was decided however to line engrave the £1, thus designers could work with this highly expensive process in mind. The Committee decided to send invitations to the following artists and engravers:

- F C Herrick
- Noel Rooke
- Eric Gill
- George Kruger Gray
- Harold Nelson
- C L Doman
- Eric Ravilious
- Alec Buckels
- F W Farleigh.

In addition the printing firms of Waterlow and Sons and Bradbury Wilkinson were invited to submit designs.

The invitations were accompanied by 'Instructions to Artists' which explained the nature of the Postal Union Congress (PUC) and the technical requirements of the stamps. The four low values were to be of approximately the same colour as the existing definitives, while the colour of the £1 stamp was not yet determined. Each artist was invited to submit one design for each of the stamps although it was suggested that the PMG might decide to issue the same design for all four of the low values. These were to be in the following dimensions: 22.5mm high by 18.5mm wide, and should include the portrait of King George V used on the definitives but in an oval frame. As there was no existing die for surface printing the King's head surrounded by an oval frame, the PUC stamps would provide an opportunity to obtain one which could also be used for other purposes. The oval itself was to be 14mm by 11mm but the artwork need only indicate the position of the King's head, as the final version would be provided by the printers. The value was to be shown numerically either once or twice, the same size as the numerals on the 1d definitive. The word 'postage' must appear together with the inscription 'Postal Union Congress 1929', but the word 'revenue' was optional.

The £1 stamp was to measure a maximum 35mm by 25mm, either landscape or portrait, but artists were free to submit designs for smaller sizes provided these remained rectangular. The King's head was that on the 2s 6d definitive, although it was likely that the size would have to be changed to be accommodated on the larger stamp. In this case it was not specified the King's head appear within an oval frame, although the size of an oval was indicated if it was used. The same inscription 'Postal Union Congress 1929' was to appear, as was at least one numeral and the word 'postage', although this could be quite small if necessary. The word 'revenue' was not to appear as £1 stamps were not used for revenue purposes. One further instruction followed: 'It is desirable that any design for the £1 stamp should be either of national significance or should be symbolic of the assembly which it is intended to commemorate.'

Final designs were received on 10 December 1928 from the following:

	LOW VALUES	£1
Noel Rooke	1	1
Eric Gill	2	none
George Kruger Gray	did not submit designs	
Harold Nelson	1	2
C L Doman	2	4
Eric Ravilious	none	1
Alec Buckels	did not submit designs	
F W Farleigh	5	1
Bradbury and Wilkinson:		
C A Fyrer (or Tyrer?)	1	1
Edwin Arnold	2	1
E M Jackman	1	1
Waterlow and Sons:		
L D Fryer	2	1
H Fleury	1	1
Ernest Linzell	3	1

The Stamp Committee considered these designs on 12 December and selected four:

½d and 2½d: F W Farleigh - two designs

1d and 1½d: E Linzell - one design

£1: Harold Nelson

The Committee decided the same design would be used for the 1d and 1½d stamps. Harold Nelson's design was similar to one he had submitted for the 1924 British Empire Exhibition featuring St George and the Dragon. He was asked to make some minor modifications, primarily in sharpening the contrasts around St George's head, and to remove the word 'Revenue'. It proved impossible to remove altogether the space in which this word appeared and, at the suggestion of Sir Cecil Harcourt Smith, Nelson replaced it with 'One Pound'. The revised drawing completed on 2 January 1929 met with the approval of Sir Evelyn Murray who suggested that the stamp be in a slightly larger size than originally intended. A photographic reproduction in the larger size showed the detail more clearly and, as the £1 stamp would only be used infrequently on mail, operational objections to larger stamps were not significant.

The selected designs were to be submitted to King George V for his approval prior to production; however, the King was extremely ill towards the end of 1928 and it was feared he might not survive. Consequently the entire process was placed on hold until some

improvement in his condition was apparent. Once the worst was over, the designs were submitted to the Palace where Queen Mary saw them and approved them on the King's behalf. At the same time, the King's attendance at the Congress was ruled out and the Prince of Wales was asked to open the occasion on His Majesty's behalf.

THE PRODUCTION PROCESS - LOW VALUE STAMPS

On 8 January 1929 the Controller, H Sparkes, took the original drawings for the low values to the Royal Mint to engrave the dies and prepare the printing plates. It was decided that, because of the technically difficult nature of the 1d and 1½d design by Linzell, caused by the limited space for the denomination which required enlarging, this die should be engraved by J A C Harrison of Waterlow and Sons who were to print the stamps. Harrison was regarded as possibly the finest engraver of the day and had produced superlative work in the past. Farleigh's two designs for the ½d and 2½d stamps were engraved by Royal Mint staff. Mr Evans of the Royal Mint raised the question of the King's Head, arguing that the one used on the 1d definitive was not suitable for these designs and suggested the use of the 'No. 2 Coinage Head', as used on the 5d definitive. This was agreed by the Controller and approved the following day by Sir Evelyn Murray. It was also noted that Ernest Linzell's design carried only the word 'Postage', while John Farleigh's had both 'Postage' and 'Revenue'. Sir Evelyn was asked whether a change should be made to provide uniformity but he decided not, although all four low value stamps were of course valid for both postage and revenue.

DIE PROOFS - THE ½D AND 2½D DESIGNS

The first soft steel die proofs of the ½d and 2½d designs from the Royal Mint were received by Sparkes in mid-January:

Received

16 January, 2½d - two proofs of the soft steel die.

17 January, ½d - two proofs of the soft steel die, two proofs marked A and B showing alternative arrangements of the words 'Postage' and 'Revenue', original artwork for both ½d and 2½d.

These essays were returned to the Mint following discussions between the Controller and Sir Evelyn Murray, who asked for the following modifications:

2½d - the '9's in '1929' needed redrawing as they resembled '0's to the naked eye;

½d - the crown was poor as it touched the King's head and, because of its small size, appeared to balance precariously on it. The crown was to be raised outside of the oval surrounding the King's head.

Two essays of the ½d design incorporating these modifications as well as improvements to the lettering – the ‘G’ in ‘Postage’ and the ‘G’, ‘E’ and two ‘S’s in ‘Congress’ – were delivered on 18 January together with a third, marked ‘C’, taken from the modified die but with the white space which existed between the crown and the King’s head blacked in to show the effect of further modifications. Two essays of the modified 2½d design were also included. Two more ½d proofs, marked ‘D’ and ‘E’ which were modified in black ink around the crown were sent by the Mint that afternoon: ‘E’ showed a shading line around the crown while on ‘D’ it was omitted. Sir Evelyn Murray saw these proofs and decided the crown was still too small and required redrawing completely: John Farleigh was contacted and asked to produce fresh drawings by 26 January. However, having seen the engravings of his designs, Farleigh wrote to Sir Evelyn Murray complaining that the engraver had failed to replicate accurately his drawing and requesting consultation on the way forward. Sir Evelyn was unavailable, but a meeting was arranged with Mr Sparkes.

Farleigh met with the Controller, Mr Evan of the Mint, Mr Tydeman and Mr Cook of the Stores Department on 29 January to discuss the engraving of his design. A number of matters were discussed, principally the crown on the 2½d design and ‘1929’. Farleigh felt that if his drawing was copied ‘facsimile’ by the engraver, the ‘1929’ would be sufficiently distinctive to overcome the previous objection. An additional problem was raised over registration difficulties in printing the white lines which ran through the centres of the figure ‘½’ on the halfpenny design, and Farleigh agreed that these should be widened as much as necessary to solve the problem. Farleigh amended the halfpenny design to bring the crown outside the oval and it was agreed to have fresh dies of both designs engraved.

On 30 January the Mint sent the discarded soft die of the halfpenny design, which had been touched up to widen the white line in the denomination figure, together with three proofs for Waterlows to test for registration purposes. Waterlows forwarded nine proofs of this die in two shades of green on the following day with assurances that there would be no problem with the printing in this respect.

The new die of these designs was approved by the artist on 4 February and two proofs of each design were produced by the Mint on 6 February. Upon receipt Farleigh agreed to redraw the word ‘Postage’ on the 2½d design and the oval. The halfpenny design was now considered finalised, and an order was put forward for four-set essay blocks of the ½d, 1d and 1½d designs by the Post Office Stores Department on 11 February. It was later decided to produce a four-set block of the discarded 2½d die for use in colour selection, so when the Mint forwarded the essay blocks of the ½d and 2½d die on 19 February, the 2½d die was not yet approved. The third soft steel die of the 2½d design was finally approved on 21 February following the production of proofs on 18 February which required a slight retouch to the ‘S’s in ‘Congress’, and of final proofs on 21 February. Although there is no delivery

note for a four-set essay block of the approved 2½d die, Evans was reminded of their requirement on 26 February. As colour trials of this block were produced shortly after, it must be assumed they were delivered within a few days.

DIE PROOFS - The 1D AND 1½D DESIGN

In spite of the decision that the design for the 1d and 1½d stamps be engraved by J A C Harrison of Waterlows, the Royal Mint still acted as the contractors to the GPO. Consequently it was Mr Evans of the Mint who forwarded the first soft steel die of this design to Sparkes on 22 January 1929. This was to be a master die from which the working dies for each denomination would be made and therefore had no denomination cut into it. Together with two proofs of this die, the Mint sent two proofs showing the proposed arrangement of the lettering and numerals as they would appear on the working dies. Four more proofs of the master die were forwarded to the Controller on 24 January, two printed in the 1d definitive colour and two in the 1½d definitive colour.

The proofs of the master die and accompanying proposed working die proofs were shown to the Controller and to Sir Evelyn Murray who approved them, enabling working dies to be produced. Evans of the Mint had made it clear that the black dots which appeared on the proofs would be eliminated from the final die and had suggested that the ornaments on either side of 'One Penny' might be left out. This was agreed, as was a proposal to reduce the size of the numbers slightly as they were oversized on the proposed proofs. He also mentioned that the wreath and crown had been slightly enlarged with the full approval of Linzell. The only new change involved toning down the Union Jack as Sparkes considered it too prominent in the master die proof.

Three proofs of each of the two working dies in black, brown and red were received from the Mint on 6 February: however, there was a slight difference in the appearance of the King's head on them, one appearing darker, and Mr Harrison, the engraver, promised to 'true them up'. The 1d die (black) was approved but it was suggested on 11 February that the '1' should be made slightly smaller; the 1½d die (black) was also approved although it was emphasised that the Union Jack should not be any more prominent than it was on the proofs. Two proofs of each working die were forwarded by the Mint on 13 February with these amendments included; however, Mr Evans had marked a number of ragged lines and edges which he suggested needed sharpening up before the final dies were hardened. This was carried out and four more proofs in black of the 1d and 1½d dies (two each) were received on 19 February and finally approved. Four-set essay blocks of these dies which had been ordered on 11 February were received from the Mint on 25 February.

COLOUR TRIALS

The Stamp Committee met again on 1 March to view proofs and to select the colours. Waterlows had been asked to print proofs of the four-set essay blocks in various colours for the Committee. In the case of the 2½d design, the die used was the four-set block which was not approved. The following proofs were received by GPO stores on 27 February and shown to the Committee:

Postal Union Stamps Proof Inks

Fast to Light

Not Fast

2½d value

0282 - Fast Orient Blue
0286 - Royal Blue
0276 - Antwerp Blue
-- - Present Standard

0285 - Peacock Blue
0287 - Azure Blue
0267 - Sky Blue

1½d value

-- - Bistre
-- - Fast Indian Red
-- - Present Standard

1d value

0096 - Sunlight Crimson
0188 - Gloss Red
0102 - Brilliant Red Lake
0122 - Fast Geranium Lake
0189 - Permanent Vermilion
-- - Present Standard

0123 - Geranium Lake

½d value

0237 - Intense Fast Green
0240 - Deep Chrome Green
0236 - Middle Chrome Green
0232 - Middle Zinc Green
-- - Present Standard

0253 - Viridine Lake
0244 - Deep Faience Green

The Committee selected the following colours:

½d: 0236 - Middle Chrome Green
1d: 0189 - Permanent Vermilion

1½d: 0324 – Chocolate or 0082 – Art Brown

2½d: 0270 – Steel Shade Blue.

The final choice between the two colours for the 1½d value was left to the PMG. Unfortunately there is no record why the Committee failed to make a firm recommendation so one can only assume an impasse was reached. The PMG selected chocolate brown (0324) on 4 March.

The four-set essay blocks of each of the stamp designs were sent to Waterlows early in March together with the approved essays to produce further essays in the approved colours prior to final printing. During this time the final die cut of the 2½d design was approved, although exactly when is unclear. Suffice to say that by early March the Mint had prepared an approved die which was used to prepare the printing plates. Waterlows produced the first trials of the approved colours on 11 March when they submitted 12 pulls of four stamps of each of the four low value designs. These were found to lack depth and richness in colour compared to the standard essays produced previously: Mr Scott of Waterlows agreed to have another try.

The second set of colour trial essays arrived on 14 March in the same quantities as the first batch, 12 blocks of four for each denomination. These were also found to be lacking depth and richness so Mr Sparkes visited the company which provided the ink for stamp printing, Mander Brothers of Noel Street, London. Mander Bros agreed to attempt to produce an ink which would print in the required depth of shade and would also be non-toxic; most of the richer inks contained high quantities of lead which would be unsuitable for postage stamps. Meanwhile Waterlows continued to produce colour trial essays of the four designs over the following two weeks:

15 March: 1½d – 12 blocks of four stamps each nearer to standard but not quite enough body and slightly warmer in shade.

19 March: ½d – 11 blocks of four

19 March: 1½d – 11 blocks of four

20 March: 1d – 12 blocks of four

22 March: 1d – 12 blocks of four.

Mander Brothers delivered samples of the stamps, taken from samples sent to them, printed by letterpress in the following colours: Steel Blue – 62422; Middle Green – 62423; Vermilion Red – 62424; Chocolate – 62425.

25 March (all denominations printed in Mander Bros inks):

½d – 6 blocks of four

1d – 6 blocks of four

1½d – 6 blocks of four

2½d – 6 blocks of four.

Final approval of the colours was made by the Controller at various points throughout this process, with the approved essays coming from various of the essays submitted:

½d colour approved from essays of 14 March

1d colour approved from essays of 22 March

1½d colour approved from essays of 19 March

2½d colour approved from essays of 25 March (Mander Bros colour).

The last two of these selections were forwarded by the Controller to Waterlows on 27 March who were asked to go ahead with printing. Three of the approved colours were printed with inks supplied directly by Waterlows, but the Steel Blue approved for the 2½d stamp was to be supplied by Mander Bros for which warrants were arranged.

PRINTING PLATES

Following the approval of the master die in late February discussions with the Royal Mint established a timetable for the production and proving of printing plates. As the date of issue was 10 May, two months away, time was running short. On 27 February, Mr Evans of the Royal Mint submitted a proposed delivery schedule for 22 plates of which 4 master plates and 17 working plates would need to be sent to Waterlows for proving and touching up following engraving as the Mint's staff would not be able to meet the production demand. The proposed schedule called for the delivery of printing plates as follows:

Value	Series	Set	No	Ready for Proving at Waterlows on:	Prove in Mint on:
½d	Sheets	240	4	5, 6, 7, 8 March	27 March
½d	Books	264	2	11, 12 March	
½d	Rolls (end)	180	1	14 March	
1d	Sheets	240	2	19 March	
1½d	Sheets	240	4	21, 22, 25 March	
1d	Rolls (end)	180	1		
2½d	Sheets	240	2	26, 28 March	
1½d	Books	264	2	28, 29 March	1, 3 April 5, 8 April
1½d	Books	176	2		
1d	Books	264	2		
Total Plates			22	17 outside	5 Mint

A further 14 plates were also required which the Mint was unable to prove until after 8 April; however, the plates themselves would be ready earlier and it was proposed that they be

proved by Waterlows in order to reach the production deadline. The production schedule for these follows:

Value	Series	Set	No	Ready for Proving at Waterlows on:	Prove in Mint on:
½d	Rolls (side)	192	1	18 March	The Mint is unable to prove any of these plates prior to 8 April.
1½d	Rolls (end)	180	1	25 March	
1d ¹	Rolls (side)	192	1	2 April	
1d	Rolls (side)	192	1	2 April	
½d	Sheets	240	3	3, 4 April	
½d	Sheets	240	3	5, 6 April	
1d	Sheets	240	3	6, 7 April	
1½d	Sheets	240	1	8 April	

Total Plates: 14

The dates for the production of plates were agreed on the understanding the Mint would try to anticipate them as much as possible. Provided the schedule was adhered to, it was expected that the printers would have no problems fulfilling their printing warrants on time, although Waterlows did ask that 1½d plates be delivered as early as possible as these involved the largest print runs. The totals required for delivery before 3 May were as follows:

Sheets

½d - 870,000

1d - 315,000

1½d - 750,000

2½d - 36,000

Rolls

B - 100

D - 1,300

E - 1,150

G - 3,650

K - 750

L - 900

N - 13,000

O - 2,050

P - 20,000

W - 4,300

¹This may actually be 1½d value as the original typed schedule bears an ambiguous inked correction

X - 4,900
Y - 2,050
Z - 2,300.

Delivery of the approved plates began on 12 March and continued for the next five weeks; however, a problem arose when the four working plates of the ½d (plate nos 1/1, 2/2, 3/3, 4/4) were found by Waterlows to be 'picking up' (ie, applying too much ink to the paper causing blotting). These had to be returned to the Mint where it was decided to produce new plates rather than attempt correction. A delay of some four weeks occurred: the new ½d plates were not ready until 5 April. Additionally there was some suggestion that a reintroduction of the 1d minimum letter rate might occur in 1929, in which case the quantities of this value would be increased. To guard against this, the Supplies Department requested a further two 1d plates to be prepared by mid-April. While the Mint promised to supply these, it was made clear that overtime working would be required over the Easter holidays.

By mid-April it was obvious that Waterlows were having difficulties meeting the required delivery schedule, which it attributed to the late delivery of plates from the Mint. The actual schedules were adjusted somewhat but in a letter of 18 April Alex Scott, Waterlow's Watford printing works manager, explained that extensive overtime working would be required. The situation became even more critical towards the end of April whereupon Mr Scott sought assurances from the GPO that it would meet any additional cost incurred as a result of overtime. Although he was told to proceed, the actual matter of payment was not resolved at the time and led to a subsequent dispute between Waterlows and the GPO. Waterlows maintained that the production shortfall had been caused by delays in the delivery of plates and subsequent problems with the ½d plates produced by the Royal Mint, while the GPO claimed that had Waterlows actually used all of the production time available to them, the demand could have been met. An inquiry by the GPO concluded that:

'There is no doubt that the trouble with the first batch of ½d plates threw the programme both at the Mint and at Waterlow's entirely out of gear. At the same time, I do not think that Messrs Waterlow used every effort to meet the Department's requirements until considerable pressure had been brought to bear upon them.'

(GPO Memorandum, 29 April 1929)

Unfortunately Waterlows had not objected to the original proofs in February when they received the 4 set die proof of the ½d value and had delayed in returning the faulty plates to the Mint. Had they acted immediately, on proving or on plate delivery, new plates would have been available much earlier. In the end Waterlows decided not to pursue their claim for extra payment.

STAMP BOOKS

Three of the low values were additionally made available in stamp booklets. Plates for stamp books had been proved by early April and the first proofs of the book covers were sent to the Secretary of the GPO, Sir Evelyn Murray, on 3 April. Two stamp books containing ½d, 1d and 1½d stamps in panes of six stamps were issued costing 2/- and 3/-, composed as follows:

2/- books: 6 - ½d, 6 - 1d, 10 - 1½d

3/- books: 6 - ½d, 6 - 1d, 18 - 1½d.

The advertising contract was held by Messrs Sells who suggested that in order to attract advertising revenue the covers ought to carry distinctive features such as special titles or colours. Waterlow and Sons submitted proofs of the 2/- book cover in red and the 3/- cover in blue both with cream background with the words 'Postal Union Congress London 1929'. The first proofs marked A - D received on 27 March were printed on four different shades of paper in red and blue. These were considered dirty and further proofs in lighter shades of blue with different typographical treatments of the heading (marked E - H and J - T) were submitted on 8 April. On 16 April Mr Cook of the Stores Department informed Waterlows that the approved proof for the 2/- book was that marked 'R' for both the colour and typography, whereas that for the 3/- book was proof 'A' except for the typography of the heading which should be as proof 'R'. The books carried advertising labels inside on perforated panes with the stamps. Five editions of each book were printed numbered 103 - 107 for the 2/- books and 168 - 172 for the 3/-.

PRODUCTION OF THE £1 STAMP

Following approval by Queen Mary of Harold Nelson's design for the £1 stamp depicting St George and the Dragon, Bradbury Wilkinson were asked to begin engraving. The Stamp Committee had decided that the design should be line engraved as this technique would produce the best quality stamp and they requested that J A C Harrison undertake the task. Harrison was at the time working for Waterlows on the low value stamps but was seconded to Bradbury Wilkinson for this project which began in early January. On 9 January Bradbury Wilkinson were sent three dies of the 2s 6d, 5s and the 10s so that the MacKenna head of King George V, which had also been engraved by Harrison, could be incorporated into Nelson's design. The following day H Leslie Hendricks, Bradbury Wilkinson's Managing Director, wrote to the Controller with costings and printing plans. The estimates provided showed costings for the various functions:

Item	Cost
Original engraving	£89 10s 6d
Printing Plate - 20 set	£14 7s 6d
Printing 50,000 stamps	£15 15s
Printing 100,000 stamps including perforating, warehousing, counting and controlling	£25
Total	£ 144 13s

The stamps were to be printed in sheets of 20 instead of 40: the relatively small print run meant that the saving of printing 40 stamps at a time would not offset the higher cost of engraving a 40-set plate. There was, however, a proposal from Mr Hendricks that a comb perforator be purchased at cost of £38 as the ordinary rotary perforating machine punched a double perforation where the lines crossed. Bradbury Wilkinson intended to pass on the full cost of this purchase to the GPO as it would have no other use for the perforator, but when the idea was put to Sir Evelyn Murray he rejected it on cost grounds. Approval was given, however, that the £1 stamp be printed on paper bearing a special watermark, similar to that adopted for the high value National Savings Certificate, consisting of a large Royal cypher, GVR, in script with a crown above, appearing once on each stamp.

DIE PROOFS

The first proofs of the £1 were handed to the Controller, Mr Sparkes, by Hendricks on 25 January. These were both taken from a soft steel die with the design 'laid in', ie, cut in outline only with no shading or depth, and were printed in blue. Of the two proofs submitted one was taken straight from the die while the second was completed in wash to give an impression of the final effect. On 28 January, Mr Sparkes accompanied Sir Frank Short, who had been asked by the Stamp Committee to oversee the engraving process, and Harold Nelson to Bradbury Wilkinson for a consultation with J A C Harrison. It seems that Harrison's 'laid in' proof met with their general approval and he was asked to proceed with the fully-cut die.

The die was ready by early February and on 7 February, Bradbury Wilkinson forwarded to the Controller ten proofs, in duplicate (20 prints in total), of different colours marked A - J. Bradbury Wilkinson had also retained a copy of each proof (10 prints) for reference. The Controller was asked to provide advice in relation to the die and colour as soon as possible. These proofs were shown to Harold Nelson, Sir Frank Short and Sir Evelyn Murray who all approved the cut of the die so a letter of 11 February from Mr Sparkes approved the die for printing. The matter of colour was unresolved as the final choice would be made by the Stamp Committee meeting on 1 March. Meanwhile Sir Frank Short requested that a proof in full black as he felt this would sharpen the contrast and accentuate the darker parts of the

engraving, namely the horse and armour. Bradbur Wilkinson had presumably already been preparing further colour trials and duplicate proofs of seven more colours (14 prints) marked K - Q were delivered to the GPO Stores Department on 12 February. These proofs were printed in three shades of blue, three shades of green and one, marked Q, was black. Bradbury Wilkinson had also retained a set of these proofs for reference.

The die approved, Bradbury Wilkinson started production and submitted two full sheet proofs on 19 February for approval. These were shown to Mr Coleman of the Stores Department who discovered a small line present above and to the right of the £1. This flaw was, however, very slight and there was a risk that, should steps be taken to remove it, damage to the plate might occur, so it was decided to approve the plates as they stood. There was a slight difference between the layout of the plates and the original layout used to centre the watermarks on the paper, but Bradbury Wilkinson provided assurances that this would not affect the final printing of the stamps. One of the above sheets was returned to Bradbury Wilkinson on 21 February together with permission to curve the plate for mounting on the rollers and chrome facing to prolong its durability.

The Stamp Committee met on 1 March to view the die proofs and to select the colour. For this meeting, Bradbury Wilkinson had been asked to provide four sets of the 17 different colour proofs (A - Q) and delivered the 68 proofs on the day of the meeting. The Committee added their approval of the engraved die and selected proof Q in black for issue. The approval of the Committee was sent to Bradbury Wilkinson on 7 March together with a signed copy of proof Q. Accompanying this was a request for twelve sets of four imperforate £1 stamps printed on art paper and in sunk mounts. These were produced by printing 50 sheets from the 20-set plate and extracting the required number of blocks of four, the remainder of the stamps being destroyed. Similar sets of the low values were also produced and were presented as gifts to the members of the Stamp Committee and the artists who were involved with the stamps. A second die was engraved during March and two single prints with extra wide margins were taken from it during late April which were presented to King George V for the Royal Collection.

Following a request from the GPO Stores, Bradbury Wilkinson provided a detailed list of all material produced in relation to the £1 stamp on 10 May including all the material mentioned previously. Most of the material is traced as having been destroyed as per the list below.

Status of £1 PUC Proofs, etc.

Item	Status
2 single prints of layed in die in blue - one washed in.	extant
7 sets of colour proofs A - Q	4 sets destroyed 4 May 1935. 3 sets extant.
3 full sheets pulled from the plate in black	1 sheet destroyed 10 May 1929; 2 sheets destroyed 4 May 1935.
2 single prints from new die with wide margins	Presented to HM King in special album
14 soft paper prints pulled for colours.	Destroyed 10 May 1929
12 sheets of 4 stamps sets imperforate.	Presented to Stamp Committee members and artists

PRINTING DETAILS

20 reams of the specially watermarked paper were delivered by Portal and Sons and Waterlows gummed 9,173 sheets prior to printing. Bradbury Wilkinson printed 3,750 sheets of 20 stamps under warrant U17 of which 5,660 £1 stamps were waste, leaving a total print of 69,340 stamps delivered.

THE PUC STAMPS ISSUED

The new stamps were to be issued on the first day of the Postal Union Congress which opened in London on 10 May 1929 and, despite all of the production difficulties, supplies were in hand on the date. A press notice for publication on the first day of issue outlined the details of the designs and designers and notified the public that the stamps would replace the current definitives until further notice. There was some debate over the distribution of the £1 stamp with a suggestion it be issued only to Head or branch offices; however, Sir Evelyn Murray made it clear that he wished to see a wide distribution of the stamp and it also became available at all sub-post offices in London. Provincial distribution at sub-office level was left to the discretion the regional Head Postmasters. A notice in the Post Office 'Circular' of 1 May indicated the procedure for Postmasters ordering stocks of the new stamps and gave strict instructions that none of the new stamps should be issued

before 10 May. Each of the delegates to the Congress received a commemorative album containing the special stamps and the King was sent both mint stamps and a cancelled first day cover for the Royal Collection.

The reaction of the public was mixed although first day sales were quite strong. The low values were criticised in many quarters, including THE LONDON PHILATELIST, house journal of The Royal Philatelic Society London, as being of poor and cheap design; critics compared them variously to 'beer bottle labels' and 'railway parcels stamps'. As for the £1 stamp, the critics were unanimous in their praise, although it was described as more suitable for a bookplate than a stamp. Criticism was directed quite sharply at the GPO for perceived exploitation of the philatelic market, as the stamp was of very limited operational use. On the whole, however, sales of all the stamps were very successful and stocks of the low values were exhausted before the GPO had intended to withdraw the stamps in October.

Final Sales Figures: Low values.

Single stamps	½d	1d	1½d	2½d
In Sheets	589,797,840	274,777,200	658,920,960	26,782,800
In Books: 2/-	14,723,034	14,723,034	24,538,390	
In Books: 3/-	15,001,614	15,001,614	45,004,842	
In Rolls	58,020,960	36,525,600	22,758,720	
Total	677,543,448	341,027,448	751,222,912	26,782,800

For a further breakdown of these figures see Table 4.

Initial sales of the £1 stamp were good, almost exclusively to the philatelic market; the stamp remained on sale until further notice. It was not until May 1933 that the stamps were withdrawn from general distribution although a supply was retained at the London Chief Office. The stamp was also included in the commemorative album presented to the delegates to the Postal Union Congress held in Cairo in 1934. Finally, in July 1937 GPO Stores were told to stop issuing supplies of the £1 although presumably some sales may have continued after this date while the London Chief Office exhausted the remainder of its stock. A memo dated 7 July 1937 records final sales for the £1 stamp of 66,788.

Alan Griffiths
National Postal Museum

REFERENCES:

Post Office Archives Files:

- Post 33/2903 - Postal Union Congress, 1929 Commemorative Stamps.
- Post 52/0516 - Notes on 1924-40 commemorative stamps, 1946
- Post 52/0986 - Unified Stamps: Postal Union Congress (London) Issue

Books

- GPO Establishment Book, 1929
- GREAT BRITAIN VOL. 2: KING EDWARD VII TO KING GEORGE VI. SPECIALISED STAMP CATALOGUE (7th ed), London: Stanley Gibbons Pubs Ltd. 1986.

Journals

- Alexander, Jean. 'Great Britain: 1929 PUC Commemoratives New Discoveries', THE STAMP LOVER, Vol. 62 (March-April 1970) pp 53-4.
- Rigo de Righi, A G 'The Postal Union Congress Issue of 1929', PHILATELIC BULLETIN, Vol. 10, No. 2 (October 1972) pp. 3, ff.
- Watson, James. 'British Special Stamps: 2. Ninth UPU Congress, 1929 - The Low Values', PHILATELIC BULLETIN, Vol. 12, No. 1 (September, 1974), p. 5.
- Wiseman, Tony. 'Great Britain: King Edward VII 5d. Part 1 - Plate Varieties', THE STAMP LOVER, Vol. 66 (July-August, 1974) p. 109-112.
- Wiseman, Tony. 'PUC Plates and Other Matters', GB JOURNAL, Vol. 11 No. 2. March 1973

Table 1: (See next page)

Postal Union Congress - Statement of Contractual Terms and Weekly Deliveries: Sheets and Books

Description	Warrants		Contractual Delivery Terms Min. required.	Deliveries : week ended					Plates received at Watford
	Dates	Quantity*		6 April	13 April	20 April	27 April	4 May	
½d sheets	11/3 12/4	1,150,000 750,000	10% in 14 days from despatch of warrant and 625,000 sheets per week thereafter.		2	106,000	220,000	274,000	4-5/4, 3-18/4
1d "	11/3 19/4	420,000 400,000			34,002	46,000	66,000	120,000	2-28/3, 2-8/4, 1-10/4
1½d "	11/3 19/4	1,000,000 1,300,000			20,002	154,000	214,000	338,000	4-28/3, 2-17/4, 1-18/4
2½d "	11/3 19/4	50,000 30,000			2		49,998	14,000	2-8/4, 1-15/4
Totals					54,008	306,000	549,998	746,000	
2/- books	10/4 19/4	500,500 2,002,000	250,000 books within 14 days of receipt of approved advertisement proofs and 350,000 per week thereafter.				286,000	214,500	2 x ½d (264) - 10/4 1 x 1d (264) - 8/4 & another on 15/4 1 x 1½d (264) - 3/4 and 1 on 10/4 1 x 1½d (176) - 5/4 & another on 17/4
3/- books	10/4 19/4	500,500 2,002,000						418,000	
Totals							286,000	632,500	

The quantities quoted in Tables 1 and 2 are for initial deliveries only as total sales exceed them.

Table 2:

Postal Union Congress - Statement of Contractual Terms and Weekly Deliveries: Rolls

Description	Warrants		Contractual Delivery Terms Min. required.	Deliveries : week ended					Plates received at Watford
	Dates	Quantity		6 April	13 April	20 April	27 April	4 May	
Rolls		Rolls							
B	11/3	240	25,000 rolls in 14 days of despatch of warrant and 8000 per week thereafter.				100		½d (180) - 12/4
	19/4	150							
D	"	2,100						125	1d (180) - 8/4
E	"	960							
	"	2,400							
G	"	1,500					250	900	1½d (180) - 5/4
	"	6,000							
K	"	3,300							
	"	1,050							
L	"	750							½d (192) - 8/4
	"	1,050							
N	"	750					250	8,750	1d (192) - 10/4
	"	17,500							
	"	11,000							1½d (192) - 17/4
O	"	3,000						1,250	
	"	750							
P	"	32,000				3,75	12,5	3,500	
	"	12,500				0	00		
W	"	7,200						3,840	
	"	3,600							
X	"	8,400							
	"	4,200				1,08	3,72		
Y	"	3,600				0	0	1,875	
	"	2,100							
Z	"	4,200							
	"	2,700						125	

Table 3:**Postal Union Congress - Record of Movement of Plates and Proofs**

Description			Proof received	Plate returned to Mint	Plate received from Mint	Plate sent to Watford	Remarks
value	set	number					
½d	240	Master	25/2	25/2	-	-	
½d	90	"	4/3	5/3	-	-	
½d	96	"	6/3	7/3	-	-	
½d	264	"	4/3	5/3	-	-	
1d	240	Master	5/3 &	5/3 &	-	-	
1d	90	"	9/3	9/3	-	-	
1d	96	"	13/3	14/3	-	-	
1d	264	"	16/3	18/3	-	-	
			16/3	18/3			
1½d	240	Master	11/3	13/3	-	-	
1½d	90	"	12/3	14/3	-	-	
1½d	96	"	16/3	18/3	-	-	
1½d	264	"	13/3	14/3	-	-	
2½d	240	Master	12/3	13/3	-	-	
½d	240	1/1	8/3	11/3	12/3	14/3)	Plates unsatisfactory . Returned to the Mint 22/3. Unsatisfactory
½d	240	2/2†	8/3	8/3	12/3	14/3)	
½d	240	3/3†	11/3	11/3	12/3	14/3)	
½d	240	4/4†	12/3	12/3	14/3	14/3)	
½d	240	5/5**	unknown	unknown			
½d	240	6/6	* -	-	5/4	5/4	
½d	240	7/7	* -	-	5/4	5/4	
½d	240	8/42	4/4	5/4	5/4	5/4	
½d	240	9/43	* -	-	5/4	5/4	
½d	240	10/44	16/4	16/4	18/4	18/4	
½d	240	11/47	* -	-	18/4	18/4	
½d	240	12/48	* -	-	18/4	18/4	
½d	180	1/34	16/3 11/4	19/3 11/4	11/4	12/4	Unsatisfactory
½d	192	1/31	20/3 4/4	22/3 5/4	8/4	8/4	
½d	264	1/23	16/3	19/3	-	-)	

½d	264	2/24	21/3	22/3	-	-)	"
½d	264	3/45	9/4	10/4	10/4	10/4	
½d	264	4/46	9/4	10/4	10/4	10/4	

Description			Proof received	Plate returned to Mint	Plate received from Mint	Plate sent to Watford	Remarks
value	set	number					
1d	240	1/8	20/3	22/3	27/3	28/3	unsatisfactory
1d	240	2/9	unknown	unknown			
1d	240	3/10	25/3	27/3	28/3	28/3	
1d	240	4/11†	4/4	4/4	8/4	8/4	
1d	240	5/12†	3/4	4/4	5/4	8/4	
1d	240	6/37†	5/4	6/4	9/4	10/4	
1d	180	1/35	3/4	4/4	8/4	8/4	
1d	192	1/32	9/4	10/4	10/4	10/4	
1d	264	1/25†	3/4	3/4	5/4	8/4	
1d	264	2/26†	11/4	11/4	12/4	15/4	
1½d	240	1/13	23/3	25/3	27/3	28/3	
1½d	240	2/14	25/3	27/3	28/3	28/3	
1½d	240	3/15†	21/3	25/3	27/3	28/3	
1½d	240	4/16	27/3	27/3	28/3	28/3	
1½d	240	5/17	12/4	12/4	16/4	17/4	
1½d	240	6/18	16/4	16/4	16/4	17/4	
1½d	240	7/19	*	-	18/4	18/4	
1½d	180	1/36	28/3	2.4	4/4	5/4	
1½d	192	1/33	15/4	15/4	16/4	17/4	
1½d	176	1/29†	28/3	2/4	4/4	5/4	
1½d	176	2/30†	4/4	5/4	17/4	17/4	
1½d	264	1/27†	28/3	-	28/3	3/4	
1½d	264	2/28	5/4	6/4	9/4	10/4	
2½d	240	1/20	4/4	5/4	-	8/4	unsatisfactory
2½d	240	2/21	3/4	4/4	8/4	8/4	
2½d	240	3/22	unknown	unknown	-	-	
2½d	240	4/38†	12/4	12/4	12/4	15/4	

*Proofs examined at Mint.

†Proved by Waterlows at Clifton St.

**Plates marked as delivery date unknown were found to be defective at the Mint and were not entered in the official Plate record.

Table 4:

Statement of Issues of Postal Union Congress Stamps: Low Values

½d unified in sheets of 240 stamps	2,457,491
1d " " " " " "	1,144,905
1½d " " " " " "	2,745,504
2½d " " " " " "	111,595
Total sheets of 240	6,459,495
Books of Stamps: 2/- (6 - 1d, 10 - 1½d)	2,453,839
" " " 3/- (6 - ½d, 6 - 1d, 18 - 1½d)	2,500,269
Total of Books	4,954,108

Rolls	No. of stamps	Value	Rolls Issued
B	960	1d	952
D	960	½d	2,993
E	480	1d	5,916
G	480	½d	11,811
K	960	1½d	3,245
L	480	1½d	2,847
N	480	1½d	38,077
O	480	1d	4,653
P	480	½d	43,458
W	960	½d	14,555
X	960	1d	15,373
Y	1920	½d	7,628
Z	1920	1d	8,219
Total Number of Rolls			159,727

Table 5a:

PUC Booklets, 2s 0d - list of advertisers

10 May 1929 - booklet no. 103	
FC	Punch
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Society

	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	General Acoustics, Shellacon	Scotland by the East Coast
label	Holiday Trips £40. 3rd cabin only	
	SS Minnekahda and Minnesota. Atlantic Transport Line	
2	Dean and Dawson	New Zealand Lamb
3	Civil Service Co-op Trust	Times Furnishing Co
4	Free Church Touring Guild	Underwood Portable
1BC	Adams and Sons	
BC	Adante	

30 May 1929 - booklet no. 104

FC	The Prudential	
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Society	
	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	The Shellacon, General Acoustics	Belgium, Zeeland, Holland, Germany, LNER
label	Have YOU tried Cleaver's Terebene? F S Cleaver, London.	
2	Dean and Dawson	Free Church Touring Guild
3	Sunchek and Kullafast Upholstery	Underwood Portable Typewriters
1BC	Dickens Wine Houses	
BC	Ardente	

17 June 1929 - booklet no. 105

FC	BP gives you more	
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Society	
	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	The Shellacon, General Acoustics	LNER Edinburgh, etc.
label	Cash's Washing Ribbons Patterns J and J Cash	
2	Dean and Dawson	The Time Furnishing Co.
3	New Zealand Lamb	P and O Cruises
4	Beasley's Spinales	Lavell Batton / E J Woods
1BC	Free Church Touring Guild	
BC	Ardente	

3 July 1929 - booklet no. 106

FC	Basildon Bond	
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Society	
	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	The Shellacon, General Acoustics	LNER Edinburgh, etc.

label	Stamp Collectors. Chas. Nissen, 63 High Holborn	
	Desti Cigarettes	
2	Dean and Dawson	Henckey Ltd
3	Sun Life Assurance of Canada Ltd.	Pickfords
4	P and O Cruises	Mead Typewriters
1BC	Ardente	
BC	Mabic, Todd, Swan Partners	

15 July 1929 - booklet no 107		
FC	Burgogne's Gintara	
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Society	
	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	General Acoustics Ltd	LNER Holidays
label	Telephone Service/ Air Mails - Letters and Parcels	
2	Dean and Dawson	Sun Life Assurance of Canada
3	P and O Cruises	New Zealand Lamb
4	T. Wallis Easy Chairs	Beasley's Spinales
1BC	Lavell Batton	
BC	Ardente	

Table 5b:

PUC Booklets - 3s 0d- list of advertisers

10 May 1929 - booklet no. 168		
FC	Burgoyne's Gintara	
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Co Ltd	
	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	General Acoustics Ltd	LNER
2	Dean and Dawson	H R Harmer
3	Kennicott Water Softeners	Church Travellers Club
4	Perfection Pie	UIL
5	PRI	PRIF
1BC	Ardente	
BC	Swan	

3 June 1929 - booklet no. 169		
FC	BP gives you	
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Society	
	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	General Acoustics Ltd	LNER
2	Dean and Dawson	Massage and Medical Electricity

3	T. Wallis and Co Ltd	Church Travellers Club
4	Torquay	Gabbitas, Shring Education
5	PRI	PRIF
1BC	Ardente	
BC	Hamptons	

2 July 1929 - booklet no. 170

FC	Punch	
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Society	
	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	General Acoustics	LNER 'on either side'
2	Dean and Dawson	University Motors Ltd
3	B and I Agency	Guardax Safety Glass
4	P and O Cruises	Ealangers
5	PRI	PRFC
1BC	Ardente	
BC	Keith Prowse	

16 July 1929 - booklet no. 171

FC	BP gives you	
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Society	
	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	General Acoustics Ltd	on holidays
2	Dean and Dawson	Henckey's Ltd
3	P and O Cruises	John Knight
4	PRI	PRIF
1BC	F Lavell Batton / E J Woods	
BC	Ardente	

31 July 1929 - booklet no 172

FC	The Prudential	
IFC	Legal and General Assurance Society Ltd	
	<i>front</i>	<i>back</i>
1	Dime, General Acoustics	Holiday Suggestions, LNER
2	Dean and Dawson	Burgoyne Opher Rick
3	P and O Cruises	Henckey's Wine and Spirit Merchants
4	PRI	PRIF
1BC	Gabbitas, Shring Education	
BC	Ardente	