

Trail of the Caribou

By DAN MEYERSON (BNAPS L3)



I GUESS THAT it only goes to prove that a stamp collector really never stops in his search for information. Several weeks ago Roz and I drove down to Huntingdon Valley, Pa., to spend the weekend with the Llewellyns. On Sunday we all drove over to the Culhanes who live in nearby Norristown, and Peg and Jim dragged out the liquid cheer to refresh the tired travellers. Since I was nursing a brand-new ulcer, I very wisely and prudently refrained from joining them, so for want of something to do I started to leaf through Jim's very interesting Newfoundland collection. Jim goes in rather strongly for covers and one in particular caught my eye. So, having made the necessary notes, I checked it when I got home and sure enough, it shows the latest use of the "235" cancel on cover recorded thus far. It is a very nice cover with or without the "235", but that late date is really the frosting on the cake. The cover, posted at St. John's on March 8, 1887 is addressed to Pennsylvania in the U.S.A., and is franked with a pair of the 1 cent violet brown, Scott No. 41, and a single of the 3 cent blue, Scott No. 49, to make up the five cent rate. This is almost three months later than the cover submitted by Dr. Allan A. Wilkinson and written up in the June 1956 issue. We see that there was a typographical error in this writeup as the previous late date was July 3, 1886, and not "1887" as was published. This cover of Jim's is the latest recorded.

Little by little those reported-but-never-seen items slowly turn up. We first heard of the existence of a Plate 2 in the UL margin on the 2 cent, Scott No. 186, in the Die II from Stan Wood of Auckland, New Zealand, who advised that it had been recorded in the March 1939 issue of Gibbons' Stamp Monthly. We thought that it might be a mistake as a Plate 2 did exist on No. 186 but it was on the Die I and the plate number was reversed. As we continued to search for it we had almost concluded that it didn't exist, when out of the blue we received a letter from Dr. Willan (BNAPS 568), Lancashire, England, and in it he enclosed an upper left plate single from Plate 2 in the Die II. Thank you, Dr. Willan, for clearing up a moot point that had long

troubled plate block collectors. It does exist and Gibbons was right.

We made a very nice purchase the other day that we think is of interest to the collectors of Newfoundland die proofs. The purchase comprised a complete set of die proofs in black on unwatermarked stamp paper of Scott Nos. 182-198, complete with die sinkage and die number, and it is the last that should be the most interesting to the Newfoundland collector. The die sinkage is 58 mm. by 88 mm., and the die numbers are as follows: Scott No. 183, Die No. 954; Scott 185, Die 967; Scott 187, Die 966; Scott 188, Die 969; Scott 190, Die 960; Scott 192, Die 981; Scott 193, Die 972; Scott 194, Die 957; Scott 195, Die 958; Scott 196, Die 956; Scott 197, Die 962, and Scott 198, Die 963.

We note that in the June issue of TRAIL, at the very end we neglected to advise that the stamp we were talking about was the 2 cent, Scott No. 24.

We are in receipt of a note from Mr. Van Ness (BNAPS 1062), of Chestnut Hill, Mass., giving us some further information on the POSTAGE PAID marking No. 6 first shown in the March 1956 issue of BNA TOPICS. Mr. Van Ness submits two covers with the No. 6 strike and says that they were used between August 27, 1943 and September 7, 1943, that is just about a full year later than the previously recorded date. He also goes on to say that in order for him to send a letter from Argentina to his wife in Halifax, it was necessary to leave the envelope open and enclose seven cents in cash (Newfoundland or Canadian) and the postal authorities would take it from there. It was not possible to send a letter from Newfoundland to Halifax via the States. At the same time we've come into possession of another example of handstamp No. 8 and this one, in addition to the handstamp, bears a St. John's cancel dated February 13, 1947 or about 14 months later than the first one recorded. Why this cancel should continue to be used after the termination of hostilities is more than we can fathom. Does anyone have a possible explanation? ★