

The Halifax Philatelist.

Vol. III.

HALIFAX, N. S., JUNE, 1889.

No. 6.

THE ADHESIVE STAMPS OF CEYLON TO THE END OF 1870.

A Paper read before the Philatelic Society, London, on Friday, 5th March, 1889.

BY W. B. THORNHILL.

(Continued.)

We may fairly start with the idea that, if they exist, they are due to some flaw in the watermarking of the sheet, because if not, as they are of so recent a date, and dealers have had and have large blocks of the Crown and C C, bought at the time of issue, we should most probably have heard of them in blocks; and I have never heard any one suggest yet that they have a pair of long no-watermarked stamps. I think the following facts will bear out my statement.

The 1d., 2d., and 6d. are the values most commonly supposed to exist. These three values, with the $\frac{1}{2}$ d., are, I believe, the only values which were watermarked in panes. You will see in the block of 1d. before you that, at all events, that portion, and I think we may take it the whole sheet, was watermarked in four panes, each pane surrounded by a line; and between the panes horizontally the words "Crown Colonies," in large block letters. There are plenty of places on that sheet, if the position of the sheet was slightly altered before being printed on, where a stamp would show only a portion of a letter or a line, which in some stamps would undoubtedly be difficult to see, and would lead one to suppose they had no watermark at all. Again, on this particular sheet it would be possible, though most improbable, given a certain position of the sheet, to have so printed it that a stamp came exactly between the N of CROWN and C of COLONIES, and exactly between the two compartment lines of the panes above and below; in that case the watermark would be invisible, though there; for the distance between the compartment lines is not long enough, and the lines would come in the top and bottom perforation. Therefore, as regards the 1d., I have shown the probability, at all events, that, though it may appear to have no watermark, still it most likely has. I have not had sheets of the 2d., green, and the 6d., brown; but I have pairs showing lines, evidently part of the line surrounding a pane; and if my theory holds good for the 1d., it will be for the 2d. and 6d. If we look at the other values, of which you will see several blocks here, you will not find any vestige of watermarking in panes; and it is of these values—the 4d., 5d., 8d., 9d., 10d., 1s., 2s.—that we do not get specimens apparently without watermark. Is it not, therefore, a fair conclusion to come to, that the 1d., 2d., and 6d. are really not on unwatermarked paper at all? It is not likely that those should be the only values printed on unwatermarked paper, and one certainly does not often hear of the others. I may mention here that Mr.