

# Confederation

The Newsletter of the Large and Small Queens Study Group

Number 12

August 1999

## OPINION:

### Unitrade Needs Revision

by *W. H. Manyluk*

I would like to make some comments, suggestions and recommendations regarding the classifications of some of the Large Queens and most of the Small Queens as listed in the "Unitrade Specialized Catalogue of Canadian Stamps." I am concerned because Unitrade can be considered to be the standard Canadian reference catalogue and because I believe it could use considerable improvement in its classification of these stamps.

In my opinion, there are problems for the following reasons:

1. Studies based on the existing erroneous Unitrade classifications cannot possibly yield meaningful results (e.g. survey of early dated cancels on Large Queens and also the survey of Small Queen dates of earliest reported use);

2. Having erroneous, incomplete and inadequately defined catalog listings is undoubtedly very confusing and frustrating for a wide range of collectors and potential collectors of these issues.

*Continued on Page 3*

## 2¢ and 3¢ Large Queen Tête-Beche Die Proofs and Essay

die proof



essay



die proof

die proof

Pictured above are the two known 2¢ and 3¢ compound Tete-Beche die proofs. John Jamieson shares these with us, pointing out that both 2¢'ers are die proofs of the issued stamp, whereas one pair has a 3¢ essay and on the other pair the 3¢ is a die proof.

The pair with the essay is in the National Archives. The pair both of which are die proofs is in a private collection.

## **Chairman's Column –**

*Ron Ribler*

It is gratifying to see so many more people participating in our newsletter. The more, the merrier. In fact, I would like to respond to some of the items from the latest Confederation.

1. Paul Hahn asked about the dot of color on the left side of the stamp. This is not a plate flaw, but a relatively scarce guide dot, found only on the First Ottawa and Montreal printings. The dots are more often found on the right side, but they are not common either. Other dots, according to John Hillson, are found in the lower right corner only on the 10th stamp in the 5<sup>th</sup> row and in the upper right corner, only on the 5th stamp in the 1st row. The latter are found less frequently than the first two.

2. The matter of the three-cent Small Queen on the soft, almost blotting paper (37i) has been a sore point with me for a long time. The stamp is almost like kleenex - it is so soft. It also is found in a deep rose shade and is most usually off center. It is probably rarer than the perf. 12 1/2, which helps explain why most people do not know what it is. I am in possession of the largest reported multiple of the stamp - a block of 4 that has been certified and vouched for by leading experts. Three papers are found on the rose shade: 1. A hard paper, 2. Thick soft paper, and 3. Thick soft, almost blotting paper. The thick soft paper variety (2) is often mis-identified as the third variety and is not separately listed in the catalogs.

3. As to color, the Pittsboro Philatelics Color Guide offers the most accurate definition of the colors of the issue that I have seen. The color names tend to be confusing because they are not very descriptive and they conflict with names given to colors on other color guides. The Three-Cent Small Queen is unique in its color variations and, while we have a good color guide, we may never get complete agreement on the myriad shades we encounter. I have studied this stamp for more than 20 years and I still find examples that do not seem to fit any accepted definition.

4. To the Northeast Beavers, I suggest that there is more to the paper identification than we have had in the past. It would be very useful to have definitions similar to those in the Duckworths' work. In fact, I too am working on such a task and would appreciate being brought into the Northeastern Beavers work. Please let me hear from you. E-mail works well. John Milks asks about the perf. 12 cover dated July 7, 1873. The perf. 11 1/2 x 12 came into use when the printing moved to Montreal in the Fall of 1873, so this cover is probably legitimately a perf. 12 x 12 item.

5. The 15-cent Large Queen was issued before the Small Queen era. Although it was available throughout the Small Queen period, it clearly is not a Small Queen and should, in my opinion, not be considered a Small Queen. The most comprehensive article I have seen on the three cent Small Queen was written by L. D. Shoemaker in 1941 for Stamps Magazine and reprinted in BNA Topics in Volume 7, No. 5 (1951). I am in the process of updating that article. I hope it will be the definitive statement on the three cent Small Queen, at least until we learn more about it than we now know. Please help.

## Unitrade Needs Revision

*Continued from Page 1*

I would think that this would have an effect in limiting collecting interest in these areas and therefore be of benefit of no one.

I would like to think that the "prominent" Editorial Associates of the Unitrade Catalogue would favor furthering the interests of the hobby and the knowledge and interests of Canadian stamps in particular by improving the Unitrade catalog and making it as correct and useful as reasonably possible.

In this regard, I propose that the Study Group and perhaps the entire BNAPS suggest to Unitrade that improvements be made to their catalog in the Large and Small Queens listings. I am hoping that the recommendations of a knowledgeable and influential group will have more sway with Unitrade than the ideas of one unknown collector.

My personal observations and suggestions regarding the Unitrade listings are as follows:

### Large Queens:

1. The Duckworths have listed and described 10 paper types (counting 9a and 9b as one), three of which are described as "thin." Which of these are included in Unitrade's "thin paper?" A discussion or definition in the catalog would be helpful.

2. **No's 29b, e, iii.** Neither Firth nor Robson Lowe, nor even Boggs, list the red lilac as the first printing as Unitrade seems to do (ERD 03/02/68 and "thin paper.") The reddish purple shade is listed only for the major re-entry (29iii). Should the normal stamp have a separate listing or is it included under 29i purple (shades)? This does not seem proper if reddish purple were the color of the first printing as described by Firth, Robson Lowe and Boggs.

3. **No's 29a and 30a.** The perf 11 1/2 x12 is also known in brownish purple, dull grey violet and slate grey/blue. These should be acknowledged one way or another in the catalog.

4. **No. 30ii** deep blue. Is this the "almost true blue" (Studd's "brilliant cold blue", Firth page 43), or does it include a wider range of blue shades?

5. **No 30c.** Why is this violet shade listed under the greys and not under 29, the lilac/purple/violets?

### Small Queens:

My main reference in this area is "The Small Queens of Canada" by John Hillson, second revised edition 1989. This reference defines slightly different printing periods than previous well known works such as Boggs and Robson-Lowe (which may not be independent from each other) in this area.

The printing periods are defined as follows:

<u>Printing Period</u>	<u>Hillson</u>	<u>Previous others</u>
Ottawa (first)	1870-late 1873	1870-74
Montreal	Jan. 1873- April/May 1889	1875-87
Ottawa (second)	April/May 1889-1897	1888-97

The dates proposed by Hillson seem to be generally supported by "Shoemaker's and Porter's Three Cent Classes and Mitreit's One Cent Classes as recompiled by Len Krucynski" in  
*Continued on Page 4*

## Unitrade Needs Revision

*Continued from Page 3*

the August, 1991 issue of the Small Queen Study Circle (Volume 16 No2). These lists may be of interest to the person compiling the "Small Queens Dates of Earliest Reported Use" table.

My difficulties with the Unitrade catalog include the following:

1. The heading "**1870-1893 SMALL QUEEN ISSUE**". The stated time period covers only a portion of the third (Second Ottawa) printing period, and yet..

2. The heading "**1888-1897 OTTAWA PRINTINGS**" covers the entire second Ottawa printing period - without clarifying that the First Ottawa period is not included. This may be confusing for someone trying to learn about this issue.

3. Most seriously, many of the 1¢ (#35...), the 2¢ (#36...), the 3¢ (#37...) listings have the Montreal/Ottawa printing periods confused.

### **#36 2¢ green (Montreal) 02/-/72.**

This is a First Ottawa date. This begs several questions. What is #36 supposed to represent? If the date is correct, the answer would be First Ottawa, or possibly First Ottawa and Montreal periods. If this number includes the First Ottawa period, then what do numbers 36i and 36ii represent? My guess would be the Second Ottawa but how is a person to know for sure?

**#37 3¢ dull red (Montreal 1872).** This is the same problem as above for #36 and also applies to #37a.

Further to the 3¢, why does Unitrade describe 37i as being a dark rose when Hillson, Boggs, Robson-Lowe, Shoemaker and Porter all seem to agree that this is a carmine shade of either rose or red?

**#35v deep red orange (Montreal 1873-74).** None of the listings I have seen put s this shade into the Montreal printing period, nor in years this late.

In view of the above, I would recommend, as a minimum, correcting the obvious errors (and/or omissions of adequate notes in the Unitrade catalogue) and, even better, reorganizing the entire Small Queen section into the three printing periods as currently generally recognized, i.e. as presented in the Hillson book. Among other things this would result in having the 1/2 ¢ listings in both Montreal and Second Ottawa periods, and having the 1¢ and 2¢ values in all three periods.

In addition to the above, I would also recommend that Unitrade clarify their perforation listings where appropriate. For example, in the Large and Small Queen periods, do the stamps which Unitrade indicates are perf 11 1/2 include just those that range from 11.5 to 11.6 (see Kiusalis) or do they range all the way up to 11.75 or even 11.8? An examination of the Shoemaker and Porter lists of the 1¢ and 3¢ Small Queens shows the significance of the difference in the inclusion range.

Once again, I propose that for the benefit of the Large and Small Queen collectors and potential collectors, the Study Group (perhaps with the added authority of BNAPS) submit recommendations to Unitrade with improvements to their catalogue along the lines I have outlined above. Of course, I invite the study group to review my ideas and any improvements the Study Group (or others) can offer would be most welcome as I am far from being an expert in these areas. I would also invite Unitrade to communicate with the Study Group and collectors in general with their reasons behind their listings.

*Editor's note:* Ron Ribler has done an update of Shoemaker's articles that will appear in *Topics* soon.



## Editor's Column

Roy Sass

I was intrigued by the 5th class mail cover Horace Harrison shared with us in the last newsletter. What sort of mail goes 5th class? I found the answer in John Hillson's book "The Small Queens of Canada" where, on page 39, he quoted from the Canadian Postal Regulations of 1893.

"5th Class Matter. - Comprises such articles of general merchandise as are not entitled to any lower rate of postage. Postage 1 cent per oz., or fraction of an ounce. Limit of weight, 5 lbs.; of size, two feet in length by one foot in width or depth. Matter claiming to be 5th Class *must be open to inspection* and there must be no correspondence enclosed. Packages of 5th Class matter, including Seeds, Bulbs, Cuttings, Roots may be sent to the United States for the same prepayment as required in the Dominion."

The regulations continue with rules for "Sealed tins of fish, lobster, vegetables, meats &c." and how these could be sent within Canada but no such sealed matter could be sent to the U.S.

W.H. Manyluk's comments are interesting to me. I was having a heck of a time using the Unitrade listings in plotting my own album pages for the Small Queens. This article helped me to put some of the stamps into the right places. As some of you know, I suggested a renumbering of the Large Queens (*Topics*, Vol. 52, No 1, First Quarter 1995). I don't think I would do it in the same manner now (4 more years of knowledge), but I do believe a correction and renumbering of both LQs and SQs are needed.

I received a nice letter from Chris Ryan, from the Revenues study group, with a copy of a six-page article he wrote for *The Canadian Paper Money Journal*, Vol. 32, serial 116 in 1996 entitled "The Canadian Patents for the Printing Tints of Thomas Sterry Hunt." The Patent tints were developed to foil attempts to counterfeit the paper money. It is Chris's opinion that Patent Green was not used in the printing of the stamps. If it were, he believes the sheet margins should contain the inscription "Canada Bank Note Printing Tint." This article would be of interest to those of us interested in the inks. If you would like a copy, let me know and I'll send a photo copy to you.

Finally, let me beg and plead for articles to print. As summer moves into "Stamp Season" (a.k.a. autumn), I hope you have the time and inclination to send something, long or short, questions or answers. Remember, want ads are FREE!

## Commentary

by John Hillson

Regarding Dr. Milks's contribution in the last newsletter, the same observations were sent to the editor of "Maple Leaves" and I was asked if I had any comment. Unfortunately, that together with Dr. Milks's comments won't appear till July and I don't want to pre-empt the issue. Suffice it to say I got hold of the Smythies Gibbons approved shades and can only say that in my opinion Dr. Milks is reading far too much into far too little. The "Pale Rose Red" example isn't exactly atypical being an 1872 printing on very white paper; the 1870 and 1871 shades are rather more "rosier." Also only one Indian Red example is shown whereas there are two distinct shades leaving aside intensity of colour.

## How to Reach Us

Chairman:  
Ron Ribler, PO Box 22911  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33335  
(fax) (954)760-7794;  
(phone) (954)760-7795  
e-mail at [laudron@yahoo.com](mailto:laudron@yahoo.com)

Editor  
Roy Sass, PO Box 31054,  
Walnut Creek, CA 94598  
e-mail at [roywcca@ccnet.com](mailto:roywcca@ccnet.com)

