

CANADA & NEWFOUNDLAND POSTAL STATIONERY CATALOGUE - 4TH EDITION - J.F. WEBB

At last the new 4th edition of Webb's Canada & Newfoundland Postal Stationery Catalogue is available! When the first edition appeared in 1971 Jim Webb spurred a revival in the collecting of Canadian Postal Stationery. Indeed his listing has become the Canadian postal stationery catalogue. Anyone who doubts Jim Webb's contribution need only compare this new volume with the stationery section of the 1968 edition of Holmes' catalogue.

It is now five years since the 3rd edition appeared and inflation has been high during that period. One indication of this is the fact the 4th edition costs \$12.00; the third edition was priced at \$7.50. Better stationery items have been selling at a premium over prices given in the third edition for most of that five year interval. Therefore, it is not surprising that prices are generally higher in the 4th edition.

There are many substantial increases in Newfoundland, with the largest percentage changes appearing for scarce used and relatively common unused material. The increase in the price of the reply letter card is particularly striking.

The price changes for Canada are led by a general increase of over 100% for the railway view cards and of approximately 100% for aerogrammes in used condition. For the most part the prices for the more common regular issue material have changed only slightly. Large increases have been given for many of the scarcer pieces (e.g. EN5a, EN8a, EN17e, P35, P36 and P44b) while other "difficult" items which appear to be in less demand or which have not been sold recently at auction (e.g. EN56, EN69c, P27d and A27a) show little or no change in price. Several previously unpriced items now bear very high valuations (e.g. for EN7a used - \$2000.). There are few changes in the section on election envelopes but large increases for selected special order material. This also reflects the fact that at auction almost all but the commonest pieces of special order stationery have been realizing prices at, or often very much above, catalogue. I expect that there will be considerable disagreement with a few of Jim Webb's prices, but, overall, they are sound and well-considered.

Aside from the badly needed price adjustments what does the new 4th edition offer? There are no new sections. There are, of course, the new items issued since 1978. There are the "normal" additions to the list of special order envelopes (with some minor renumbering), and a variety of newly reported private order postal cards and postal bands. Several inconsistent or incorrect listings have been changed. Unfortunately, except for the envelopes, the new catalogue continues the practice of mixing the listings of regular issues and private order issues. This is very confusing - especially for the Elizabethan postal cards. Additions to the list of "regularly issued" material include a

Postal Stationery Notes is the newsletter of the BNAPS Postal Stationery Study Group, and is co-edited by Earle Covert and Robert Lemire. All information for the newsletter, and correspondence about the study group, should be addressed to: Robert Lemire, Box 549, Pinawa, Man., Canada ROE 1L0.

limited number of newly reported revalued items (1968 issue), a selection of fairly minor varieties and one or two real surprises. One is EK81, the Queen Victoria 3¢ envelope (small size) on paper watermarked "Old Berkshire Mills 1881" (previously this watermark had only been reported on the 1¢ envelope); another (although it may be private order) is P66p - the 1¢ George VI postal card, mimeo rouletted but with the standard bilingual heading! (Do similar cards exist for any other issue?).

Not all items discovered since the 3rd edition went to press are listed in the 4th edition, and in many (but not all) cases Jim Webb is not to blame. Items are listed only if they have been examined by him personally, and many collectors, myself included, tend to procrastinate. (I usually send items for listing by registered mail and enclose an envelope bearing sufficient postage for return by registered mail). If your favorite "find" is not listed, it never will be if you don't properly report it.

The whiter paper used for this edition provides a good contrast to the printed material. Unfortunately, at least in my copy, many of the pages show offsets of other pages, and one or two of the pictures have faded out almost completely. There are also a few new typographical errors. However, these are really minor flaws.

The new catalogue (available directly from Jim Webb, Hornby, Ontario, Canada LOP 1EO - CAN\$12.00) is a necessary tool for all serious collectors of Canadian postal stationery, and is well worth its price. Regardless of its faults it is still, by far, the best up-to-date listing available.

Robert Lemire

ERPs

With this issue an initial list of ERPs for regularly issued postal stationery is completed. As is evident from this and the previous lists much work remains to be done, and considerable revision will be necessary as members compare dates with those on pieces in their own collections. It is hoped that many new dates will be given in the next issue of Postal Stationery Notes, and that a complete list will be available for distribution to members by early September, possibly in time for BNAPEX. If you have an item which has an earlier date than the date listed in the newsletter, please send a photocopy of both the front and the back of the item to the editors of Postal Stationery Notes, or directly to Bill Walton. Items in this list are arranged by Webb number with the Higgins and Gage number in parentheses.

Aerogrammes

A30	(F29)	July 22, 1971
A30a	(-)	?
A30b	(F30)	Oct. 16, 1971
A30d	(-)	?
A30e	(F31)	Nov. 22, 1971
A30f	(F32)	?
A30g	(F32a)	?
A31	(F33)	?
A31a	(F33a)	?
A32-43	(F35)	Oct. 17, 1973
A44-55	(-)	?
A56		Oct. 18, 1978
A57		?
A58		?

A59	?
A60 *	?
A61 *	?
A62 *	?
A63 *	?

Letter Sheets

LS3-14 (F34)	Oct. 17, 1973
LS15-26	?

Postal Cards

P99	(204)	June 7, 1968
P99a	(204a)	?
P99b	(-)	?
P100	(206)	?
P101a	(205)	Sept. 29, 1967
P102a	(210)	April 28, 1969
P102b	(210a)	?
P102c	(K27)	?
P103b	(211)	Feb. 24, 1969
P104b	(212)	June 15, 1971
P104c	(218)	Feb. 13, 1974
P104g	(-)	?
P104h	(-)	?
P105a	(214)	June 30, 1971
P106b	(216)	Dec. 30, 1971
P106d	(-)	Oct. 12, 1973
P107	(208b)	?
P107a	(208c)	?
P107b *	(-)	?
P107c	(207)	Aug. 3, 1969
P107d	(207a)	May 20, 1970
P107f	(208)	?
P107g	(208a)	?
P107h *	(-)	?
P108	(209a)	Mar. 29, 1971
P108a	(209)	Aug. 30, 1969
P108b	(-)	Aug. 24, 1970
P109	(213)	Dec. 4, 1971
P109a	(213a)	Dec. 4, 1971
P109b	(K28)	Sept. 17, 1973
P110		Mar. 3, 1975
P110a		Aug. 28, 1976
P111		Mar. 3, 1975
P112		Oct. 18, 1976
P112a		"
P113		Mar. 9, 1977
P113a		?
P114		April 28, 1978
P115 *		Mar. 28, 1979
P115a *		?
P116 *		Mar. 28, 1979
P117 *		Oct. 24, 1982
P118 *		?

Envelopes

EN83	(B89)	Dec. 27, 1967
EN83a	(B89a)	May 25, 1967
EN83b	(B92)	?
EN83c	(B92a)	Sept. 13, 1968
EN84	(B90)	Mar. 15, 1968
EN84a	(B90a)	Jan. 21, 1968
EN84b	(B93)	Dec. 18, 1967
EN84c	(B93a)	June 4, 1968
EN85	(B91)	July 27, 1967
EN85a	(B91a)	Oct. 26, 1967

EN85b/f	(B94)	Dec. 28, 1967
EN85c/g	(B94a)	Feb. 21, 1968
EB85d	(B106)	Mar. 2, 1971
EN85e	(B106a)	April 26, 1971
EN86	(B107)	Jan. 29, 1969
EN86a	(B107a)	Dec. 13, 1968
EN87	(B108)	June 29, 1970
EN87b	(B108a)	Oct. 7, 1970
EN87d	(B109)	July 29, 1971
EN87e	(B109a)	July 23, 1971
EN87f	(B111)	Nov. 30, 1971
EN87g	(B111a)	Nov. 30, 1971
EN87h	(-)	Jan. 23, 1974
EN87i	(-)	Feb. 13, 1974
EN88	(B112)	June 30, 1971
EN88a	(B112a)	Oct. 25, 1971
EN89	(B113)	Jan. 31, 1972
EN89a	(B113b)	Mar. 14, 1973
EN89b	(B113a)	Mar. 28, 1972
EN89c	(B113c)	Sept. 25, 1973
EN90	(B95B)	"
EN91	(-)	?
EN91a	(B95)	May 27, 1969
EN91b	(B95a)	Aug. 29, 1969
EN92	(B96)	Feb. 26, 1970
EN92a	(B96a)	July 10, 1970
EN92b	(B97)	July 7, 1970
EN92c	(B97a)	Aug. 29, 1969
EN92d	(-)	?
EN93	(B98)	Oct. 7, 1969
EN93a	(B98a)	June 23, 1969
EN93b	(B99)	Mar. 4, 1969
EN93c	(-)	?
EN94	(B99a)	Mar. 31, 1969
EN94a	(B99b)	April 10, 1969
EN94b	(B100)	Mar. 26, 1969
EN94c	(B100a)	July 22, 1969
EN94d	(B101)	July 18, 1969
EN95	(B101a)	"
EN96	(B102)	April 15, 1969
EN96a	(B102a)	April 22, 1969
EN97	(B102b)	June 30, 1969
EN97a	(B103)	Mar. 31, 1969
EN97b/g	(B104)	Feb. 25, 1969
EN97c/i	(B104a)	Feb. 8, 1970
EN97d	(B105)	July 2, 1969
EN97e	(B105a)	May 21, 1969
EN97f	(B105b)	Aug. 21, 1969
EN97h	(-)	"
EN98	(B110)	July 29, 1971
EN98a	(B110a)	July 29, 1971
EN99		March 3, 1975
EN99a		March 3, 1975
EN100		March 3, 1975
EN100a		March 3, 1975

EN101	Sept. 23, 1976	EN104c *	March 31, 1979
EN101a	Sept. 23, 1976	EN105 *	March 28, 1979
EN101b	Aug. 3, 1977	EN106 *	March 7, 1980
EN101c	May 20, 1977	EN106a *	Nov. 20, 1979
EN102	Mar. 10, 1977	EN107 *	July 23, 1979
EN102a	Mar. 9, 1977	EN107a *	Mar. 28, 1979
EN102c *	Mar. 27, 1979	EN 107c *	Nov. 20, 1979
EN103	April 14, 1978	EN108 *	July 15, 1982
EN103a	April 5, 1978	EN108a *	June 14, 1982
EN104 *	March 28, 1979	EN109 *	?
EN104a *	March 28, 1979	EN109a *	?

* catalogue numbers from Webb's 4th edition.

NEW ERPs (for items on previous lists)

Another good set of additions from Earle Covert, Colin Campbell, Lawrence Sandford, John Aitken, Bruce McCallum, Robert Lemire and Horace Harrison.

A17c April 10, 1951	A22 Sept. 29, 1955	A23 April 23, 1956
A23a May 30, 1956	A26 Jan. 24, 1966	W20b May ? , 1940
A28 Oct. 12, 1968	W16/16b Mar. 10, 1931	P48 Jan. 23, 1931
W22 July 12, 1958	W25 June 10, 1961	P84a Oct. 28, 1954
P71 June 11, 1953	P77 Aug. 7, 1943	P89 Nov. 1, 1955
P85 Aug. 17, 1954	P87 Nov. 26, 1954	P92 Aug. 12, 1960
P90 Nov. 29, 1956	P91 June 14, 1960	P95a Aug. 5, 1966
P93 Sept. 16, 1960	P94f Oct. 14, 1965 *	EN63 June 6, 1951
EN6b/8b Aug. 6, 1888	EN16a Oct. 19, 1911	EN65a Aug. 20, 1951
EN63a Sept. 25, 1951	EN64a Dec. 17, 1943	EN71 June 11, 1954
EN66a Feb. 16, 1952	EN70 May 18, 1954	EN71c Oct. 15, 1955
EN71a Jan. 30, 1955	EN71b Mar. 14, 1955	EN72c Nov. 21, 1955
EN72 April 8, 1954	EN72b Feb. 18, 1955	EN75 Nov. 9, 1962
EN73 (knife 1) Dec. 17, 1954	EN73 (knife 2) Apr. 5, 1955	EN76a Nov. 19, 1962
EN74 Dec. 16, 1962	EN74a Aug. 20, 1962	EN79 April 25, 1964
EN75a July 12, 1962	EN76 Oct. 13, 1962	EN79c Sept. 2, 1966
EN77 Sept. 29, 1964	EN77b Nov. 17, 1964	EN81d Nov. 26, 1965 +
EN79a May 4, 1964	EN79b Nov. 25, 1966	<u>Nfld.</u> P6 Mar. 16, 1892 **
EN80a Jan. 5, 1965	EN81b Nov. 26, 1966	
EN81e Dec. 22, 1965 +	EN82 July 28, 1964	

* text date

+ catalogue numbers from Webb's 4th edition. EN81d is the envelope with the 36mm inspection notice, EN81e is the envelope with the message 41½mm long.

** a particularly nice date reported by Horace Harrison. The March 1892 issue of "Postal Card" refers to this card as "just issued" as does the message on the back of Horace's card.

Bill Walton

17¢ AND 30¢ ENVELOPE VARIETIES

Earle Covert reports a copy of the #10 17¢ envelope with the brown colour omitted, and a copy of the #8 17¢ envelope with the stamp impression on the inside. Leopold Beaudet sent a copy of a 30¢ envelope for examination. This had the normal #8 knife and had the normal security printing. The tag bar was present, but all other printing was missing. With a strong glass and a good light the faintest traces of a part of the French language postal code message was visible. Mr. Beaudet reported that another copy was missing even the tag bar, while a third showed only one of the three locomotives.

SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE ISSUING OF WEBB EN44

On July 1, 1931 the first class domestic rate (1st ounce) was raised from 2¢ to 3¢. This left the Post Office with a considerable stock of 2¢ stamps and postal stationery printed in the same colour (red) as the supplies printed in the new 3¢ denomination. On July 16, 1931 the postmaster at Halifax wrote to the Financial Superintendent of the Postage Stamp Division (H. E. Atwater):

" I beg to advise the receipt of your communication of the 13th inst. advising that the new 3¢ red postage stamps are being issued to Postmasters and to say that the supply sent to this office has been received.
In connection with this supply and the instructions thereon that the issue to the public of all 2¢ red postage stamp values is to be discontinued, I beg to say that there are now in stock here - 6000-2¢ red stamp books, and 75000 2¢ red envelopes. Is it to be understood that the issue of these items is also to cease."

A letter was sent on July 20, 1931 by Mr. Atwater confirming the balance of the 2¢ supplies were to be "laid aside pending receipt of instructions." On the same day Mr. Atwater wrote to the Deputy Postmaster General:

" It may be preferable that all 2¢ reds be recalled to have an additional one cent stamp printed thereon to be later disposed of as 3¢ envelopes.
It is probable that large quantities of such envelopes are on hand at all Depots which may possibly total up to a quantity of 400 or 500 thousand. As the cost of printing for such a quantity would be approximately 50¢ per M., making a total cost to the Department of about \$200.00 or more, the matter is being deferred pending the receipt of instructions to that effect."

A copy of the 2¢ + 1¢ #10 envelope (EN40a) was attached to the letter. As will be seen, Mr. Atwater was overly optimistic about the cost of adding the extra stamp impression. The Earliest Reported Postmarks for copies of EN40 and EN40a are July 16, 1931 and July 23, 1931 respectively. It is probable that the post office had had recent experience with the cost of applying two stamp impressions to a single envelope. It would be most interesting to see documents related to EN40,40a to find out the reason for their being printed and what this printing cost.

On August 11, 1931 Mr. Atwater wrote to the postmasters of eight major post offices enquiring as to the quantities of the 2¢ red items remaining at the depots. The replies indicated that the total numbers of envelopes were 282,350 #8's and 176,360 #10's.

The whole idea of revaluing the 2¢ envelopes appears to have been forgotten for several months and further delays were caused by the misplacing of some of the correspondence. It was, therefore, not until January 28, 1932 that Mr. Atwater wrote again to the Deputy Postmaster General for permission to revalue the envelopes. On March 15 Mr. Atwater requested Mr. Legault (Accountant in Charge, Postage Stamp Division) to have envelopes forwarded to Ottawa for "overprinting". This was done and on April 7th Mr. Atwater wrote to Mr. C. G. Cowan, Vice-president and Managing Director of British American Bank Note Company:

"The department has on hand 74,500 No. 8 and 82,000 No. 10 two cent red stamped envelopes which cannot be put into circulation owing to the colour which is now used for the 3¢ denomination.

In order to make use of them, it is desired to have additional 1¢ postage stamp impressions printed on same in order to dispose of them as 3¢ envelopes.

As you are no doubt equipped to perform work of this kind, I would be much obliged if you will let me know at what cost per thousand such work could be done.

I am enclosing samples of the envelopes in question, as well as an envelope which was previously printed in this way, which you will please return with your quotations. "

It is interesting to note the large percentage of the two cent envelopes which had (apparently) been disposed of normally by the post offices since the survey of envelopes on hand the previous August. Indeed if they had continued to dispose of the 2¢ envelopes at the same rate the problem would have solved itself by late 1932.

Mr. Burland, Secretary-Treasurer of BABNC replied on April 8:

" We are in a position to add a 1¢ stamp to these envelopes, printed from one of the Post Card dies in our possession. For printing the total of 156,500 envelopes in this manner, we quote the sum of Three Hundred and Ten (\$310.00) Dollars, including Sales Tax at the rate of 3%.

As an alternative proposition these envelopes might have the 2¢ Stamp appearing on them at present surcharged "3¢". This operation would be somewhat less costly as covered by the following quotation:

Surcharging 156,500 envelopes, the sum of Two Hundred and Sixty (\$260.00) Dollars, including Sales Tax at the rate of 3%. "

The price quoted was much higher than anticipated. Mr. Atwater wrote to Mr. Burland on April 15, 1932:

" I am sorry to say that it will be useless to go ahead on the figures quoted and the Department will have to try and have the printing done elsewhere.

It is pointed out that the original cost of manufacture and printing of the envelopes in question averaged about \$1.75 per M., and same could be replaced at that cost by envelopes bearing 3¢ postage stamp impressions. As the price you quote is approximately \$2.00 per M., the suggestion of disposing of the envelopes in this way would not be practicable.

The same would apply to your suggestion of surcharging the envelopes to 3¢. "

Mr. Burland replied immediately :

" We can readily understand the difference in prices owing to the fact that the envelopes are originally made on special equipment which does the whole operation at one time and probably prints as many as 16 on the sheet. On the other hand, we are handicapped inasmuch as the printing would have had to be done single. " ,

and reduced his quotation for surcharging to \$1.60 per thousand and then on April 27, 1932 Mr. Cowan offered "a special price of One Dollar and Twenty-five Cents (\$1.25) per thousand envelopes ... ". The King's Printer was asked for a quotation, and indicated in a letter written May 10, 1932 that they could do the work for approximately \$1.33 per thousand. Both these prices represented a saving over buying an equivalent number of new 3¢ envelopes. On May 28, 1932 a memorandum from Mr. Atwater to Mr. Legault indicated that approval for surcharging of the envelopes by BABNC had been obtained from the Deputy Postmaster General.

The order (No. 76) was sent to BABNC on June 2, 1932 mistakenly requesting printing one cent stamp impressions on the two cent envelopes! On June 8, 1932 the order was corrected, requesting surcharging.

It appears that there were problems with the printing which were probably discussed by telephone, for, on June 22, 1932, a letter to Mr. Cowan from Mr. Atwater contains the paragraph:

" In regard to the printing of extra postage on the 2¢ envelopes, the Deputy has approved of the suggestion that stamps should be put on since it is almost impossible to properly over-print the stamps which are already on. This may be proceeded with as soon as you are ready to go ahead. "

A partial accounting from BAENC was given on June 28, 1932 and on July 25, 1932 the following letter was sent:

With reference

" With reference to Departmental Order No. 76 covering 2¢ red stamped envelopes, we beg to advise you as to delivery, etc., as follows:

<u>No. 10</u>			
Surcharged	-	6,925	
Stamped 1¢	-	<u>74,297</u>	
	Total		81,222
Spoilage - surcharged			777
Proof - surcharged			<u>1</u>
	Total		82,000

Under your instructions the spoiled envelopes have been retained here and we understand that you will arrange for their destruction under the joint supervision of the Department and our Company.

<u>No. 8</u>			
Stamped 1¢	-	72,500	
Returned (unfit for stamping)		1,978	
Shortage		<u>22</u>	
	Total		74,500

In view of the fact that we were not called upon to stamp 2,000 No. 8 envelopes referred to above it was only necessary to use 294 rolls of 1¢ stamps and the balance of 203 stamps has been delivered to the Department. Our charge will be based upon a total delivery of 154,500 envelopes at the agreed price of \$1.25 per thousand less the cost of the stamps at contract rates; viz., \$95.00 per thousand. "

The figure of \$95.00 per thousand does not make any sense (perhaps it should have read \$0.95 per thousand ?). A marginal note on a page of the correspondence indicates that the spoiled envelopes were destroyed on June 27, 1934. The final memorandum in the file relating to the 3¢ on 2¢ surcharge issue is dated August 9, 1932 and reads:

" As requested in the Financial Superintendent's memorandum of the 3rd instant, the undersigned begs to confirm verbal report made some time ago regarding 2¢ red stamped envelopes surcharged to 3¢ by the British American Bank Note Company.

6925 No. 10 envelopes which are quite satisfactory were delivered by the company and are being held pending an opportunity to issue a small

quantity to the Postmaster at Ottawa when the majority of them will be placed on sale to stamp collectors through the Cash Sales Section. This is in accordance with verbal instructions received.

The balance of the 2¢ red envelopes, both No. 8 and No. 10, to which 1¢ stamps have been affixed, have been returned to this Division and are being issued to Postmasters as 3¢ envelopes in the regular way.

T.R. Legault,
Accountant in charge
Postage Stamp Division. "

Copies of "FIRST DAY" covers of EN44 are known postmarked September 1, 1933. The copy in my possession is backstamped with a circular cancel from the Postage Stamp Division, Fin. Br. P. O. Dept. It is not known whether the Post Office actually followed through on their plans and released a small quantity through the Ottawa Post Office, but apparently most copies were issued through the Philatelic Service. Although fewer than 7000 copies were printed this envelope is quite common unused. I have never seen a copy properly used in period except for the First Day Cover copies.

I wish to express my thanks to the staff of the National Postal Museum who helped me research this issue during my visit in 1980. The bulk of the reference material related to EN44 can be found in Post Office file 13-12-27.

Robert Lemire

POST OFFICE SPECIAL ORDER STATIONERY ?

One of our members has reported details on an unusual #10 30¢ envelope. The envelope has no security printing nor return address lines. The postal code information is printed on the back and there is a printed return address in the upper left hand corner of the front. These envelopes were apparently used by the Canada Post Corporation to evaluate delivery times for mail within Canada. None were released to the public through normal channels, but a few used copies are in collectors' hands. A similar 32¢ envelope is also rumoured to exist.

CANADIAN AEROGRAMME H22 F24 - A VARIETY ACKNOWLEDGED BY THE POST OFFICE

Beneath the listing for the aerogramme F24 (Webb A25) in the Higgins and Gage Catalogue appears the note: "Numbers 24 through 28a were printed in red, black and shades of gray. The air letter sheets are on various shades and types of unwatermarked bluish stock. Many varieties of paper and printing occur for each listed item."

I have a copy of a letter from J.A. MacDonald, Director of Financial Services, Post Office Department. The letter dated 10th July 1961 reads: "NEW TYPE OF PAPER FOR AEROGRAMME" The enclosed aerogramme contains a slight modification in the specifications of the paper and it is now being distributed throughout Canada. A solid arrowhead, preceding the words "First fold here" on the new paper distinguishes it from the previous form on which the arrowhead is composed of minute dots visible with a magnifying glass."

Actually the arrowhead for the original aerogramme consisted of cross-hatching, not dots. The differences in the papers are small, but aerogrammes exist with a solid black arrowhead in the indicated location. Do any of our members have details of other minor varieties of these aerogrammes from the early and mid-1960's?

Robert Lemire