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## EDITORIAL.

## INTERPOSTALS.

The statement giving the Circle's opinion on the status of the Egyptian Inter--postals, as prepared for publication in " The Philatelic Magazine", but brought up to date by the inclusion of information embodied in a letter to Mr. E. A. Kehr which appeared in "Q.C." Vol.II, No.8, Page 96 ( September 1944 ) is to be published in the P.J.G.B. and may be expected to appear in the December issue of that journal.

By airgraph from Egypt, Jean Boulad contributes the following :-
" As regards the status of the Interpostals, here is a notice published in the " Circulaire Postale of 15 th September 1887; it is addressed to all the postal staff.

Il a été émis de nouveaux tickets qui portent simplement l'indication "POSTES"'" EGYPTIENNES" sans le nom du bureau. L'emplacement où se trouvait le nom du " bureau a été laissé en blanc et est destiné à l'apposition du timbre à date. Les Agents ne devrout faire demande de ces nouveaux tickets que lorsqu'ils auront épuisé ceux actuelement en usage. "

We give the following translation of the Notice referred to by Jean Boulad -
There has been on issue the new tickets which simply bear the indication "POSTES EGYPTIENNES" without the name of the office. Where the name of the office usually appears is left blank for the application of the date stamp. Postal Agents who have not made application for the new tickets will continue to use these at present current.

RED CROSS SALE. OCTOBER 171944.
It will be a source of satisfaction to members to know that the collection of Egypt ( Lot 167 ), to which so many members of the Circle contributed, was bought for $£ 45$ (Valuation $£ 30$ ) by Mr. Coomer of the Hammersmith Philatelic Society who obviously is taking Egypt seriously and who, in consequence, we hope some day to welcome as a member of the Circle.

YARDLEY SALE. OCTOBER 30-31, 1944.
In this sale were three very dangerous bogus covers which were withdrawn after the catalogue has been printed but before the sale took place.

They were :-
Lot 216. 1866. 20 para. pale blue, S.G.3. somewhat off centre but used on entire from Alexandria and bearing the oval marking of the Post Europea office.

This was a genuine P.E. cover, bearing a Type II frank, to which had been added a single copy of the 20 para. 1866. It must be obvious to our readers that these two forms of franking were not employed during the same period of time; moreover the postal rate between the two places involved would have been I P.T. and not 20 para.

Lot 219. 1866. 2 P.T. orange-yellow, S.G.7. Used on entire from Smyrna and with scarce " Dead Letter Office" cachet at side, also a copy of the yellow shade used on entire from Alexandria.

In both cases the 2 P.T. stamp of 1866 had been added and cancelled with the postmark V R POSTE EGIZIANNE which was a marking in use only after the stamps of the first issue had been demonetised.

Lot 22. The fine and valuable collection of issues to 1893, including blocks, strips, varieties. etc.

This contained a most interesting items, viz. a copy of the 5 P.T. Boulac, perf $121 / 2$ with a genuine postal marking dated 2 NOV 1874. This is the earliest date we have seen of any Boulac printed stamp.

## GREETINGS FROM THE PHILATELIC SOCIETY OF EGYPT.

Dr. Byam has received thee following message from the president and vicepresident of The Philatelic Society of Egypt ( the new title of the Club Philatelique d'Egypte ).

## Dear Dr. Byam,

With all the best wishes for a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year for you and the members of the Egypt Study Circle.
From

The President.
Ibrahim Chaftar.
\&

Vice-President
Jean Boulad.
of the
The Philatelic Society of Egypt.

$$
\text { P.O.B. } 142 \text { - Cairo }
$$

This message was sent by airgraph from Cairo under date 19th. December, 1944.

## FIRST INTERIM REPORT ON STUDY XIV.

THE THIRD ISSUE ( $1878-74 / 75$ ) OF EGYPT.
Study entrusted to J. C. Besly.
Item 1. We are satisfied there were lithographic printings made at Alexandria of the 20 para and I P.T.
2. Used copies of the 20 para litho. bear dates in 1872 and so far we have seen only a few copies of the typographic printing of this value dated earlier than January 1873. ( earliest October 1872.)
3. Used copies of the I P.T. litho. are mostly dated during 1873 but we have seen a few used in 1872, 1874, 1875 and one in January 1876. Earliest dated litho. we have seen is 6 MAR 1872. ( W.C.Hinde )
4. The fact that these stamps are printed by lithography is confirmed by the expert at the London School of Printing and by P. L. Pemberton who examined them with Byam on 9-8-44.
5. The evidence so far available suggests that the lithographed transfers were taken from a group of stereos and not from the dies.
6. Other values are being examined for lithographs and R. J. C. Thompson has produced one stamp of the Bulac series ( 20 para) which has the appearance of a lithograph.
7. We are of opinion that the stereos for the Penasson stamps were cast from moulds made in plaster of paris; those at Bulac from moulds formed in papier mâché.

Opinion expressed by Printing Expert at the London School of Printing.
(a) That the copies of 20 para and I P.T. submitted to the L.S.P., through R. J. C. Thompson, are printed by lithography.
(b) That our suggestion regarding the die is confirmed; i.e. the outer frame is a single piece, into which were fitted the other three portions.
(c) That the four numerals of value may have been inserted as separate plugs at each corner of the die. ( This practice was of ten employed where one die had to serve numerous duties.)
(d) That the outer margin of the stereos was not trimmed and that the varying breadths of the frame line, as seen on the stamps, is due to spueing of ink.

## Comment on this opinion.

(c) The side labels for the various duties are not the same throughout the PARA series and there would have been no object in carrying out the other steps suggested.
(d) We hope to convince the printing expert of the L.S.P. that our view is correct; viz. That the stereos were trimmed, to enable them to fit snugly into the "forme" where they were held apart by loosed metal rules or "spacers". The many grossly broken frame lines, seen on the stamps, could hardly have occurred had the surrounding metal formed part of each loose stereo.

## CATALOGUE des TIMBRES d'EGYPTE. <br> 3rd. Edition, 1945. <br> par <br> GEORGES N. ZÉHÉRI.

The appearance of a new " Zéhéri " is a great event and we congratulate its author, realising in some small measure the difficulties with which he must have had to contend. The Preface apologises for the poor quality of paper on which the catalogue is printed and excuses the increase in tis price, to P.T.115, by explaining that this is in part due to the reduced number of copies which could be produced. That a new Edition was justified is obvious from the large number of new stamps listed and from the many enhanced prices, which are said to reflect the condition of the market in Egypt. The listing brings us up to the 10 millièmes stamp issued to celebrate the 8th anniversary of the death of King Fouad, an emission which arouses anxious doubts for the philatelic future of Egypt, and the prices stagger on and conjure up the thought that the piastre can have little worth these days. A control block of four of the $£ E 1$ birthday stamp at $£ 65$, and P.T. 65 for a $5 \mathrm{~m} .+5 \mathrm{~m}$. stamp of which 30,000 were issued as recently as 17 th November 1943, cause one to reflect on the possible sanity of the collector-speculator in modern issues.

But it is as one of our Studies No. VIII. that the members of the Egypt Study Circle will view the catalogue. That it shall provided a complete check list of the stamps of Egypt, for use in conjunction with our projected book, is the ideal the Circle has in mind. And to this end it is expedient for one and all of us to consider what alterations and additions we believe will be necessary to fit the catalogue to play its part, So that discussion on the subject may be stimulated, a preliminary list of suggestions is her appended and Circle members, Zéhéri in particular, are urged to criticise and amend it in the hope that a practical solution of the problem will be evolved.

1. The catalogue should be re-arranged to conform, as nearly as may be, to the groupings in " EGYPT: its Stamps and Postal History ". This would involve a separate section to include all Commemorative stamps, apart from normal postage stamps. Stamps of Egypt used abroad, and the stamps of the various Foreign Posts in Egypt call for listing in the same way; both possibly in a separate volume. Such a volume might well include all information concerning the British Military Concession and here should come the Numeral Crown Circles which form an integral part of the franking of this mail. The cachets of the Posta Europea, The Transit Company and the Waghorn Service should also be included.
2. The Section on Essays should be recast. At present no mention is made of Negroni's essay for the 1866 stamps; instead the attempted copy of this essay by Prevost is given pride of place. The original essays by Pellas for this issue are omitted, though a set of them is included in the collection at Buckingham Palace and Moens refers to them in his handbook, published in 1880. A separation of the true essays from designs submitted in the hope of obtaining work is desirable and should follow the lines to be adopted in our book.
3. The First Issue (1866) requires simplification by the adoption of the scheme of classification of perforation recently published in the Quarterly Circular after approval by the Circle. To the same end most of the watermark varieties should be omitted, as few are worthy of catalogue rank. The incorrect date against the compound perfs. ( $121 / 2$ X 13 ) should be deleted. No serious student would attempt to arrange his stamps according to the present list. The whole of plate $V$ on page 18 is misleading and not in conformity with accepted views on how these stamps were produced.
4. Second Issue ( $1867 / 69$ ). The distinguishing marks of the various printing stones are of greater philatelic interest than would appear from the present listing and the footnotes on pages 19 nd 20 are insufficient to make the differences clear. No mention is made of the distinguishing marks of the two stones for the 20 para. This is a difficult issue to list properly but the Circle should attempt to produce a classification which will deal adequately with the printing stones, shades of colour, and varieties of perforation and watermark in so far as these have philatelic importance.
5. Third Issue ( 1872 and $1874 / 5$ ), This, too, will call for revision in the light of recent findings now being discussed by the Circle.
6. The De La Rue Sphinx issues need but little revision though it is doubtful whether it is correct to list the imperforate copies of the first printings as stamps and not as proofs.
7. The classification of the Crown Overprints (1922) might seem simpler if the four types were grouped separately, instead of as in the present catalogue, where the various types of overprint are listed as they occur on each stamp.
8. The First Portrait issue ( $1923 / 24$ ). The many interesting and important major retouches should be listed even if no attempt is made to price them. These retouches are of greater philatelic importance and interest than many of the varieties at present listed and illustrated throughout the catalogue.
9. Of the later stamps there is little to say, as the listing is mainly careful and accurate. This portion of the catalogue will be greatly improved when the commemorative stamps form a separate section akin to the Air Mail Stamps.
10. The illustrations should each be considered in turn. Many at present included are of little help to the collector and many of the overprints would be clearer if the stamps were screened out as on page 48.
(signed) W. BYAM.

WARNING. EGYPTIAN FIRST DAY COVERS.

A case has been brought to our notice of the sale of faked first day covers. They are crude in their construction and would not for a moment deceive a philatelist of any knowledge, but considerable prices have been asked and paid - we have seen:-

A reputed first day, registered, Air mail cover franked with a black of four Princess Ferial 1943 Provisional.
The stamps are genuine but were cancelled to order in Cairo. The cover also carried a registered letter docket but of ALEXANDRIA - an obvious impossibility.

| DE LA RUE DIE PROOFS ON GLAZED CARDS ( unless otherwise stated ) IN THE DANSON COLLECTION OF SUDAN. ( Continued from Vol. II No. 8. Page 104.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ISSUE. | DESCRIPTION. | DATED. | STATE. | REMARKS. |  |
| Small Camel | Frame 2 Mills. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In pencil } \\ & 24 / 8 / 21 . \end{aligned}$ | Stamped <br> BEFORE <br> STRIKING <br> in black. |  | 寝 |
| -- | -- | In pencil 26/8/21. | Stamped <br> AFTER STRIKING in black. |  | 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> $\vdots$ <br>  <br>  |
| -- | Frame 3 Mills. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In pencil } \\ & 17 / 8 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | Stamped BEFORE STRIKING in black. |  | $$ |
| - | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In pencil } \\ & 20 / 8 / 21 . \end{aligned}$ | Stamped AFTER STRIKING in black. |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{0}$ |
| -- | Frame 4 Mills. | In pencil 29/8/21. | Stamped <br> BEFORE STRIKING in black. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ? } \\ & \text { ? } \\ & \text { 1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| -- | -- | In pencil 31/8/21. | Stamped AFTER STRIKING in black. |  |  |
| -- | Frame 5 Mills. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In pencil } \\ & \text { 21/7/21. } \end{aligned}$ | Stamped AFTER HARDENING in black. |  |  |
| -- | -- | $\begin{gathered} \text { In pencil } \\ \text { 2/8/21. } \end{gathered}$ | Stamped <br> BEFORE STRIKING in black. |  |  |


| ISSUE. | DESCRIPTION. | DATED. | STATE. | REMARKS. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Small Camel | Frame 4 Mills. | In pencil 5/8/21. | Stamped <br> AFTER STRIKING in black. <br> Stamped |  |  |
| -- | Frame 10 Mills. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In pencil } \\ & 13 / 8 / 21 \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | BEFORE STRIKING in black. |  |  |
| -- | -- | In pencil 17/8/21. | Stamped AFTER STRIKING in black. |  |  |
|  |  |  | Stamped |  |  |
| -- | Frame 15 Mills. | $\begin{gathered} \text { In pencil } \\ 7 / 9 / 21 \text {. } \end{gathered}$ | STRIKING <br> in black. |  |  |
| -- | -- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In pencil } \\ & \text { 13/9/21. } \end{aligned}$ | Stamped AFTER STRIKING in black. |  | ¢ ¢ ? |
| -- | 1 Mill. | None | None | ] On cards; Cut down. Combined proofs of frame | H |
| -- | 2 Mills. | -- | -- | L ${ }^{\text {and centre dies struck in grey black. Probably }}$ done to ascertain that each of the frame dies, | ? |
| -- | 3 Mills. | -- | -- | after hardening, would register correctly with the centre die. | - |
| -- | 10 Mills. | -- | -- | 」 | $\stackrel{\text { \% }}{\substack{0 \\ \hline \\ \hline}}$ |
| Postage Due 1901 | Centre die. | Stamped 25 JAN 99. | Stamped |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+}$ |
|  |  | in blue. | HARDENING <br> in black. |  |  |
| -- | -- | Stamped 26 JAN 99. in blue. | Stamped AFTER HARDENING in black. | Initialed in black ink. E.D. |  |
| -- | -- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stamped } \\ & 30 \text { JAN } 99 . \\ & \text { in blue. } \end{aligned}$ | Stamped AFTER STRIKING in black. | This stamp was issued on 1 Jan 1901, although the dies were prepared for use almost 2 years before. |  |


| ISSUE. | DESCRIPTION. | DATED. | STATE. | REMARKS. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postage Due | Frame 2 Mills. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stamped } \\ & 25 \text { JAN } 99 . \end{aligned}$ in blue. | Stamped BEFORE HARDENING in black. |  |  |
| -- | Frame 4 Mills. | -- | -- |  |  |
| -- | Frame 10 Mills . | -- | -- |  |  |
| -- | Frame 20 Mills . | -- | -- |  | $\stackrel{\square}{8}$ |
| Telegraph Stamps. | Centre Die. | Stamped 8 JAN 98. in blue. | Stamped BEFORE HARDENING in black. |  |  |
| -- | -- | -- | Stamped AFTER HARDENING in black. |  | ¢ |
| -- | -- | Stamped 14 JAN 98. in blue. | Stamped AFTER STRIKING |  | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ |
| -- | Frame 5 Mills. | Stamped <br> 14 JAN 98. <br> in blue. | None. |  | H H |
| -- | Frame I P.T. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stamped } \\ & 29 \text { JAN } 98 . \\ & \text { in blue. } \end{aligned}$ | -- |  | - |
| -- | Frame 2 P.T. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Stamped } \\ 29 \text { JAN } 98 . \\ \text { in blue. } \end{gathered}$ | -- |  | $\stackrel{\text { \% }}{\text { \% }}$ |
| -- | Frame 5 P.T. | -- | -- |  |  |
| -- | Frame 10 P.T. | Stamped 26 JUL 98. in blue. | -- |  |  |
| -- | Frame 25 P.T. | Stamped 23 NOV 00. in blue. | -- |  |  |



STUDY III. THE POSTAL HISTORY OF THE SUEZ CANAL ZONE.
By Lt.-Col G.R.Worthington Wilmer \& Jean Boulad.
(Continued from "Q.C." Vol. II. Page 107.)
PART IV. ( Contd. )

Stamp No. 28. S.W.C. line joining 0 and C. N.W.C. break at top of 0 . Right Ray break beneath at 8 o'clock.
29. S.W.C. broken at top. N.W.C. break in top left of 0. Right top serif of $2 n d M$ joined to frame above.
30. S.W.C. broken 0 and C. N.E.C. Flaw in outer frame $S$ of the stamp to the left, and right of right Ray.
31. S.W.C. Line across 0 by stop. S.E.C. Flaw at foot of 2, and break in 0 near top. Break above N. Spot of colour to the right of $Z$.
32. N.W.C. Dash off 2, break in oval below. Dot of colour left of horizon.
33. S.W.C. Broken at bottom. S.W.C. break below 2. Break in top of Z. Dot in sky below A of MARITIMES.
34. S.E.C. 2 broken at top. N.W.C. Spot of colour head of 2 . top of 2 broken $S$ of SUEZ joined to oval above.
35. S.E.C. Diagonal line above 0 to oval. N.E.C. Extension to left App. S.W.C. break in oval above. Break in E of SUEZ.
36. White flaw above RIT. N.W.C. Colour flaw above 2 and O. S.W.C. Indent below, line across 0 .
37. N.W.C. line joining 2 and O. S.W.C. broken 2. S.E.C. spot in centre of 0 . Break above $S$ of SUEZ.
38. N.W.C. Line across 2 joining 0 and extending down O. S.E.C. Spots beneath 2 and 0 .
39. N.W.C. broken O. N.E.C. Stop above 2 and 0 . Break beneath $U$ of SUEZ.
40. P of POSTES squared. While flaw in hull below Mizzen. Left Ray spots off at 12 o'clock and 1 o'clock.
41. S.W.C. White flaw off 2. N.W.C. Break in top of 0 . No bottom right serif to second 1, break in bottom of $E$.
42. Right Ray 2 o'clock petal faulty. N.W.C. Break in head of 2 and top of O. N.E.C. Flaw in App.
43. Break in Main Pennant. S.W.C. Dash of colour to the right above 2. Thickening in the first $A$ of CANAL.
44. N.E.C. broken O. S.E. Corner of stamp a projection. Line in the two ovals below $E$ of DE. Break above $Z$.

Stamp 45. Lower serif of $Z$ missing. S.E.C. spot of colour below head of 2.
46. N.E.C. Line off bottom of 0 . Break above second M. Rigging aft the Funnel broken.
47. S.E.C. broken at top in two places. N.E.C. extension to right app. Left Ray 1 o'clock spot off.
48. N.W.C. break in top of O. S.W.C. Break in downstroke of 2. Right Ray break in petal 3 o'clock.
49. N.W.C. Badly flawed. C of CANAL faulty. Break above E of MARITIMES. Right C is almost solid.
50. Line joins $S$ of SUEZ to oval. C of CANAL line above joins ovals. S.E.C. Flaw in inner of 0 .
51. N.E.C. broken by stop. E of DE faulty and oval interrupted below. S.E.C. No top to C.
52. Circular flaw N.E. corner POSTES tablet. A of MARITIMES broken. C of CANAL line below joins ovals.
53. 2nd $M$ of MARITIMES broken. White flaw in outer frame of stamps above M. Break beneath E of DE.
54. N.E.C. Flaw in inner frame. Break in top of 0 . Dot in C of Canal. Colour spot between MA.
55. E of DE broken. White flaw in background above 1st I. Right Ray 9 o'clock break in inner oval.
56. N.W.C. White flaw right app. White flaw above left C.
57. S.W.C. Colour line bottom of O. S.E.C. Left App. small white flaw.
58. 2nd M of MARITIMES diagonal line across right serif. Right Ray spot between 2 and 3 o'clock. Break beneath $C$ and $A$.
59. N.E.C. left of large white blurred flaw. Mark in centre of $C$ of CANAL.
60. Left Ray colour spot off 1 o'clock. $N$ of CANAL right serif extended, E of Suez line joins oval above.
61. Curved white flaw in ship and sea above $S$ of SUEZ. Break beneath $U$.
62. Left of POSTES tablet white flaw above, also $S$ and E. Left Ray 1 o'clock spot off.
63. Left Ray 12 o'clock spot off. Break and a diagonal line to right of $Z$.
64. E of Suez line at bottom joins oval. Right $C$ weak, white flaw above.
65. Right of stamp two large white flaws. N.W.C. spot top left of 0 .
66. S.W.C. Broken at bottom. Break beneath D of De. S.E.C. O defective, kink in circle below 2.

Stamp 67. Jib forestays broken. N.E.C. Short dash left of stop. Distinct spot between $E$ of DE and $S$ of SUEZ.
68. E of MARITIMES to the right of two colour spots. S.W.C. Kink beneath 0 . S.E.C. 0 defective below C.
69. Spot in C of CANAL. Small white flaw above right C.
70. POSTES tablet blurred. White flaw in ship where the rigging aft the funnel meet at the rail.
71. S.E.C. Break beneath 0 . and line across the two circles. A of MARITIMES dash of colour to the right top.
72. N.E.C. broken O. C of CANAL has a long tail. S.W.C. Bottom irregular. R of MARITIMES kink below.
73. S.E.C. broken by 2, and weak C. Top right of 2nd $M$ missing. Flaw in foremast rigging.
74. Left ray 12 o'clock spot off. Mark in C of CANAL. Z of SUEZ large colour spot to right in oval.
75. N.W.C. Large white flaw across O. S.W.C. break above also to the left of 2. S of SUEZ joined to the frame.
76. S.W.C. White flaw above. Break above 2nd A of CANAL. O of POSTES defective.
77. N.W.C. line off 2. S.E.C. nick in outer frame beneath 0 .
78. S of SUEZ, flaw above. C of CANAL white flaw above.
79. N.E.C. Line across top of circle. 2nd $A$ of CANAL break below. 2nd $M$ joined to frame above.
80. N.E.C. Line across 2. N.W.C. broken at bottom.
81. N.E.C. White flaw above 2. 2nd M line joins the oval.
82. D broken at top and bottom. C of CANAL joined to frame below.
83. Small white flaw right and left of POSTES tablet. Projection from bottom of C. Break above between RI.
84. N.W.C. Broken at bottom. Spot off bottom of 2 left. Foot of $2 n d M$ defective.
85. Inner oval line broken in two places right and left of Main Pennant. S.E.C. White diagonal stroke beneath 2.
86. $Z$ joins oval in two places. N.E.C. Line joins 2 and O. S.W.C. Small white flaw beneath 0 .
87. N.W.C. $O$ broken inner side. E of $D E$ middle serif elongated. Oval below IM broken. Left of POSTES tablet white flaw.
88. Inner oval to the left of D broken. S.W.C. Flaw in outer oval above. S.E.C. C weak.

Stamp 89. S.W.C. White flaw below. N.E.C. Diagonal line across head of S. Left C white flaw above.
90. N.E.C Line across upper part, white flaw below. N.W.C. Nick of colour off C. S.W.C. White flaw below 2.
91. RETOUCH above E of DE. S.E.C. Spot above C. White flaw above 20. Colour spot above 1st M.
92. N.E.C. Diagonal line through head of 2.
93. N.W.C. Top of 0 broken. N.E.C. Foot of 2 broken. S.E.C. Defective near C. White flaw below Mainmast in hull.
94. N.W.C. Line joins 2 and 0 line across 0 . N joins frame below. No top serifs of L.
95. S of SUEZ colour spot to the left. Spot off Z. White flaw in rigging aft of funnel.
96. S.W.C. colour spot off 2. 2nd A of CANAL no cross bar. Break in rail fore of Mizzen.
97. N.W.C. 0 defective. N.E.C. Diagonal line across head of Z. S.W.C. Inner part of 0 broken.
98. N.W.C. Bottom of C broken. N.E.C. Line across head of 2. Spot of colour between A and R. Flaw below EZ.
99. N.E.C. Tail to O. S.W.C. Break above L. White vertical line beneath 2nd $S$ of POSTES.
100. N.E.C. 2 broken. Small white flaw above L. White vertical line beneath left of 0 .
101. N.W.C. White flaw off 2. C joined to oval above. S.E.C. Colour mark top left of 0 .
102. CANAL, Spot between Ca, Line off left serif of N. No top serif to L and line off middle of L .
103. N.W.C. Colour spot above O. S.W.C. Lower part of 2 broken. S.E.C. Break in top of 2. Break in oval above T.
104. White flaw to the left of C and above N. N.E.C. Spot below 20. S.W.C. 2 broken at right.
105. S.W.C. Break in bottom left of inner 0 . Right serif of $N$ joined to oval.
106. N.w.C. Diagonal line running from $C$ to frame of stamp. R lower part projection off.
107. White flaw in sea below bow. Spot of colour left of $D$. and above 1 o'clock left Ray.
108. N.E.C. break in left downstroke of 2. No bottom left serif of E of SUEZ.
109. N.W.C. Line joins 2 and 0 . 1st $M$ spot of colour to the left. D not joined at foot.

Stamp 110. S.E.C. Dot above 2. AN of CANAL spot between. Long $T$ to POSTES.
111. N.E.C. Break in top of 0 . Small white flaw to the right of S.W.C. E of SUEZ thickening at bottom.
112. S.W.C. Line joins 2 and 0 . S of SUEZ break to the right, below.
113. S.W.C. Line off 2. Stop between $N$ and $A$ of CANAL. Bulge in tablet above ST.
114. N.W.C. Line off 2. S.W.C. Break in top left of 0 . Spot of colour in oval below $E$ of MARITIME.
115. S.W.C. 2 broken at top. S.E.C. spot above stop. Foot of 1st I defective.
116. N.E.C. Dot above C. Top frame line of stamp in the centre is weak.
117. N.W.C. Strong line above C. E of MARITIME weak, and break below in oval. White flaw above and break below E of DE.
118. N.W.C. $O$ and $C$ broken, dot in O. N.E.C. Colour spot top left of 0 .
119. N.W.C. Spot above C. 2nd S of POSTES flat at top. Weakness in lower part of ME.
120. Colour dot between E and Z. N.E.C. Dot below stop.

Note the inking of the sheets appears to be very uneven, in some cases the impression is good and clear and in others the impression is very blurred.

```
                    ( to be continued )
```

SUEZ CANAL STAMPS. ORDER OF THE TYPES.

We have received the following from Lt.-Colonel G. R. Worthington Wilmer.
I have been in communication with Boulad recently re the order of the Types of the Suez Canal stamps - the following is the result.

1c Not sufficient evidence yet to place the order of the Type.

5c Order of the Types
margin.


40c Order of the Types.


The Types, of course, begin repeated 30 times to form the sheet.
The 5 c is confirmed by a block of nine ( Lower left hand corner with margins ).

Nos.

| 61 | 73 | 74 | 85 | 83 | 97 | 98 | 109 | 110. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

The 40c. is confirmed by a block of seven.

Nos.
Type.

| 41 | 42 | 53 | 54 | 64 | 5 | 66 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |

Working back to a corner from this block gives the order of the Types.
I have not personally seen these blocks but as they have been examined by Jean Boulad and Ibrahim Chafter, it can be taken that the information is correct and I suggest that you find room for it in the Quarterly.

I have checked up on this as far as I can.

## Yours sincerely

Taylers Close
Beaulieu. Hants.
3 Jan. 1945.

## RECENT MEMBERS OF THE CIRCLE.

53. Henry T. Hardy, "Woodleigh", Towers Avenue, Jesmond, Newcastle-on-Tyne. 2.
54. Brigadier C.D. Rawson, "Ladysfield", Weyhill, Nr. Andover. Hants
55. H. R.. Holmes, 28 Lynton Road. New Malden. Surrey.
