

The 4d., 6d., 8d., 9d., 2s. more particularly can be divided into distinctly cold and warm shades, as I think you will see by these here; and they are long and short, as I have stated. These are, I think, the chief points noticeable about the long and short Crown and C C stamps. Now let us see what we can arrive at from the evidence before us.

We have dismissed the idea of running-in colour causing the difference.

We will now consider the pros and cons of the shrinkage of paper theory.

Major Evans thinks the perforation of the 1863 set being 13 instead of 12½ shows shrinkage; but that we may put aside, as the Crown and C C short stamps gauge 12½. Shrinkage would not make a rough-cut perforation like the 12½ perforation into a fairly clean-cut perforation 13, like the 1863 set. If from shrinkage of paper, why have they only shrunk in length and not in breadth? I believe it is possible for paper to shrink only one way, but not likely. One would expect to get from such a large shrinkage a running together of the lines and the impressions becoming more or less indistinct. We do not find that.

That the stamps would expand to a certain extent if soaked for any time; but forty-eight hours soaking makes not the slightest difference. The total shrinkage on a sheet, taking 1 in. per stamp, and allowing twenty rows of twelve, which I suppose was the size of the sheet, would be roughly 20 in., which I understand from a practical paper manufacturer is an impossible amount for so small a sheet of paper to shrink.

I think these reasons are sufficient to put shrinkage of paper out of court.

What other reasons are there possible? Different matrices for the long and short stamps is the only natural reason left, but I think I can prove that the matrices for each value through each issue are identical! If you will examine the five 1d. stamps before you—all the different 1d. there are, star, perforated and imperforated, no-watermark, and C C, long and short—and look carefully at the left-hand bottom square, which contains a rose-shaped ornament, in the middle of which you will find a many-rayed star, one ray of which points, if I may call it so, north by east, and runs up a little into the white space dividing the pear-shaped leaves of the rose. This ray is longer than the other rays, and is not so in the right-hand bottom ornament; but it is present, this peculiarity, in each of the one pennies before you, showing to my mind clearly that there was never more than one matrix made for this value. If there had been, is it likely, not to say possible, that this little irregularity, as it can hardly have been made so intentionally, would have been copied? There are dozens of other peculiar little lines and marks in this value, constant in all the issues short and long, but I think this one is enough for our purpose. I can find you some peculiarity also in all the other values constant in all the issues. I do not think there can be much hesitation in saying that the long and short stamps are from the same dies or matrices. What is the difference due to? Mr. Tapling thinks it is from some mistake in the formation of the plate from which they are printed, though what that mistake can be, I do not think he suggests in his article; but I feel sure that he has, as usual hit the nail somewhere near the head, and that until we know how the plates were formed to print from, and how the stamps were printed, we shall not be