

SAPPHIRE

This book has been generated from a scan of the original and we cannot guarantee that it is free from errors or contains the full content of the original.



This compilation
copyright © Sapphire Publications

STRICTLY NOT FOR RESALE OR REDISTRIBUTION

ECT
C4385
·Yc

Chalmers, James

HOW JAMES CHALMERS SAVED THE PENNY POSTAGE SCHEME.

LETTER

OF THE

DUNDEE BANKERS AND MERCHANTS

TO THE

Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury.

BY

PATRICK CHALMERS,

FELLOW OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.



LONDON:

EFFINGHAM WILSON & CO., ROYAL EXCHANGE, E.C.

1890.

PREFACE.

After the passing of the Penny Postage Bill in August, 1839, Mr. Rowland Hill was appointed to a position in the Treasury for the purpose of superintending the carrying out of the scheme which he had introduced, but for the working of which in practice he had failed to propose any practicable plan. The Lords of H.M. Treasury consequently applied to the public for plans and suggestions for that purpose, by Treasury Minute of date 23rd August.

James Chalmers, of Dundee, had in December, 1837, and again in February, 1838, already proposed to the proper authorities, and to Mr. Rowland Hill himself, the plan of an Adhesive Postage Stamp, and now in response to this public appeal from the Treasury sent in his plan for the third time.

A copy of the *Arbroath Herald*, of date October 11th, 1839, has been brought to light, from which I am now enabled to show that on this last-named occasion the proposal of Mr. Chalmers was accompanied by an influential memorial on the part of his townsmen in Dundee advocating the plan which he had brought forward. The article in the *Arbroath Herald* is as follows:—

"POSTAGE IMPROVEMENT."

"Mr. James Chalmers, bookseller, Dundee, has for many years, as perhaps most of our readers may be aware, taken a very active

interest in directing public attention to the means and importance of accelerating the mail and in the general improvement of the Post Office establishment. It was chiefly through his exertions, prior to the use of railways, a gain of two days* was effected in the correspondence between London and Liverpool and this neighbourhood. He has lately applied himself to mature a plan for carrying into effect the uniform postage of one penny; and in consequence of the recent Treasury Minute inviting competition on the best mode of carrying into effect the principle recommended by Mr. Rowland Hill, and now sanctioned by the Legislature, Mr. Chalmers has transmitted his plan to the Lords of the Treasury, accompanied by the following certificate subscribed by about one hundred and fifty of the principal bankers, merchants, writers, shipowners, and others in Dundee."

Here follows the certificate or letter dated September 30th, 1839, to the same effect as above, first setting forth the early postal services of Mr. Chalmers, and ending by respectfully recommending his plan, a specimen along with a description of which they had seen, to the favourable consideration of the Right Honourable the Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury.—(*See page* 46).

For this copy of the *Arbroath Herald*, from which the above is taken, I am indebted to friends in Arbroath (the birthplace of James Chalmers), including Mr. J. M. McBain, F.S.A., banker there, and author of the work "Arbroath Past and Present," already mentioned in my last pamphlet, page 32, and also author of the "Bibliography of Arbroath Periodical Literature," lately published.

Some account of the Herald, a weekly paper published in Arbroath, will be found at page 46.

Having applied to the Treasury here for permission to inspect the above official letter to the Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury, I have been favoured with the following reply:—

* On the double journey.—*Encyclopædia Britannica.*

"Treasury Chambers,
"19*th June*, 1889,

"Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 28th ultimo and 17th instant, I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to inform you that the document which you ask permission to inspect is not in their possession, nor is it amongst the papers preserved at the Record Office.

"I am, Sir,
"Your obedient Servant,

"P. Chalmers, Esq., "(Signed) R. E. WELBY.
"Wimbledon."

As Mr. Pearson Hill in his publications admits having in his possession the entire correspondence from 1838 to 1840 betwixt Mr. Chalmers and the then Mr. Rowland Hill, as well as the plan referred to in this Dundee letter to the Treasury, it may be fairly concluded that this document is likewise, and has been throughout this controversy, in his hands. This, however, I of course cannot prove, and consequently do not assert, and readers must therefore form their own opinion on the subject. Mr. Pearson Hill, to whom I have put the question, has made no reply either way.

Here, then, is a further and most impressive instance of the system pursued by Sir Rowland Hill in endeavouring to efface all traces of evidence disproving his pretensions to having been the originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp. The official correspondence betwixt James Chalmers and himself, the inspection of which would have proved the justice of Chalmers' claim, was removed from the Treasury; advantage is equally taken of his position there to remove this official letter of Chalmers' townsmen proving that up

to that period nothing whatever had been heard or known as to the adoption of an Adhesive Stamp having been proposed or contemplated by Mr. Hill himself. When the subsequent Sir Rowland Hill comes to write what purports to be a "History of Penny Postage," all reference to the proceedings in the Houses of Parliament officially proving as they do (see pages 10–12) that, up to the introduction of the Bill in July, 1839, he had *not* proposed to adopt the Adhesive Stamp is carefully omitted.

Proof upon proof thus demonstrates, and many others will be found in these pages, that the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp for the purpose of carrying out the Penny Postage Scheme formed no part of the original proposals or intentions of Sir Rowland Hill; and that his subsequent pretensions to having been its originator were unfounded in fact—a mere pretext and afterthought bred of the success which had attended the invention and proposal of James Chalmers, and a misuse of the power placed in his hands.

Mr. Pearson Hill in his publications has, equally with Sir Rowland Hill, shunned all reference to the proceedings in Parliament already named, same being insurmountable and conclusive against his pretensions. The correspondence has been equally withheld, with the exception of an "extract" from one of Mr. Chalmers' letters purporting to favour his own views, but as to which extract, or to any other partial extract Mr. Pearson Hill may think proper to produce, none but the merest partisan has attached or will attach any importance whatever. While thus significantly withholding the correspondence and evading any notice of the Parliamentary records, Mr. Pearson Hill has substituted for these marked omissions a mystification of the matter at issue, adding thereto much ungentlemanly abuse of myself, my witnesses

and supporters, as may be read, pages 41–42, to which I beg to refer.

At page 44 will be found the remarkable and conclusive statement lately brought to light from the article "Post Office" in the *Penny Cyclopædia*, vol. 18, 1840, inside the title-page of which appears the name of Rowland Hill, Esq. F.R.A.S., as one of the Committee of Management, and thus drawn up under the supervision of Mr. Rowland Hill himself, if not actually written by him, as follows:—"He (Mr. Rowland Hill) proposed that the rate of postage should be uniform, to be charged according to weight, and that the payment should be made in advance. The means of doing so by stamps were not suggested in the first edition of the pamphlet, *and Mr. Hill states that this idea did not originate with him.*" When this was written, about May or June, 1840, the use of stamped envelopes and Adhesive Stamps had just been introduced. Soon afterwards it will be seen, page 17, Mr. Hill's plan of stamped envelopes proved an utter failure, while the supply of Adhesive Stamps "failed to meet the demand;" and with the unexpected success of the Adhesive Stamp arose likewise on the part of Mr. Hill that pretension of having been its originator which has hitherto deluded the world.

PATRICK CHALMERS, *F.R.Hist.Soc.*,
Honorary Member of the Société Internationale de Timbrologie Paris, and of Ten American Philatelic Societies.

WIMBLEDON, S.W.,
November, 1889.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Plan of Sir Rowland Hill 9

Mr. John Francis of the "Athenæum" 14

Archer's Patent for Perforating the Stamps 16

James Chalmers 21

Sir Henry Cole's Papers, and the Plan of Mr. Chalmers ... 29

The Pretence and Afterthought 33

Mr. Pearson Hill 38

Dundee 42

Memorial to James Chalmers, and Desecration of his Grave ... 51

Conclusion 53

APPENDIX.

Recognition of James Chalmers at Home and Abroad 57

United States of America 61

France... 63

Germany, Vienna, Berlin, Liepzig, Stuttgart, Frankfort, Dresden, Munich, &c. 64

Stockholm, Constantinople 67

Later Recognitions... 68

The Plan of Sir Rowland Hill.

The plan by which Mr. Rowland Hill, in his pamphlet of 1837, proposed to carry out in practice his uniform penny postage scheme was, shortly stated, first, simply to pay the penny or money with the letters; but secondly, and more especially, by stamped sheets of letter paper, and stamped wrappers or covers. "Let stamped covers and sheets of "paper be supplied to the public, from the Stamp Office or "Post Office, or both, and at such a price as to include the "postage." . . "Economy and the public convenience "would require that sheets of letter paper of every description "should be stamped on the part used for the address; that "wrappers, such as are used for newspapers, as well as "covers made of cheap paper, should also be stamped," and kept on sale at the post-offices. "Stationers would also be "induced to keep them."

What Mr. Hill overlooked in this proposal was the broad fact that he sets up the Stamp Office or Post Office to do the business in letter paper of the stationers throughout the kingdom—some huge Government establishment against which competition would be hopeless, as the Stamp Office was to sell the writing paper at cost price, while the stationer requires a profit to pay his rent and expenses, and to live upon. The effect upon the stationers, consequently, would have been confiscation—and against this plan the united body of papermakers and stationers subsequently protested.

The Select Committee of the House of Commons of 1837-38 again took exception to Mr. Hill's plan mainly on account of its liability to forgery—a stamp of the nature

proposed would be extensively forged. After evidence on the part of the Stamp Office authorities and papermakers had been taken, it was decided to recommend that the paper for all stamped covers should be manufactured at the paper-mills of a Mr. Dickenson, or of another, solely, under strict excise supervision. This paper of Mr. Dickenson's was of a peculiar make, having threads of cotton or silk so interwoven in the paper, that a post-office clerk could readily know by the look or feel that a stamped cover was genuine. The papermakers protested and petitioned against this, objecting to one of the body having all the work. Besides, the proposal involved permanent excise supervision over the manufacture of paper. This proposal, however, extended only to covers or envelopes; how forgery was to be prevented in respect to the stamps upon the sheets of letter paper the Committee do not say. The whole position, in fact, remained in a state of chaos, only relieved by the ultimate adoption of the Adhesive Stamp, which plan Mr. James Chalmers, it will be seen, had laid before this Committee through Mr. Wallace, the Chairman, and likewise through Mr. Chalmers, M.P., a member of the Committee, and which plan had been publicly discussed, not without finding adherents, including Mr. Cobden, one of the witnesses in favour of the scheme.

To the solution proposed by the Committee that all stamped covers should be made of Dickenson's peculiar paper the Government again highly objected, further adding to the dilemma; and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the 5th of July, 1839, introduced and carried a resolution sanctioning a Penny Postage Bill being brought forward, he distinctly only "asked Hon. Members to commit themselves "to the question of a uniform rate of postage of one penny "at and under a weight hereafter to be fixed." Everything else was to be left open. "If it were to go forth to the "public to-morrow morning that the Government had pro-"posed and the House had adopted, the plan of Mr. Rowland "Hill, the necessary result would be to spread a conviction "abroad that, as a stamped cover was absolutely to be used

"in all cases, which stamped covers were to be made by one "single manufacturer, alarm would be felt lest a monopoly "would thereby be created, to the serious detriment of other "members of a most useful and important trade. The sense "of injustice excited by this would necessarily be extreme. "I therefore do not call upon the House either to affirm or to "negative any such proposition at the present. I ask you "simply to affirm the adoption of a uniform penny postage, "and the taxation of that postage by weight. Neither do I "ask you to pledge yourselves to the prepayment of letters, "for I am of opinion that, at all events, there should be an "option of putting letters into the post without a stamp."

"If the resolution be affirmed and the Bill has to be "proposed, it will hereafter require very great care and "complicated arrangements to carry the plan into practical "effect. It may involve considerable expense and consider- "able responsibility on the part of the Government; it may "disturb existing trades, such as the paper trade." . . . "The new postage will be distinctly and simply a penny "postage by weight." . . . "I also require for the "Treasury a power of taking the postage by anticipation, "and a power of allowing such postage to be taken by means "of stamped covers, and I also require the authority of "rating the postage according to weight." *

In this dilemma as to *how* to carry out the scheme in practice, Mr. Wallace favourably suggested the Adhesive Stamp, the adoption of which plan, he had no hesitation in saying from the evidence adduced, would secure the revenue from loss by forgery. Mr. Warburton, also a member of the 1837–38 Committee, "viewing with considerable "alarm the doubt which had been expressed of adopting "Mr. Hill's plan of prepayment and collection by stamped "covers," recommended that plans should be applied for the public.

Again, in the House of Lords on the 5th of August, Lord Melbourne, in introducing the Bill, is as much embarrassed as was the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the

* See "Hansard," Vol. 48.

Commons. The opponents of the Bill use, as one of their strongest arguments, the impossibility of carrying out the scheme in practice. The Earl of Ripon says: "Why "were their Lordships thus called upon at this period of the "session to pass a Bill, when no mortal being at that mo- "ment had the remotest conception of how it was to be "carried into execution?" Here Lord Ashburton, like Mr. Wallace in the Commons, favourably suggested the Adhesive Stamp, "which would answer every purpose, and "remove the objection of the stationers and papermakers to "the measure."

Let it, then, be clearly noted that, up to the period of the Bill in July and August, 1839, not a word is said in any way connecting Mr. Hill's name with other than the impressed stamp on the sheet of letter paper, or more especially, on the stamped covers. That, *and that alone*, is taken on the one part as *his* plan by all the speakers, official or otherwise—for that alone does the Chancellor of the Exchequer ask for "powers." The Adhesive Stamp is brought in, on the other part, as a distinct proposal, in no way entering into the proposals of Mr. Hill.

Now, what does Sir Rowland Hill tell us of all this in his "History of Penny Postage"? Not a word! giving his readers, on the contrary, to understand that the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp was included in his proposals of 1837.

To the above official and conclusive evidence that up to the introduction of the Penny Postage Bill in July, 1839, Mr. Rowland Hill had *not* proposed the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp, may be added further evidence to the same effect:—

First, when writing to James Chalmers under date 3rd March, 1838, acknowledging the plan of the Adhesive Stamp from Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Rowland Hill makes no pretension to having already proposed or being then in favour of an Adhesive Stamp. This is known from Mr.

Chalmers having subsequently sent Mr. Hill a copy of that letter for the purpose of pointing out that fact to Mr. Hill. This correspondence, however, Mr. Rowland Hill removed from the Treasury, and same is now in the possession of Mr. Pearson Hill, who has not consented to produce that letter of 3rd March, 1838, publishing only such portion of the correspondence as appears to tell in his own favour.

Again, it is enough to point to Mr. Hill's letters to the Postmaster-General, Lord Litchfield, in January, 1838, explaining and enforcing his Penny Postage Scheme then before the public, in which not a word is said of an Adhesive Stamp. In these Mr. Hill states his plan to be:—"That the payment should always be in advance. And to rid this mode of payment of the trouble and risk which it would otherwise entail on the sending of letters, as well as for other important considerations, I propose that the postage be collected by the sale of stamped covers."

Again, take the Press of the period. Here is an extract from the *Montrose, Arbroath, and Brechin Review*, of date 8th December, 1837, commenting on a speech by the Earl of Lichfield delivered in the House of Lords on the 30th November:—

"The Earl of Lichfield, the Postmaster-General, argued that if Mr. Hill's system was adopted by which letters would be sent to any distance *under a stamped cover costing a penny*, there must be as many letters pass through the Post Office as there are pennies in £2,200,000 in order to yield the same revenue. This, the *Montrose Review* goes on to say, 'seems at first sight a very just conclusion, which, on examination, it is a very false one. If this scheme was adopted, the expenses of the Post Office would be curtailed—they would be confined to the mere expense of transmission. Stationers would sell the *stamped paper* as they now do the plain, and if parties had reason to complain, it would be these tradesmen, for it would greatly add to the value (duty-paid cost) of their commodity without increasing their gain, and thus, in cases in which credit is given, multiply their outlay and their risk without an equivalent. Indeed, it seems evident that *more than a penny* must be charged in order to provide for an allowance on account of trouble and risk as in the case of other stamps."

Again, on the 22nd December, 1837, the same paper

remarks, in leading type, under the head "Parliamentary business":—

"The Post Office.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer has signified his intention of lowering the postage and giving to *Mr. Hill's plan of stamped covers for letters* a partial trial in the vicinity of London."

The *Edinburgh Courant*, December, 1837, says:—

"Mr. Hill proposes to reduce the rate to a penny, which would no doubt be a great boon to commerce. . . . . With respect to *the scheme of stamped covers* to be purchased by the writer of the letter, its utility seems doubtful."

Again, this is what the *Times* produces under date 30th August, 1839, a fortnight *after* the passing of the Bill:—

"The Penny Postage will commence, we learn, on the 1st January next. It is intended that stamped envelopes shall be sold at every Post Office, so that stationers and other shopkeepers may, as well as the public, supply themselves at a minute's notice."

Not a word, it is seen, as to an Adhesive Stamp being any part of Mr. Hill's plan or proposal. And yet, in his "History of Penny Postage," Sir Rowland Hill keeping all these proofs to the contrary, official and otherwise, wholly out of view, gives his readers to understand that the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp formed part and parcel of his original proposals of 1837!

Mr. JOHN FRANCIS (of the "Athenæum") ON THE PLAN OF SIR ROWLAND HILL.

Few readers will require to be told that the late Mr. John Francis, whose testimony I am now about to bring forward in support of my case on the subject of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, was a leading man in the literary circles of London. Born in 1811, he became engaged on the staff of the *Athenæum* in 1831, until the period of his death in 1882. In all the reforms of that period tending to remove the shackles from the Press and to advance the cause of education and learning, Mr. Francis took a prominent part,

more especially in advocating such measures as the abolition of the "Taxes on Knowledge," and in promoting the Penny Postage Reform brought forward by the then Mr. Rowland Hill. A work in two volumes, entitled "John Francis, Publisher of the *Athenæum:* a Literary Chronicle of Half a Century," compiled by his son, Mr. John C. Francis, has lately been published in which the names of most of the prominent writers and public men during the period throughout which his own labours extended are brought forward, with some account of their proposals and the benefits resulting from their efforts.

The warm interest which Mr Francis took in the proposed Penny Postage Scheme of 1837 brought him into close relationship with Mr. Rowland Hill, an intimacy or indeed friendship which continued throughout their respective lives. What Mr. Francis has to say on this subject is consequently of much importance to all readers of this Chalmers-Hill controversy. Here, then, is the testimony of Mr. Francis as respects the plan proposed by Mr. Rowland Hill for carrying out the Penny Postage Scheme in practice:—

"On the 6th May, 1837, the *Athenæum* gave a short "notice of Rowland Hill's pamphlet 'Post Office Reform,' "and expressed its conviction that his statements and "reasoning were worthy of the most serious consideration, "though hesitating to acquiesce entirely in his conclu- "sions. On the 21st and 28th April, 1838, it returns to "the question in two leading articles upon the 'Minutes of "Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Postage,' "the Committee having been appointed for the purpose "of examining the mode recommended by Rowland "Hill for charging and collecting postage. The writer "of the article says: Mr. Hill proposed the issue "of penny stamped covers for letters. Having seen "that the Chairman of Stamps and Taxes mentions a "'a peculiar paper with lines of thread or silk stretched "through its substance, which is the best preventative of "forgery he has seen,' and therefore likely to prevent

"these stamped covers from being forged, we have "requested Mr. Dickenson, the inventor, to manufacture "for our next number so much of this threaded paper as "shall be sufficient for our whole impression, which will "be printed upon it so as to make our subscribers "acquainted with the nature of the proposed method. "The issue of April 28th (1838) had these blue threads "inserted in the substance of the paper, and the article "states—'We shall be surprised if so simple a means of "protecting the revenue and preventing crime is not "adopted.'"

Such is the record of Mr. Francis, the friend of Sir Rowland Hill. The scheme of 1837 is first commented on in May of that year. Attention is continued and directed to all that took place up to the proceedings of the House of Commons Select Committee in the following year, and then in April, 1838, we have two articles on the subject. On the 21st April Mr. Francis' great journal "returns to the question," telling us that "Mr. Hill proposed the issue of penny stamped covers for letters," mentions the way in which it was proposed to get over the difficulty of forgery by the use of Dickenson's "peculiar paper," and in its next issue of the 28th April actually prints that issue upon this same "peculiar paper," in order to show the public the manner in which Mr. Hill's scheme was to be carried out in practice. Not a word or a whisper does Mr. Francis utter as to an Adhesive Stamp having either been proposed or being for one moment contemplated. This record, left us by this learned and intimate acquaintance of Sir Rowland Hill, altogether and exactly confirms, it will be seen, my own account of the matter and that of the other authorities already quoted by me.

ARCHER'S PATENT FOR PERFORATING THE STAMPS. MR. HILL "CANNOT RECOLLECT."

The Penny Postage Bill passed into law on the 17th August, 1839, whereupon Mr. Hill was appointed to a

position in the Treasury for the purpose of superintending its carrying out. The first step taken was to advertise for plans from the public, and nothing better having been found, the Adhesive Stamp was adopted by Treasury Minute of date 26th December, 1839, in conjunction with Mr. Hill's plan of stamped covers, or stamp impressed upon the sheet of letter paper itself. This result was only what might have been looked for, as Mr. Hill, in a paper circulated by him about the period of the Bill being before Parliament, had already given his adhesion to the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp, a principle now advocated by many of those who sent in plans in response to the Treasury invitation.

This Treasury Minute, drawn up under the supervision of Mr. Rowland Hill himself, at length provides for both stamps, impressed and adhesive, "the paper to be peculiar in its water-mark or some other feature," or as recited in the Act of Parliament, "which paper shall have such distinguishing words, letters, figures, marks, lines, threads, or other devices marked into or visible in the substance of same as the said Commissioners of Excise shall from time to time order and direct."

It is now necessary to note the reception the respective stamps met with from the public as described in the pages of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" and by Sir Rowland Hill himself:—

"Mulready's well-remembered allegorical cover came into use "on the 1st May, 1840, together with the first form of the "stamped letter paper and the adhesive labels. They all met at "first, but only for a few days, with a large sale. That of "the first day yielded £2,500. Soon afterwards, the public "rejection of the 'Mulready envelope' writes Rowland Hill, "'was so complete as to necessitate the destruction of nearly all "the vast number prepared for issue.' Whilst, on the other "hand, the presses of the Stamp Office were producing more "than half a million of adhesive labels by working both night "and day, they yet failed to meet the demand."

The Adhesive Stamp thus saved the Penny Postage Scheme from failure, and it will now be interesting to note how completely, at a subsequent period, Mr. Rowland Hill

recognises this fact, while wholly unable to recollect anything whatever about the "peculiar paper with lines of thread or silk stretched through its substance" recorded in the pages of Mr. Francis, and provided for by the Act and by the Treasury Minute drawn up by himself.

In March, 1852, Mr. Hill was examined before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on "Archer's Patent." For five years previously a Mr. Archer had pressed upon the Post Office, Stamp Office, and the Treasury, a plan for perforating the sheets of postage stamps in the manner we are now familiar with, the practice, up till then, having been to use scissors or a knife wherewith to separate the stamps. In vain, however, did Mr. Archer all this while press on the authorities this great improvement. Mr. Hill did not see much in it, though considering it "advisable, useful to a certain extent"; and the Treasury grudged Mr. Archer's terms. At length some Members of Parliament took up the proposal, and Mr. Muntz obtained a Select Committee to investigate the matter, resulting in a unanimous approval, and Mr. Archer got £4,000 for his invention.

Under examination before this Committee on the different systems of stamps, Mr. Hill first gives the members to understand that *he* was the original inventor or proposer of the Adhesive Postage Stamp :—

"*Question* 962 : I believe you are the original inventor, "or the proposer, of the Penny Postage Stamp ?—*Answer* : "*Yes.*" A statement, however, rather too much for the Committee, some of whom had been present in the House of Commons on that eventful night, already described, when all was dismay as to how the Penny Postage Bill was to be carried out. Had they not been officially told that Mr. Hill's plan was "that an impressed stamped cover was absolutely to be used in all cases?" Did they not recollect that it was through the interposition of Mr. Wallace the Adhesive Stamp was then proposed and ultimately arrived at? Mr. Hill, then, is subsequently asked :—

"*Question* 991 : The Committee of 1837-8, for inquiring

" into the postage, do not appear to have entered to any " extent into the difficulty of forgery with those different " systems?—*Answer:* I think not; they took the opinion " of the Stamp Office, which was to the effect that practical " security against forgery could be obtained.

" *Question* 992: Their principal hope as a preventative " of forgery was in adopting a distinctive sort of paper for " envelopes, was it not?—*Answer: I cannot recollect.*". . .

Such, then, was the Mr. Hill with whom the simple-minded provincial bookseller, James Chalmers, had to deal when laying his claim to the merit of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, that stamp which had saved the scheme while the covers had to be destroyed as useless. Mr. Hill unhesitatingly assures this Committee against all evidence and the knowledge of some of them that *he* was the originator of the former, but about the covers of the proposed "peculiar paper" he "cannot recollect." Some of the Committee could recollect all about this peculiar paper, Mr. Hill could not recollect—the covers had proved a failure, the Adhesive Stamp had saved the scheme—*that* was the plan to stick to, of the other the less said the better. His friend, Mr. Francis, however, well recollected and records the facts—not a word from him about an Adhesive Stamp, the merit of which Mr. Francis would have been the first to claim for Rowland Hill had there been the smallest foundation for so doing—the impressed stamped cover was the plan of Mr. Hill, he tells us, the covers to be made of this "peculiar paper" on the recommendation of the authorities, and an issue of the *Athenæum* had been printed on that very paper to emphasise the fact and explain it to the public. A copy of this issue may now be seen, as I have just seen it, in the library of the British Museum, or now in my own possession, having these blue threads run through the paper. Was not Mr. Hill one of the very first to whom a copy of that issue was sent or shown? "There, Mr. Hill, you see, is your plan on the sort of paper your covers are to be made of"—yet now, the covers having been a failure, Mr. Hill "cannot recollect." Look also at the terms of the Treasury Minute

of 26th December, 1839, already named—*Mr. Hill's own Minute*—requiring the very safeguard of a paper to be peculiar in its texture, anything as to which Mr. Hill cannot now remember, though he has no difficulty in assuring the Committee that he was the originator of the successful stamp, an assurance which a perusal of the proceedings in Parliament on the introduction of the Penny Postage Bill proves to be contrary to the fact and scatters to the winds.

That Mr. Hill had the control of everything at the Treasury connected with the providing a practicable mode of carrying out the new postal system is clearly shown by the evidence taken before this Committee on Archer's Patent of 1852. Replying to *Question* 1046, Mr. Hill states: "I think the investigation rested almost entirely with myself, it being understood I was to apply to any one I pleased in matters of difficulty." Again, *Question* 1047: "It was you, principally, who conducted the investigation? —*Answer:* Yes, it was."

The evidence of Mr. Bacon, of Messrs. Bacon & Petch, Fleet Street, who engraved the first supply of Adhesive Stamps, completes this interesting portion of my narrative. *Question* to Mr. Bacon, No. 1692 :—

Question 1692. Being first-rate copper-plate engravers, you came into contact with this business first, when it was first introduced. *Answer:* I will tell you how. We were not among any of the 200 or 300 applicants for the prizes, and for the work of the Government. So far from favouritism towards us, we did not even apply, and never had dreamt of having the work to do; but after the whole of the plans had been investigated, and from some cause or other not being found to answer, then a gentleman, Mr. Cole, came to us and said, "Why did you not put in for this contract?" I answered, "We cannot put in; the probability is the Government want some cheap kind of thing that copper-plate cannot compete with, and your size is too large.'" I said, "*You want envelopes*, and steel plates could not be made at the price the Government would give." He said, "Oh, you are quite deceived, an inch would do for us." Then I replied, "We can compete;" and we took a little time, when we promised to give him everything he wanted. We made drawings that were approved of, and from that hour to this we have done everything we pledged ourselves to do.

"You want envelopes," says Mr. Bacon, another proof that Mr. Hill's plan was that of stamped envelopes only. "Oh," says Mr. Cole, "an inch would do for us." Exactly! Chalmers' inch; as, by his plan afterwards given here in detail page 30. Here, then, has at length achieved its consummation the plan of James Chalmers, invented by him in 1834, and sent to Mr. Rowland Hill in February, 1838—a plan now in the South Kensington Museum Library, bequeathed by Sir Henry Cole—a plan submitted by Mr. Cole, under instructions from Mr. Hill to Messrs. Bacon & Petch. "Give us this inch on suitable paper with an engraver's die not to be forged." This is done, and the Report of this Committee gives copy of an agreement entered into with Messrs. Bacon and Petch for providing a die—an engraved design of Her Majesty's head, reduced from Wyon's City medal—printed on sheets of gummed paper at sixpence per thousand stamps.

But no second party was to be allowed by Mr. Rowland Hill to share with him the merit of this great reform; and just as he has succeeded in obtaining the credit of having *invented* the Penny Postage scheme itself—a scheme which investigation now shows to have been from beginning to end only an able compilation of the prior proposals of others*—so has he usurped from James Chalmers the merit of the Adhesive Postage Stamp which saved the scheme and has carried it out in practice.

JAMES CHALMERS.

It has long been known in Forfarshire and adjacent counties that the inventor and proposer of the Adhesive

* Extract from Treasury Minute, of date 11th March, 1864, conferring upon Sir Rowland Hill, upon his retirement from active service, his full salary of £2,000 a year.

"My Lords do not forget that it has been by the powerful agency of the "railway system that these results have been rendered practicable. Neither "do they enter into the question, as foreign to the occasion, what honour "may be due to those who, *before the development of the plans of Sir Rowland "Hill, urged the adoption of Uniform Penny Postage.*"

Postage Stamp, the man who supplied what may be termed the *engines* to the otherwise immovable craft of Penny Postage Reform, was James Chalmers, bookseller, Dundee. When—about 1845—the merchants of the City of London handed their cheque of £13,000 to Mr. Rowland Hill in acknowledgment of his services, the citizens of Dundee, then a town not a quarter of its present size or population, not to be behindhand in asserting the share of their townsman in the work, got up also their subscription, and, as of late years I have learned, on the 1st January, 1846, in the Town Hall of Dundee, and in the presence of the Provost, bankers, and leading citizens, James Chalmers was presented with a Testimonial in recognition of his having been the originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, and for other postal services. And when, upon the decease of Sir Rowland Hill in August, 1879, the London papers proceeded to attribute to him the entire merit of the reformed postal system, immediate protest was entered by means of letters and articles in the Dundee Press, recalling and re-asserting the services of James Chalmers.

This stage of the matter drew my attention to the subject of which up till then I knew little or nothing, having left Dundee at an early age, about the year 1834, and passed much of the interval abroad. Any charge therefore as to my having unduly delayed bringing forward my claim on behalf of my father is a mistake. Equally is it a mistake to call same a *new* claim,—it is, on the contrary, an acknowledged claim of long standing, if generally unknown at this day to a new generation. To further prove this—when thirty years ago Sir Bartle Frere introduced the Adhesive Stamp into Scinde, he knew perfectly well that James Chalmers was the inventor; his letter to which effect I have published. Again, an able writer in that popular magazine, the *Leisure Hour*, before ever having heard of me or my publications, in an article describing "A day at the Post Office," and what had there been shown him, designates the Adhesive Stamp the "Chalmers Stamp"; he had "always understood Chalmers

to have been the originator." Take another instance: In a congratulatory letter acknowledging my pamphlets Mr. W. A. Warner, Secretary to the National Philatelical Society of New York, writes, under date May 3rd, 1887: "I see that your father was the inventor of the Adhesive Stamp, and not Sir Rowland Hill, which fact I have always upheld for the last sixteen years. . . . I firmly believe that James Chalmers was the inventor of this means of applying the stamp, and deserves to be honoured by all Philatelists throughout the world." These instances show how widespread beyond his own locality the belief in Chalmers has been prior to my coming forward for the purpose of extending that belief.

To be told, therefore, that this is a new claim I am setting up, that I am too late in doing so, and that the present generation will consequently have none of it, is unfounded and unfair.

This plan of an adhesive postage stamp was invented by Mr. Chalmers, a well-known postal reformer, in the month of August, 1834, as conclusively proved to the satisfaction, after special investigation, of the leading biographical works of the day, the "Encyclopædia Britannica" and the "Dictionary of National Biography," and to the equal satisfaction of numerous other authorities at home and abroad who have read the evidence. Sir Rowland Hill, in his "History of Penny Postage," has left it on record that up to this period of 1834 an adhesive postage stamp was "undreamt of."

This evidence has been published by me in a pamphlet of date 1884, entitled "James Chalmers the Inventor of the Adhesive Stamp, not Sir Rowland Hill." There is not only the testimony of an entire community who publicly presented the Testimonial already named, but the specific testimony of individuals now or lately living as to the date when Chalmers got up his sheets of adhesive stamps on his premises. To repeat all this testimony would be to republish a pamphlet, copy of which is at the service of any reader, who will find that the witnesses

include gentlemen of position in the town, with three of the workmen in the employment of Mr. Chalmers in 1834, and the son of a fourth. W. Whitelaw describes the whole process—the setting up of the forme with a number of stamps having a printed device—the printing of the sheets —the melting of the gum—the gumming the backs of the sheets—the drying and the pressing—are all described, and the date already named conclusively proved. Nor is the date in any way a matter of mere recollection, but proved by specific events in the career of the individuals: as, for instance, by Mr. Prain, for many years the well-known and respected teacher of Brechin, and now Manager of the local Savings Bank, who left Dundee in the autumn of 1834, and testifies to having been shown the adhesive stamp in existence in Mr. Chalmers' premises before he left. Mr. D. Maxwell, Manager of the Hull Town Waterworks, formerly an *employé* of Mr. Chalmers, handled the adhesive stamp sheets in the premises and took part in clipping same previous to the 1st November, 1834, the date of his indenture as an apprentice to another business, that of an engineer. Further specific testimony has just appeared in the columns of the Dundee Press. Mr. George Hood, then at the same engineering business, testifies to having known and been told of this by his then fellow apprentice, D. Maxwell, confirming the date. Mr. John D. Wears, father of the well-known Philatelist, Mr. T. Martin Wears, of Rosemount, Dundee, writes to the Press referring to the above testimony, and adding: "To all this I should like "to add my own testimony. Having settled in Dundee in "May, 1835, I distinctly remember being shown within a "year of that date the stamped slips by James Chalmers "himself, who explained to me the use he intended they "should be put to. I cannot fix the exact date, but I know "it was before Robert Nicoll, the poet, left Dundee in the "summer of 1836, as I was frequenting his circulating "library at the time. James Chalmers has all along been "regarded by old residents in Dundee as the inventor of "the Adhesive Stamp." Much confirmatory evidence in a

general way is added in my pamphlet of 1884, and such might have been indefinitely multiplied. For instance, James Paton, the son of one of Mr. Chalmers' *employés* writes: "Allow me to corroborate W. Whitelaw's statement, in so far as I have heard my late father relate the same over and over again."

Here is further important confirmatory testimony:—

"11, Derby Terrace,
"Glasgow, 13*th November*, 1882.

"Dear Sir,

"Being desirous to add anything in my power to the evidence upon the subject of your late father's invention of the Adhesive Stamp, letters with reference to which have lately appeared in the Dundee Press, I beg to say that I was connected with the Post Office in Dundee from 1835 to October, 1842—senior clerk. The then postmaster, Mr. Robert Bell, had many and long conversations with your father, Mr. James Chalmers, who took a very great interest in Post-office reform, and on Post-office matters. I am *perfectly certain* your father was the inventor of the Adhesive Stamp; such, in fact, was quite a matter of notoriety at the time. Honour to whom honour is due.

"Yours truly,
"JAMES R. NICOLL.

"Patrick Chalmers, Esq.,
"Wimbledon."

The following, not before published, is from a retired member of one of the principal mercantile firms in Dundee:—

"1, Rothesay Terrace,
"Edinburgh, *January 29th*, 1886.

"Sir,

"I have received your note of yesterday, and the two copies of your pamphlet on the Adhesive Postage Stamp, for which I thank you *very* much. The perusal will bring to my recollection the events of *fifty years ago*.

"Your most obedient servant,
"(Signed) WM. G. DON."

"Patrick Chalmers, Esq."

It will be observed that Mr. Don points to events of fifty years ago from 1886, and underlines same—taking us back to the period when James Chalmers was displaying

his stamps, as already proved, and thus corroborated by Mr. Don, and prior to the advent of Mr. Rowland Hill upon the scene.

The testimony of the Rev. Samuel Roberts, the pioneer of postal reform, demands a separate chapter.

The Rev. SAMUEL ROBERTS, M.A.

"A few days ago," it is recorded in the *Times* newspaper of 30th September, 1885, "there passed away a man whose name deserves remembrance in this column—the Rev. Samuel Roberts, of Conway—one of the earliest, if not the very earliest, advocates of postal reform, He was born in March, 1800, at Llanbrynmair, Montgomeryshire, where his father held the charge of the Congregational Church, and had therefore completed his 85th year. He began to preach when only nineteen years of age. In 1827 he was ordained as his father's assistant, and at his death, in 1834, he succeeded him in his charge. Already, in 1819 and 1820, he had gained the medals of the London Cymmodorion and of the Ruthin Eisteddfod by essays on social subjects, and another prize of ten guineas at the Eisteddfod at Denbigh. In 1832 he was highly complimented by the Eisteddfod at Beaumaris for an essay on agriculture, but the prize was withheld because its anthor advocated the doctrine of free trade. Several years prior to the last-named date he had pleaded before many associations for one low and uniform rate of postage, both inland and foreign, addressing letters on the subject to the Welsh Cymreiyyddian societies in 1824, and to the authorities at the General Post Office in 1829, and again in 1836. He also advocated a cheap parcel post. He memorialised the Treasury in favour of a reduction of the tax upon newspapers. In 1840 he started the first cheap periodical in his native country, which proved the pioneer of other cheap monthlies."

After reciting other early efforts of public improvement on the part of Mr. Roberts, the article concludes: "About three years ago Mr. Roberts received a grant of £50 from the Royal Bounty Fund, on the recommendation of Mr. Gladstone, in recognition of his services as a pioneer in the cause of social progress, and especially of postal reform."

To this notice in the *Times* may now be added some extracts from the statements of Mr. Roberts himself, taken from that manifesto of his in which he thanks over two

hundred kind contributories, from this Royal Bounty Fund downwards, in aid of his declining years; and which list includes such names as those of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. H. J. Gladstone, Lord Derby, Mr. Samuel Morley, Mr. Bright, Mr. Rathbone, Lord Dalhousie, the Duke of Westminster, Sir Thomas Brassey, Sir Edward Baines, Mr. J. Carvell Williams, several Bishops and Members of Parliament, &c. Mr. Roberts states:—

"The aged writer has pleaded and petitioned for our useful penny postage and other postal reductions and conveniences more than ten years before the patriotic Sir Rowland Hill came out to assist in the difficult conflict. He repeatedly petitioned and memorialised the Post Office on the subject," further corresponding thereon with leading men of the day. "The proposal of a uniform penny postage on letters," Mr. Roberts states, "was well known around the Post Office and other high places." Soon after the publication of the fifth report of the Commissioners of Post Office Inquiry, of date April, 1836, which recommended a low and uniform postage on circulars, to be charged by weight and prepaid by impressed stamp at the rate of a penny the half-ounce, "Sir Rowland Hill took up the penny idea and extended its usefulness. He worked perseveringly for reform; but it should be remembered that it is not right to honour him as the originator of the penny system—the plan had been drawn and he did the work." Again, "Sir Rowland Hill was nobly rewarded for his ability and perseverance in carrying out a scheme, important portions of which had been suggested and recommended by others. He deserved honour as an able *copyist* of other men's plans; but it was not fair to honour and reward him as the inventor of the uniform penny postage system. It is really no honour to his memory that he grasped to himself all the rewards and honours of the postal reforms of those days."

Such is the manifesto of this remarkable man, now truly recorded in the *Times* as having been the pioneer of postal reform, a work taken up by such men as Lord Lowther, Mr. Hume, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Knight, Mr. Chalmers, and others, including Mr. Matthew Davenport-Hill, M.P. for Hull, the elder brother of Sir Rowland Hill, who from such men and from the various reports of the Commissioners of Post Office Inquiry, found all his proposals ready to his hand.

But now to my point—what says Mr. Roberts as to whom we are indebted for the Adhesive Postage Stamp,

without which all the proposals of himself and others having for their object a uniform penny postage were useless and impracticable? Just this:—

"It was long supposed and was generally asserted that it (the Adhesive Stamp) had been invented by Sir Rowland Hill, or one of his subordinates, and he took the honour; but it is now known that it was a thoughtful, calculating, unassuming patriotic reformer of Dundee, of the name of James Chalmers, that invented the Adhesive Stamp, and it was very unjust in the authorities of the Post Office to withhold from the real inventor and to grasp to themselves the reward and honour due to another for an invention that has proved so essential. Patrick Chalmers, son of the said James Chalmers, of Dundee, has given us in his pamphlets fresh and very interesting chapters in the history of the Post Office reform of those days. The said James Chalmers, the inventor of the Adhesive Stamp, though overlooked by Post Office Officials, was honoured by his neighbours who were well acquainted with his suggestion; and he will be honoured by future generations as the inventor of the Adhesive Stamp."

The above from such a man as Mr. Roberts, mixed up in the question of postal reform from beginning to end, ought of itself to be conclusive to all impartial minds. For several years before his death Mr. Roberts favoured me with an occasional letter; the following is from his latest, and only too true as respects the hitherto silence of many of the London papers:—

"Justice is tardy in honouring the memory of your patriotic father as the 'Inventor of the Adhesive Stamp,' and in rewarding you for your public service in the matter, but you are fast gaining ground. Justice is *often* tardy. Many, even in Wales, admit that I had pleaded for our 'Penny Postage,' and other postal conveniences, many years before Sir Rowland Hill came out to assist in the conflict, and yet they do not like to offer any *new* compliments or rewards, as that would *nullify what they had said* and *done before*. The correction of mistakes implies that mistakes have been made."

Immediately on the assembling of the Select Committee of the House of Commons in November, 1837, appointed to consider the proposed Penny Postage Scheme of Mr. Rowland Hill, Mr. Chalmers sent in his plan of

prepayment by Adhesive Postage Stamp to two members of the Committee—Mr. Wallace, the Chairman, and Mr. Chalmers, M.P. for the Montrose Burghs. The date of Mr. Wallace's letter acknowledging receipt of this communication from Mr. Chalmers is the 9th December, 1837; this we know from the portion of the correspondence published by Mr. Pearson Hill, and is admitted by him.

Mr. Chalmers also sent his plan to Mr. Cole, secretary to the Mercantile Committee of the City of London, who has bequeathed same to the South Kensington Museum Library, thus enabling me to publish his plan in detail, as follows; and since already publishing this in former pamphlets, same as been discovered in the columns of the *Montrose Review* of date 23rd February, 1838:—

SIR HENRY COLE'S PAPERS AND THE ADHESIVE STAMP PLAN OF Mr. CHALMERS.

In his "Fifty Years of Public Life," lately published, Sir Henry Cole gives much information with respect to the Penny Postage reform—a boon with the obtaining and carrying out of which he was intimately associated—first as secretary to the Mercantile Committee of the City of London, and afterwards as coadjutor to Mr. Rowland Hill at the Treasury. "A General Collection of Postage "Papers," having reference to this reform, elucidating the efforts made by this Committee of London Merchants and Bankers during the year 1838-39, to obtain for the scheme the sanction of the Legislature, has been bequeathed by Sir Henry Cole, "to be given to the British Museum after "my death."* "The Mercantile Committee," he states, "was formed chiefly by the exertions of Mr. George Moffat "in the spring of 1838. Mr. Ashurst conducted the Parlia- "mentary Inquiry, and upon myself, as Secretary, devolved "the business of communicating with the public." This

* These papers are in the Art Library of the South Kensington Museum.

Committee formed the source and focus of the agitation which brought about the ultimate enactment of uniform Penny Postage. Money was freely subscribed, meetings were held, public bodies in the Provinces were urged to petition, Members of Parliament and Ministers were waited upon, and a special paper advocating the scheme, termed the "Post Circular," was issued and circulated gratis. Of these proceedings Mr. Cole was the guiding genius; and, amongst other successes, over two thousand petitions to Parliament were obtained—labours which were ultimately crowned with success.

To Mr. Cole, then, it now turns out that Mr. Chalmers, in February, 1838, sent a copy of his plan of the Adhesive Stamp. Mr. Wallace and the House of Commons Committee had already got it, but it is only now that the particulars of the plan have been brought to light—and in this "Collection of Postage Papers," Sir Henry Cole has indeed left a valuable legacy to me, and to all prepared to recognise the true originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp. These papers include a printed statement of Mr. Chalmers' plan, dated "4 Castle Street, Dundee, 8th February, 1838," and which runs as follows:—

"*Remarks on various modes proposed for franking letters,*
"*under Mr. Rowland Hill's plan of Post-Office Reform.*

"In suggesting any method of improvement, it is only "reasonable to expect that what are supposed to be its "advantages over any existing system, or in opposition to "others that have been or may be proposed, will be "explicitly stated.

"Therefore, if Mr. Hill's plan of a uniform rate of "postage, and that all postages are to be paid by those "sending letters *before* they are deposited in the respective "post-offices, become the law of the land, I conceive that "the most simple and economical mode of carrying out "such an arrangement would be by *slips* (postage stamps) "prepared somewhat similar to the specimens herewith "shown.

"With this view, and in the hope that Mr. Hill's plan "may soon be carried into operation, I would suggest "that sheets of stamped slips should be prepared at the "Stamp Office (on a paper made expressly for the purpose) "with a device on each for a die or cut resembling that on "newspapers; that the *sheets* so printed or stamped "should then be rubbed over with a strong solution of gum "or other adhesive substance, and (when thoroughly dry) "issued by the Stamp Office to town and country distribu- "tors, to stationers and others, for sale in sheets or singly "under the same laws and restrictions now applicable to "those selling bill or receipt stamps, so as to prevent, as "far as practical, any fraud on the revenue.

"Merchants and others whose correspondence is exten- "sive could purchase these slips in quantities, cut them "singly, and affix one to a letter by means of wetting the "back of the slip with a sponge or brush, just with as "much facility as applying a wafer."—Adding that the stamp might answer both for stamp and wafer, especially in the case of circulars—a suggestion which those who may recollect the mode of folding universally practised before the days of envelopes, will appreciate. Mr. Chalmers goes on: "Others, requiring only one or two slips at a time, could "purchase them along with sheets of paper at stationers' "shops, the *weight* only regulating the rate of postage in "all cases, so as a stamp may be affixed according to the "scale determined on.

"Again, to prevent the possibility of these being used a "*second time*, it should be made imperative on postmasters "to put the post-office town stamp (as represented in one "of the specimens) across the slip or postage stamp."

Mr. Chalmers then goes on to point out the advantages to be derived from this plan, and to state objections to Mr. Hill's plan of impressed stamped covers or envelopes, or stamp impressed upon the sheet of letter paper itself. At that period envelopes—being scarcely known, and never used, as involving double postage—were a hand-made article, heavy and expensive; objections which have disap-

peared with the abolition of the excise duty on paper, and the use of machinery. But how true were Mr. Chalmers' objections *then* may be gathered from the fact, as recorded by Sir Rowland Hill in his "Life," that the large supply provided of the first postage envelope, the "Mulready," had actually *to be destroyed* as wholly unsuitable and unsaleable, while the supply of adhesive stamps was with difficulty brought up to the demand. The force and value of Mr. Chalmers' objections to the stamp impressed upon the sheet itself are best exemplified by the fact that, though ultimately sanctioned by the Treasury at the instance of Mr. Hill, such plan never came into use. People bought their own paper from the stationers, and not from the Stamp Office, and applied the adhesive stamp as the weight required. Mr. Chalmers concludes, "Taking all these dis-
"advantages into consideration, the use of stamped slips
"is certainly the most preferable system; and, should
"others who take an interest in the proposed reform view
"the matter in the same light as I do, it remains for them
"to petition Parliament to have such carried into opera-
"tion."

This statement of Mr. Chalmers is printed on part of an elongated sheet of paper. On the half not occupied by the type are several specimens of a suggested stamp, about an inch square, and with the words printed, "General Postage—not exceeding half-an-ounce—One Penny." And the same—"Not exceeding one ounce—Twopence." (It is only of late years that a penny has franked one ounce in weight.) A space divides each stamp for cutting off singly,* and the back of the sheet is gummed over. One of the specimens is stamped across with the post-mark, "Dundee, 10th February, 1838," to exemplify what Mr. Chalmers states should be done to prevent the stamp being used a second time.

Here is a complete description of the principle of the

* The perforated sheets were not introduced until the year 1852. This improvement was the invention of a Mr. Archer, for which he got the sum of £4,000, as already mentioned.

Adhesive Stamp as ultimately adopted by Mr. Hill at the Treasury by Minute of 26th December, 1839, when he sent Mr. Cole to Messrs. Bacon & Petch, the eminent engravers to provide a die and contract for the supply of stamps (see Mr. Bacon's evidence *page* 20 *ante*)—a plan in use to the present day.

This description, as now brought to light under the signature of Mr. Chalmers himself, fully confirms the evidence with respect to the invention in August, 1834, as given by his then *employés* yet living, W. Whitelaw and others before mentioned.

THE PRETENCE AND AFTERTHOUGHT.

It will now be asked, "seeing how easily and conclusively it has been proved that the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp for the purpose of carrying out his scheme in practice formed no part of the original proposals or intention of Mr. Hill, how comes it that James Chalmers did not receive the official credit for his invention and timely proposal to which he was entitled?" The explanation or excuse which Mr. Hill, in reply to Mr. Chalmers' claim, set up for attributing, after all, the entire merit to himself is this:—When Mr. Hill was explaining before the Commissioners of Post-Office Inquiry, on the 13th of February, 1837, his plan of prepayment by stamped covers, a difficulty arose as to what was to be done in the case of a person unable to write taking an unstamped letter and a penny to a post-office, a stamped cover being compulsory, no money accepted in prepayment. The penny would buy one of Mr. Hill's stamped wrappers or covers, but the cover would obliterate the address, and the person could not write. In such a case, and in such a case only, says Mr. Hill, "perhaps this difficulty may be obviated by using a bit of paper just large enough to bear the stamp and covered at the back by a glutinous wash, which the bringer might, by applying a little moisture, attach to the back of the letter, so as to avoid the necessity of redirecting it." Going on at once,

however, as Sir Rowland Hill admits in his "History of Penny Postage," to *withdraw the compulsion* to use a stamp at all: "Better, at first at least, accept the penny in cash for penny letters, so that every stamp used might be *universally* the impressed stamp." The "person who could not write" had thus only to pay the penny, no "bit of gummed paper" being required. And this penny in cash was accepted up to the year 1855. The bit of gummed paper thus appears for a moment on the scene to be used only for this supposed exceptional purpose, and then as suddenly disappears, the penny in cash being accepted in its place, all stamps to be "universally" the impressed stamp.

Here, then, was a momentary allusion to a bit of gummed paper, showing that Mr. Hill had heard of Chalmers' invention of 1834, but without seeing its value or proposing its adoption for the purpose of carrying out the scheme. Even this passing allusion to a bit of gummed paper does not occur in the first edition of Mr. Hill's pamphlet of 1837, and what took place in the interval betwixt the publishing of that pamphlet and the above-named remark? Why, Mr. Hill had become the lion of Post Office reforming circles; every suggestion was laid at his service; he was invited to give evidence before the Commissioners. But two years and a half had elapsed since Mr. Chalmers had conceived and advocated this invention, a space more than sufficient for this idea on the part of one who had done some service in the cause to have become well known—a stock piece—a current notion—in those circles of which Mr. Hill had just become the prominent figure. By his services in obtaining an acceleration of the mail Mr. Chalmers was already known in these circles south as well as north of the Tweed, as one of the early postal reformers, one who "held correspondence with the postal reformers of "his day, both in and out of Parliament" ("Encyclopædia Britannica"), the correspondent, amongst others, of Messrs. Knight & Co., who published for Mr. Hill. In a letter, then of 18th January, 1840, as we learn from Mr. Pearson Hill's

account of the matter, and from Mr. Chalmers' reply, Mr. Hill pointed out to Mr. Chalmers that his claim could not be admitted, because he, Mr. Hill, first proposed an adhesive stamp in February, 1837, the first official proposal of his plan by Mr. Chalmers, his letter to Mr. Wallace and the House of Commons Committee, having been only in December of the same year. In answer to this extraordinary pretension on the part of Mr. Hill, it is enough to point to the evidence already brought forward that, up to the introduction of the Penny Postage Bill in July, 1839, Mr. Hill had *not* proposed to adopt the Adhesive Stamp. Mr. Hill had become *cognisant* of this idea, but without seeing its value or proposing its adoption for the purpose of carrying out his scheme.

This allusion to an adhesive stamp in February, 1837, was a mere passing observation as to what might be done in a supposed exceptional case, which could never have arisen so long as the penny in cash was accepted, and was nothing more. For Mr. Hill to represent to Mr. Chalmers that he, Mr. Hill, had proposed to adopt the Adhesive Stamp as a means of carrying out his scheme in February, 1837, was to state what was *not the case;* consequently any admission so gained from Mr. Chalmers was wholly invalid. An extract from the reply of Mr. Chalmers, dated 18th May, 1840, already twice published by me, has been circulated by Mr. Pearson Hill, in whose hands alone is the entire correspondence, with the object of showing that Mr. Chalmers "honestly abandoned" his claim. But Mr. Chalmers honestly abandoned nothing; while no impartial person will, upon consideration, for a moment attach any importance to just what "extract" from this correspondence Mr. Pearson Hill has thought or may think proper to produce.* I again contend, as I have already main-

* An esteemed American correspondent, well known to have read up and examined both sides of this controversy, ably characterises Mr. Chalmers' reply thus: "Had Chalmers wanted to have said—'Notwithstanding all you have said, I am still the inventor, but you are in power, and I must yield any way; and as the public has got what I proposed to give them, I suppose I must be content,' he could hardly have chosen better language to express the idea politely."

tained, that this correspondence was public, not private property—that such should have remained at the Treasury, subject to the inspection of all concerned, in place of having been appropriated by Sir Rowland Hill as private, and thus so as to admit of only such portion being ultimately made known as may have suited himself. In this extract of 18th May, 1840, Mr. Chalmers, after stating he had delayed to reply until seeing the stamps in operation, writes with surprise at what Mr. Hill now states. Had he known or supposed that any one else, especially Mr. Hill himself, had proposed the Adhesive Stamp for the purpose of carrying out the scheme, he would not have troubled him at all. But having sent his plan to Mr. Wallace, M.P., and got his acknowledgment of 9th December, 1837, saying same would be laid before the Committee; also to Mr. Chalmers, M.P., and got his reply of 7th October, 1839, saying such had been laid before the Committee; also Mr. Hill's own letter of 3rd March, 1838, a copy of which he encloses—from *all* these he was led to believe he had been "first in the field." *Now*, in consequence of Mr. Hill's assurance of 18th January, 1840, to the contrary (and in any case indisposed to contest a decision against which there was practically no appeal), he only regrets having through his ignorance put others as well as himself to any trouble in the matter; "while the "only satisfaction I have had in this as well as in former "suggestions—all original with me—is that these have "been adopted, and have been and are likely to prove "beneficial to the public."

Such is the letter or extract which, placed in the hands of every editor in London, has led to my statements being here treated with comparative neglect. But let my statements equally with those of Mr. Pearson Hill be read by any impartial writer, as in the case of the "Encyclopædia "Britannica," the "Dictionary of National Biography," and other authorities, and the result, it is seen, has been to lead to a decision entirely in favour of my claim. "James "Chalmers was the inventor of the Adhesive Postage

" Stamp—Mr. Pearson Hill has not weakened the evidence " to that effect." Here was honesty certainly—simplicity indeed—on the side of Mr. Chalmers; but what about the representation on the part of Mr. Hill. Was it the case that he had proposed the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp in February, 1837, as represented to Mr. Chalmers? The proofs to the contrary are conclusive. Mr. Hill had pointed out where in a supposed exceptional case such a stamp might be of service if no money payment was accepted, but that was all. Nothing can be more clear than that the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp for the purpose of carrying out his scheme formed no part of the original proposals and intentions of Mr. Hill. His representation to Mr. Chalmers was therefore exaggerated, delusive, and misleading.* " Why did not you tell me anything of this before?" replies Mr. Chalmers in effect;—" *there* is a copy of your letter of " 3rd March, 1838, when I sent you my plan, in which " letter of yours no such pretensions were put forward. It " is only now that I learn for the first time that you had " ever proposed or been in favour of an adhesive stamp. " Further, how is it that neither of these members of the " Committee before whom I laid my plan had ever heard " of any such prior proposal on your part? However, I " am now only sorry at having troubled you: I have at " least the satisfaction of knowing that the public have " got my plan somehow."

" Why did you not tell me anything of this before?" Why, indeed! Because Mr. Hill *then* had not contemplated an adhesive stamp, as has been abundantly proved. An impressed stamped cover " was absolutely to be used in all " cases," says the Chancellor of the Exchequer as late as in July, 1839—a " power " was asked for this, and for this alone. But much had happened in the interval betwixt Mr. Hill's two letters to Mr. Chalmers. The stamp not accepted by Mr. Hill in 1838 had become in 1840 the

* " The *Christian Leader*, of Glasgow, ably puts the matter thus:—" Sir " Rowland Hill seems to have been at pains to obscure the facts of the case " for the purpose of claiming to himself the credit of an invention which really " belonged to the Dundee bookseller."

favourite of all opinions concerned, the adopted of the Treasury. It had saved his scheme. Mr. Chalmers must now be put aside—a matter which the entire contrast betwixt the dispositions of the two men rendered only too easy, and so this afterthought, bred of the success which had attended the proposal of Chalmers, this far-fetched pretext, was hit upon for the purpose.

At the same time Mr. Chalmers appears to have been too apathetic in the matter, indifferent to personal considerations so long as the public got his stamp from some quarter; but the absence of any desire for personal advantage is a not unfrequent characteristic in those who have done some public service.

But it is this neglect, or mere indifference, on the part of my father in not having made a better stand in 1840 with respect to a matter the national and universal value of which no one could then appreciate or foresee, that all the more calls upon me now, under a better acquaintance with the facts and circumstances, to claim for his memory that recognition to which he is clearly entitled, as having been "The Originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp."

Mr. PEARSON HILL.

Mr. Pearson Hill has at length made an attempt by the publication of a pamphlet entitled "The Chalmers Craze Investigated," to make a stand against the success which has attended my efforts to vindicate the title of my late father to having been the originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp. This pamphlet is chiefly remarkable for personalities, and for omitting to give just what is wanted to elucidate this controversy—namely, the letters of Mr. Rowland Hill to Mr. Chalmers of dates March 3rd, 1838, and 18th January, 1840; and this notwithstanding requests for their production. We are favoured with an "Extract" from a letter of Mr. Chalmers to Mr. Rowland Hill of date 18th May, 1840,

purporting to show that Chalmers "honestly abandoned" his claim; but the facts having been obscured and misrepresented to him, Chalmers honestly abandoned nothing, as just shown; while I have had no difficulty in showing, in my "Letter to the Dundee Burns Club: a Reply to Mr. Pearson Hill," pages 21–26, that this very "Extract" itself proves that Chalmers *was* "first in the field" in having proposed the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp. That Mr. Pearson Hill should still have withheld this long-asked-for correspondence in its entirety is simply an affront to the understanding of all who have followed this controversy, and virtually an abandonment of his case. No amount of sophistries or pages of vituperation of me will blind any impartial mind to that fact. Nor is any explanation given as to by what right and with what object Mr. Rowland Hill removed this official correspondence of 1839–1840 from the Treasury.

Mr. Pearson Hill's pamphlet is further remarkable for now making no pretension as to the Adhesive Stamp having been primarily or specially the invention of Sir Rowland Hill; though why he has allowed it to be believed until now that such stamp *was* the special invention of his father, Mr. Pearson Hill does not say. He thinks this stamp must have occurred to "scores of people," and so it did *in October*, 1839, to just forty-nine people when the Treasury advertised for plans, James Chalmers having already brought it forward in December, 1837, and its merits having been publicly discussed all through the interval. The "Rowland Hill" delusion being at length dispelled, Mr. Pearson Hill's motto is, "Anybody but Chalmers," "scores of people." Further, though still of opinion that the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp for the purpose of carrying out the scheme was included in Mr. Rowland Hill's proposals of 1837, Mr. Pearson Hill does not attempt to explain why neither Parliament, nor the Government, nor the Press, nor Mr. John Francis, the intimate friend of Sir Rowland Hill, nor Mr. Bacon, who supplied the first engraved stamps, knew anything to that effect up to the introduction of the Penny Postage Bill in July, 1839, any allusion whatever

to the proceedings on which occasion Mr. Pearson Hill, equally with Sir Rowland Hill, suppresses as being fatal to his pretension.

Having regard to the objection displayed by Mr. Pearson Hill to producing more than the mere "Extract" from the correspondence which purported to tell in his own favour, to the unfounded imputations against me and the personalities he has indulged in, and to his whole mode of conducting this controversy, I now desire to state, on the part of myself and friends, that we shall now be satisfied with nothing short of the production and perusal of the originals of this correspondence; and that we shall feel justified in declining to recognise as sufficient or to take cognisance of any further extract or copy Mr. Pearson Hill may publish or put forward in any quarter.

In justification of this, it may be instructive if I reproduce some specimens from Mr. Pearson Hill's pen. Here, for instance, is his letter to the publishers of the "Encyclopædia Britannica":—

"50, Belsize Park,
"London, N.W.,
"15*th March*, 1883.

"Gentlemen,

"As you are now issuing a new edition of your 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' and as for years past a Mr. Patrick Chalmers has persistently been making false and groundless charges against my father, the late Sir Rowland Hill, I think it well to send you the enclosed printed documents for your information, as it is by no means improbable that he may strive to get you to insert some untrue statement when you deal with the question of the Post Office and Postal Reform.

"I need hardly say that I shall be happy at any time to submit to you the original documents which are in my possession, which disproves the claims put forward in behalf of Mr. James Chalmers of Dundee, if you would desire to see them.

"Your statistical information about the Post Office, as given in my copy of the Encyclopædia (the eighth edition), is of course now much behindhand. I dare say you have already on your staff of contributors some gentlemen well able to supply you with fresh information; but should you be in want of any such help, I feel sure that my cousin, Mr. Lewin Hill, head of the

statistical branch of the Secretary's office, General Post Office, London, would gladly undertake the work if you desired it.

"I am, Gentlemen,

"Your obedient servant,

"(Signed) PEARSON HILL.

"Messrs. A. & C. Black,
"Edinburgh."

Having been courteously afforded the opportunity of stating my own case as against that of Mr. Pearson Hill and all his "documents," the result was the decision in my favour—that "James Chalmers was the Inventor of the Adhesive Postage Stamp in the month of August, 1834, Mr. Pearson Hill has not weakened the evidence" to that effect, and that Sir Rowland Hill's allusion in February, 1837, to the use such a stamp might be put to in the exceptional case already mentioned was to an idea "suggested from without." In place of retiring with dignity, if with regret, Mr. Pearson Hill has gone on to find fault with the conductors of this standard work, to challenge a decision initiated by himself, and to sneer at my witnesses as only men in their dotage. He further gives his sanction to the persistent way in which I have been misrepresented in the Press as "claiming the Penny Postage *Scheme* for my father," thus rendering my claim too ridiculous to obtain attention. A cause that has to be supported by such means must be weak indeed.

In the absence of a "case" we all know the not uncommon alternative, "abuse the other side," and this, in short, is the course I have been honoured with here. Every one who has followed my publications knows how gradually the facts and evidence have come to hand, or within my own knowledge, yet I am taken to task as having kept back statements, for not having early published my case full blown. Again, I am somehow held responsible for Press statements, with which I had nothing to do, or, I may say, not even seen. In this way are Mr. Pearson Hill's strictures, complaints, and cavillings mustered. So far does he forget himself as to imply that I have claimed for my father not

only the Adhesive Stamp, but further, the merit of Archer's patent perforation, and the very Penny Postage Scheme itself! That throwing over "poor Mr. Samuel Roberts," I have put James Chalmers in his place. Going on with such choice remarks as that "probably before the jubilee "of Penny Postage arrives some old people in Dundee or "Bedlam will be discovered who can testify that Mr. James "Chalmers also designed the General Post Office in St. "Martin's-le-Grand, and that the Postal Telegraphs, Tele- "phones, and the Parcel Post were all invented by Mr. James "Chalmers in 1834, and communicated by him to his "wondering friends and neighbours." Referring to my being a member of the Royal Historical Society leads to the remark—"A man may as well be called a goose because "he subscribes to a Goose Club,"—concluding, "Surely if "the Commissioners in Lunacy are in want of a promising "case they might find one at Wimbledon admirably adapted "to their hands."

I refrain from adding by any words of mine to the painful effect which such remarks will produce upon any man of intelligence or sense of propriety.

DUNDEE.

Besides giving the evidence of the *employés* of Mr. Chalmers, his friends and acquaintances, fixing the date of his invention of the Adhesive Postage Stamp as ultimately adopted and now in use, my pamphlet of 1884, already mentioned, gives further some account of Mr. Chalmers' early postal services, including an article from the *Edinburgh Magazine* for August, 1825 (Archibald Constable & Co.), entitled "Acceleration of the London and Aberdeen Mail." In this article it is stated that Mr. Chalmers had succeeded, after much pains and correspondence, in so procuring a better arrangement of the mail service as to "effect a gain of two days in corresponding with London—one from and another to the capital; and this, too, with-

out materially abridging the business hours at any place." And in connection with the mail, Chalmers is classed as the successor and completer of the work of Palmer, the originator of the mail-coach.

His mind, ever bent upon postal improvement, led Mr. Chalmers to the conception, in 1834, of the Adhesive Postage Stamp. From the year 1832, and again more forcibly in 1834, the expediency of entirely abolishing the newspaper stamp (then 4d. on every paper!), and allowing newspapers to pass through the Post Office for one penny each, was advocated by the reformers of the period, but without immediate result. Mr. Charles Knight, the eminent publisher and postal reformer, in a publication which he edited, termed "The Companion to the Newspaper," proposed in the number for 1st June, 1834, that such postage should be collected by selling penny stamped wrappers wherewith to prepay the postage.* Here it was that Mr. Chalmers interposed with his invention—proposing an Adhesive Stamp in place of a stamp impressed on the wrapper. A further source of inspiration towards the conception of an Adhesive Stamp lay in Mr. Chalmers being the printer and publisher of a local newspaper, the *Dundee Chronicle*, in which capacity the loss and trouble occasioned by spoilt stamped fourpenny sheets in the course of printing and issue would have pressed powerfully upon his invention for a remedy, culminating in the Adhesive Stamp described by his then *employés*. This conception Mr. Chalmers displayed to his friends and townsmen; and being in regular business correspondence with Mr. Knight, the publisher of Mr. Hill's pamphlet of 1837, and whose publications, such as the popular "Penny Cyclopædia," "Penny Magazine," &c., Mr. Chalmers had regularly on sale, that fellow postal reformer was doubtless made acquainted with Chalmers' alternative plan of prepayment by Adhesive Stamp.

* Referring to this proposal of Mr. Knight, Sir Rowland Hill, in his "History of Penny Postage," states, "Of course Adhesive Stamps were "yet undreamt of"—showing that such was a distinct occasion for their being applicable, and that Chalmers had no progenitor in the invention.

And here I introduce a further and most conclusive proof in support of my contention that Sir Rowland Hill was not the originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, a proof brought to my notice by a valued German correspondent. The name of the "Penny Cyclopædia" of that period is yet cherished as the pioneer of all such standard works; its publisher was this same Mr. Charles Knight, postal reformer, and publisher to Sir Rowland Hill; on its committee of management are the names of "M. D. Hill, "Esq., Q.C., Rowland Hill, Esq., F.R.A.S." And this is what the "Penny Cyclopædia" tells us under the article "Post Office," vol 18, 1840. "He" (Mr. Rowland Hill) "proposed that the rate of postage should be uniform, to "be charged according to weight, and that the payment "should be made in advance. The means of doing so by "stamps were not suggested in the first edition of the "pamphlet, *and Mr. Hill states that this idea did not "originate with him.*"

Here, then, is an article, if not actually written by Mr. Hill himself, as most probable, and of whose authorship it bears internal evidence, at least produced under his supervision and cognisance, and this extract from which tells us that the idea of stamps did not originate with him, and this without exception. The Adhesive Stamp had only come into use in May, 1840, about the period this article was written, and no pretence is made in this "Penny Cyclopædia" published by Mr. Knight (who knew too well the facts to be misled as Mr. Chalmers had been), that such stamp, any more than the stamped covers, originated with Mr. Hill. "Soon afterwards," however, as we have seen, *page* 17 *ante*, it turned out that Mr. Hill's plan of stamped envelopes proved a failure, while the supply of adhesive stamps "failed to meet the demand"; and with this exceptional success of the adhesive stamp arose likewise on the part of Mr. Hill that pretension of having been its originator which has hitherto deluded the world.

Immediately on the meeting of the Select Committee of the House of Commons in November, 1837, appointed to consider Mr. Hill's proposal of a uniform penny postage, Mr. Chalmers, as has been seen, sent his plan of an Adhesive Stamp to this Committee. Again, in February, 1838, he sends it to Mr. Cole, Secretary to the Mercantile Committee of the City of London—a plan bequeathed by Sir Henry Cole to the South Kensington Museum Library, as already mentioned and given. At same time it is sent to Mr. Hill himself, whose reply of 3rd March, 1838, is withheld by Mr. Pearson Hill, but which reply we know to have been unfavourable, as Mr. Chalmers afterwards returned a copy of same to Mr. Hill to show him that such was the case. We know this also from the fact that Mr. Chalmers' recommendation was not adopted by Mr. Hill until the following year. Throughout the year 1838 this plan is discussed in the Committee, attracting attention in other quarters concerned, more especially on the part of the stationery trade, who looked with dismay upon Mr. Hill's plan of stamped writing paper of every description being sold by the Stamp Office or Post Office, while by this alternative plan the stationers would sell the paper, the Post Office the stamp. In July, 1839, the Penny Postage Bill is introduced into Parliament; but as has been shown, *pages* 10–12 *ante*, under a general dilemma as to *how* it is to be carried out in practice. By Treasury Minute of 23rd August, plans are invited from the public, and again Mr. Chalmers submits his, but now accompanied with the letter of his townsmen named in the preface to this publication—a letter which has been brought to light through the researches of able and warm sympathisers with me in my efforts to vindicate my father's services, and to bring home to the land north of the Tweed a share in the great work of postal reform.

In the Preface I have already given the opening remarks of the *Arbroath Herald*, introducing this letter of the Dundee Bankers, Merchants, and others, to the Lords of the Treasury, and which letter is as follows :—

"DUNDEE, *September 30th*, 1839.

"We hereby certify that Mr. James Chalmers, bookseller here, has for many years taken an active interest in the acceleration of the mail and general improvement of the Post Office establishment, and his services in this way have been repeatedly noticed with much commendation in respectable periodical publications. Chiefly through his exertions in directing attention to the means and importance of accelerating the mail, two days were gained in correspondence betwixt this place and London, and also betwixt this and Liverpool, prior to the use of railways. Since this proposal to establish a uniform rate of postage was announced, Mr. Chalmers has devoted much attention to the subject, and has been at great pains to discover the best method of carrying the scheme into effect. We have seen a specimen along with a description of his plan of using stamped slips, which appear to us to possess several peculiar and important advantages. We beg, therefore, respectfully to recommend his plan to the favourable consideration of the Right Honourable the Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury."

Some account of the *Arbroath Herald*—from the columns of which paper this most valuable addition to my evidence has been brought to light—is given in the learned work lately published by Mr. J. M. McBain, F.S.A., Banker, Arbroath, entitled "Bibliography of Arbroath Periodical Literature," and from which able compilation of much research I extract the following information :—

"THE ARBROATH HERALD.

"On the 30th November, 1838, the first number of the *Arbroath Herald* appeared. It was an eight-page paper, 17 inches by 12 inches, price 4½d. It was well printed and ably conducted. But the chief ground on which, in its opening number, the *Herald* claimed public support was 'the utter absence of all personal abuse, and the strict attention to truth, purity of language, and selection of subjects.' From the first to the last number it adhered to this, and it deserved much better support than it appears to have got. The paper continued only thirteen months, and, in their valedictory address, its proprietors stated that, while it was not commenced with very sanguine expectations of making money, they frankly confessed that it not only did not pay its way, but that financially it was a losing concern. It was conducted by Robert W. Anderson, a young Arbroath lawyer, and James Duff. The former acted as editor, and the latter as printer and publisher.

"Mr. Anderson removed many years ago from Arbroath to Forfar, where, in addition to his legal business, he held a number of important public appointments. He died in Forfar on 27th July, 1888. He was the first to obtain leave to give verbatim reports of the Town Council proceedings.

"James Duff, the printer and publisher, was essentially a newspaper man. He was born in 1797, and died in 1882. In 1811 he was apprenticed to the proprietors of the *Dundee Advertiser*, Mr. Rintoul being then editor.* The *Dundee Advertiser* at that time was a weekly, with a circulation of 600, the price being 6d. The work was then done by two journeymen and three apprentices in an old building in New Inn Entry, a mighty contrast to the magnificent premises, splendid appliances, and numerous staff of that journal to-day. When quite a lad, Duff was entrusted with the most responsible work in the office, and during his service there he came into contact with many men of note, George Kinloch and Robert Nicoll, the poet, being among the number. Besides doing his duty at the 'case' he did good work with his pen.

"After twenty-seven years' continuous service there, Duff came, as we have said, to Arbroath, and established the *Herald*, of which, although he was not the recognised editor, the literary part of the work largely devolved on him, and it was a great disappointment to him when he felt called upon to abandon his Arbroath venture. On the relinquishment of the *Herald*, Duff returned to Dundee, where he established himself as a general printer, in which business he continued to thrive till his retirement in 1869.

"On the completion of the seventieth anniversary of his connection with the printing trade, Mr. Duff was presented by the master printers of Dundee with an illuminated address. Even after his retirement from business he continued his connection with periodical literature, contributing interesting articles on a variety of subjects to the local Press."

Mr. Duff, it is thus seen, was practically a Dundee man, and was, I am moreover informed, on terms of much intimacy with my father, thus fully accounting for the appearance of this matter in his paper. The *Herald* has of late years been resuscitated.

* Afterwards editor of the eminent London newspaper, the *Spectator*.—P.C.

From the reply of the Secretary of H.M. Treasury to my request for permission to inspect this Dundee letter, as already given in the Preface, it will be seen that said letter is not now in the possession of the Treasury or amongst the public records. I have consequently addressed the following letter to Mr. Pearson Hill, of date July 24th, 1889:—

"Sir,

"It has come to my knowledge that a letter of date September 30th, 1839, was addressed to the Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury by the Bankers and Merchants of Dundee in support of the plan of Mr. James Chalmers for carrying out in practice the Penny Postage Scheme, and I am officially informed that this letter is no longer in the possession of the Treasury. I consequently trouble you with this note to ask if I am correct or otherwise in concluding that this Dundee letter is in your possession equally with the correspondence between Mr. James Chalmers and the late Sir Rowland Hill, as admitted in your publications to be held by you?"

To the above I have not been favoured with any reply, and the reader will consequently form his own opinion whether this Dundee letter is or is not in Mr. Pearson Hill's hands equally with the correspondence which he has not ventured to publish.

So much for 1839. And I now come to the 1st January, 1846, when, under the circumstances named, *page* 22 *ante*, the past generation of Dundee Bankers and Merchants again take up the support and recognition of their townsman, James Chalmers, by presenting him in the Town Hall of Dundee with the Testimonial already mentioned, particulars of which meeting, taken from the *Dundee Advertiser*, have been given in my pamphlet of 1884. The well-remembered and respected Mr. William Thoms, Dean of Guild, was Chairman, and in his speech handing the

Testimonial did justice to the services of James Chalmers both as respects his acceleration of the mail and as originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, "the correspondence "connected with which he had seen." Mr. Thoms trusted that the Testimonial, however tardy an act of justice, would be acceptable, "the more so as he saw around him such an assemblage of the most respectable and "influential of his fellow-citizens." Provost Brown "had known Mr. Chalmers for nearly forty years," and with Mr. Milne, Banker, endorsed the remarks of the Chairman.

Mr. Chalmers died on the 26th August, 1853, while I was still abroad. Both Dundee papers contributed lengthy obituary notices recognising the services above named, the *Dundee Courier* stating "it was the opinion of many, "including Mr. Joseph Hume, that our townsman ought "to have obtained the reward." The *Dundee Advertiser* in its article says—"Had Mr. Chalmers been as fussy as "some others who now lay claim to great merit in con- "nection with the introduction of Penny Postage, perhaps "he, too, might have had his name more closely associated "with this important movement; but he was satisfied "with the consciousness of having done his duty, and with "the approbation of his fellow-citizens"; and in these words admirably hits off the characteristics respectively of the assumed and the real originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp.

The recognition of James Chalmers by the past generation of the Dundee community was, it is thus seen, hearty and complete. Not so, however, as respects the present generation; a late movement to obtain funds for the purpose of placing a marble bust of Chalmers in the Dundee Art Gallery having met with such poor support that, at my earnest desire, the generous promoters desisted from pressing the matter upon an unwilling or hostile public, and the subscriptions were returned. The banking, mill-spinning, and mercantile classes of the now *City* of Dundee would

Curiously enough, the same result took place when first the attempt was made to obtain funds for a memorial to Sir Rowland Hill in the City of London. Not over a hundred pounds were obtained, and Lord Mayor Sir Charles Whetham, 1879, returned the money to the subscribers.

have nothing to do with the matter; while a proposal brought forward in the City Council, of thirty members, to subscribe £5 to the bust fund was, after violent opposition, only carried by the casting vote of the Lord Provost.

The indifference thus manifested to the above-named proposal by the mercantile body in Dundee of the present generation was all the more remarkable, inasmuch as the Town Council had already of late years twice officially acknowledged the services of James Chalmers—first, by having passed the following resolution at their meeting of 1st March, 1883, and approved at their subsequent meeting of 5th April, as communicated to me by Mr. Hay, the Town Clerk, by letter of date the 9th April, 1883:—

"That having had under consideration the pamphlet lately "published on the subject of the Adhesive Stamp, the "Council are of opinion that it has been conclusively "shown that the late James Chalmers, bookseller, Dundee, "was the originator of this indispensable feature in the "success of the reformed Penny Postage scheme, and that "such be entered upon the Minutes."

The terms and correctness of the above resolution were shortly afterwards confirmed by the able and learned writers of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" after a special investigation initiated by Mr. Pearson Hill—likewise by the "Dictionary of National Biography,"—and subsequent to all these recognitions the remarkable piece of confirmatory testimony was found amongst the papers bequeathed to the South Kensington Museum Library by Sir Henry Cole, namely, the letter of Mr. Chalmers to Mr. Cole, already given, *page* 29 *ante*, adding indisputable evidence of his having been the first man to propose the adoption of the Adhesive Stamp for the purpose of carrying out the Penny Postage scheme.

The publication of this plan sent to Mr. Cole brought me the following important letter, with permission to publish same, from Mr. Leng, now one of the Members for Dundee in the House of Commons:—

"DUNDEE ADVERTISER OFFICE,
"DUNDEE, 22*nd January*, 1886.

"DEAR SIR,

"I heartily congratulate you on the success you have now achieved in establishing on irrefragable authority the claim of your father as the inventor of the Postage Stamp. Sir Henry Cole's papers bequeathed to the South Kensington Museum is decisive.

"If other editors could be induced to look at the evidence you have produced, as I have done, I believe they would not hesitate to award justice to the memory of your father.

"Should you ever visit Dundee, I trust you will not forget to call on

"Yours faithfully,
"(Signed) JOHN LENG.

"PATRICK CHALMERS, Esq.,
"Wimbledon."

Time and research ever adding to my evidence, a copy of Mr. Chalmers' letter containing his plan as sent to Mr. Cole and to Mr. Rowland Hill has now been also found in the *Montrose Review* of 23rd February, 1838—a year and a half *before* the Penny Postage Bill was brought forward!

MEMORIAL TO JAMES CHALMERS, AND DESECRATION OF HIS GRAVE.

In March, 1888, I made application to the Town Council of Dundee for permission to put in order my father's grave in the old "Howff" or cemetery of Dundee, now laid out as a place of public resort under the care and control of the Council; and, further, to erect a second headstone bearing an inscription in terms of the resolution of the Council of March 1st, 1883, already given, recording him as having been the Originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp. This permission having been granted, as officially intimated to me by Mr. Hay, the Town Clerk's letter of April 11th, considerable improvements were effected at the grave, and a

granite Memorial erected bearing the following inscription:—

To
The Memory
of
JAMES CHALMERS
Bookseller, Dundee.
Born 1782. Died 1853.
Originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp,
which saved the Penny Postage Scheme of 1840 from collapse,
rendering it an unqualified success, and which has since been adopted throughout the postal systems of the world.

This Memorial is Erected by his Son,
Patrick Chalmers, Wimbledon,
1888.

After many years of toil and contention against a popular delusion, I thus looked upon my task as closed. I had vindicated my father's services in the eyes of all impartial persons far and near who had cared to read the circumstances. I had brought home to our native land and locality the valuable heritage of which these had so long been deprived; and finally, by this Memorial, had completed the work which had lain to my hands.

But what followed? Shortly afterwards the revered spot was invaded by ruthless hands and despoiled of all of value that could be carried off and sold!* And in this wrecked and mutilated condition the Memorial remains—a monument of the indifference of the community of

* The brass chains encircling the grave, to the value of seven to eight pounds, the supports forcibly wrenched from the stone-work, were carried off and "sold to Mr.——— Brassfounder, ——— Street, Dundee, and at once put into the melting-pot."

Dundee to the memory of the man who saved and has carried out the Penny Postage Scheme—who was aided in that work by their predecessors of 1839, and honoured for that work by those of 1846, and in the official records of which now great city that work is acknowledged and "entered upon the Minutes." Such is the gratitude this great mercantile community displays to the memory of the townsman who, himself poor and unrewarded, thus confessedly gave them that boon without which, from their merchant princes downwards, they could not, even at this distance of time, carry on their business! Confessedly, not thus alone by their own acts and records, but by every paper in Forfarshire, and by numbers throughout the land, including Scotland's great literary and historical authority of world-wide influence and celebrity—an authority for these very reasons appealed to by my opponent himself. And what was the decision of this *Encyclopædia Britannica* after a long and impartial investigation? Just this: that "James Chalmers was the Inventor of the Adhesive "Postage Stamp in the month of August, 1834," and that "Mr. Pearson Hill has not weakened the evidence" to that effect—the *first* occasion, moreover, of the conception of an adhesive postage stamp in all history. Sympathising minds in this and other lands will learn with regret, and able pens, in many languages, will record with surprise, that the sole memorial to be found of James Chalmers in the scene of his labours or the land of his birth is—and this in "a place of public resort"—HIS DESECRATED GRAVE.

CONCLUSION.

While it is not now pretended by Mr. Pearson Hill and his friends that the Adhesive Postage Stamp was specially the *invention* of Sir Rowland Hill, I have clearly proved in the foregoing pages from the records of Parliament and

other sources, that the *adoption* of same for the purpose of carrying out in practice the Penny Postage scheme formed no part of his original proposals or intentions. And I have proved as clearly that James Chalmers proposed that plan to the proper authorities, and to Mr. Hill himself, a year and a half *before* the Penny Postage Bill was introduced into Parliament, such plan having been his own invention in 1834.

Let me here ask the reader's attention for a moment to that scene in the House of Commons on the 5th July, 1839, *page* 10–12 *ante*, and on the subsequent occasion in the House of Lords. Here was a Bill on which the nation had set its heart—the prospect of a uniform penny postage had been brought within measurable distance of completion, but yet wanted the motive power. Ministers and Members of the Legislature alike were at fault as to *how* to carry it out in practice, and the voice of the Opposition rose in jeering tones, "Why should we be called upon to pass this "Bill when no mortal being had the remotest conception "of how it was to be carried into execution?" Has not the man who solved that problem, who made that prospect a reality—yet himself unrewarded, neglected, and unknown —has not that man deserved well of his country?

Then what of the professed and reputed originator of all this—enriched in life, canonised in death—what does Sir Rowland Hill tell us of those memorable scenes, the struggle and crisis of the fight? What says he of them in that "History of Penny Postage," written by himself, for the information of his countrymen and posterity? Of the dilemma of the Government, the sneers of the Opposition, or the interposition of Mr. Wallace and Lord Ashburton, he tells us not a line, not a word—all totally ignored. And why? *Because to have breathed a whisper of these matters of* 1839 *would have been ignominiously to extinguish his pretensions to a* PRIOR *proposal of an adhesive stamp*, or of anything approaching to such a proposal. Long years were allowed to elapse before a "History" such as this was palmed upon the public—the facts would be forgotten

—no man would arise to question the statements or pretensions of one who had clenched that public so thoroughly in his grasp. That he may be looked upon as an originator where he was only an adapter or copyist at the dictation of others, reference to matters of the most vital interest in the history of this reform is wholly omitted. Statements in Parliament of the first importance, and essential to the right understanding of this history are left wholly unnoticed, thereby adding to his own brow unmerited laurels stripped from a helpless and deserving man. What was the use of Sir Rowland Hill's scheme, even had his proposals been original, if such could not be carried out in practice? "And is the man," writes the *City Press*, an authority second to none in London ("the adopted medium for all " official announcements concerning the Metropolis" and of the Corporation of the City of London), "Is the man " who, at a critical moment and unrewarded, supplied the " motive power to the Penny Postage scheme—a power to " this day indispensable to the commerce and revenues of " the world, to be left unmentioned, while every possible " occasion is availed of to laud the services of Sir Rowland " Hill?"

That is the question placed before the Press and the public now in this Jubilee year of the great postal reform of 1840; and it would be wrong to doubt that the name and services of James Chalmers will be brought still more prominently forward as the man who saved and has carried out that postal reform by having been the Originator of the still indispensable Adhesive Postage Stamp.

APPENDIX.

RECOGNITION OF JAMES CHALMERS AT HOME AND ABROAD.

In former publications I have already given copies of numerous articles and notices in recognition of James Chalmers as having been the originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, including thirty of the London Press, with a fairly numerous body of the Provincial and Scottish papers, headed by the "Encyclopædia Britannica" and the "Dictionary of National Biography." Special mention should also be made of the Glasgow Post Office Magazine, "The Queen's Head," containing an able article in recognition of Chalmers, nearly 5,000 copies of which were subscribed for by the *employés* of the various post-offices in the United Kingdom. This article has been favourably received, including reviews by Philatelic journals on the Continent and in the United States.

To now print in full the additional articles which have more lately been published, and continue to come forward, would extend this publication to quite a further 250 pages. For the present, consequently, I must content myself with a mere summary or indication of these valuable recognitions, first noticing those at home.

Former able supporters, such as the *City Press*, *Whitehall Review*, *Croydon Review*, *Metropolitan*, *Home and Colonial Mail*, *Sunday Times*, *Bric-a-Brac*, *Manchester Guardian*, *Brighouse Gazette*, *The Christian Leader* of Glasgow, and others, lose no opportunity of returning warmly to the subject. The *Whitehall Review* says: "As a matter of common justice and right, it only now remains for those who have so publicly recognised Sir Rowland Hill to now as publicly recognise and acknowledge James Chalmers."

Mr. Palmer, the well-known Philatelist and extensive dealer in stamps, of the Strand, and publisher of *Bric-a-brac*, has been

good enough to dedicate his Stamp Collector's Catalogue, issued to commemorate the Jubilee of the Postage Stamp, to myself as son of James Chalmers, the originator. Upon this the *City Press* observes:—

"The dedication to Patrick Chalmers of this Stamp Catalogue is a graceful tribute on the part of Mr. Palmer to a man who for years, despite rebuffs on all sides, has unwearingly asserted his father's right to be termed the originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp. Recognition of the claim by such an authority as Mr. Palmer is evidence that Mr. Chalmers' reiterated efforts are having their due effect on the minds of the public."

Well may these writers ask for discrimination in the Press when treating of the subject of Penny Postage Reform. No one denies the great services of Sir Rowland Hill, but in the indiscriminate panegyrics customary amongst modern writers it is overlooked that "originality of conception" formed no part of his merits or proposals, the official Treasury declaration to which effect I have already given (see *ante*, page 21), while the Sir Rowland Hill Mansion House Committee abandoned his pretensions to originality, as admitted by the change of inscription effected by them upon the City statue of Sir Rowland Hill, and by the correspondence betwixt myself and the Lord Mayor of 1882 (the Chairman) which has been published.* Further than this, the late Mr. Fawcett, H.M. Postmaster-General, in his remarks upon the occasion of unveiling the City statue, made no claim whatever to the effect that the uniform Penny Postage Scheme was in any particular an invention or conception on the part of Sir Rowland Hill, simply claiming him as the man to whom we are indebted for "*having introduced*" that scheme.

Another feature overlooked by many in now pointing to the large revenue derived from the Post Office is that of the heavy loss entailed by the introduction of Penny Postage during the first twenty-three years of the change. The old system previous to 1840 produced a net revenue of £1,634,000, and not until the retirement of Sir Rowland Hill in 1864 did the revenue recover itself to an equal amount, the comparative loss in the interval having amounted to £14,000,000 sterling.

The great publishing firm of Messrs. Trübner & Co., in a late circular, state: "Sir Rowland Hill has got a statue for his advocacy of cheap postage, although he had not the remotest idea of how it could be *successfully* carried out; but the intelligent Dundee bookseller, James Chalmers, who, by inventing the Adhesive Postage Stamp, rendered cheap postage possible, has had no such recognition;" going on to urge that some public memorial should be equally raised to the memory of Chalmers. Other great publishing circulars now to be claimed in recognition

* See "Concealment Unveiled: a Tale of the Mansion House."—Effingham Wilson & Co., Royal Exchange.

are—the *Publisher's Circular* (Messrs. Sampson, Low & Co.), the *Bookseller*, and the *Stationery Trades Journal*: with additional London papers, the *Boy's Own Paper*, *Home Work*, *Society Herald*, *Chit-Chat*, the *Star*. The *Leeds Times*, *Salford Chronicle*, *Wednesbury Herald*, *Huddersfield Daily Examiner*, *Belfast Morning News*, *Greenock Herald*, and that clever and popular monthly the Comus of Birmingham, may be added to former adherents. I am indebted to Mr. F. Graham Aylward, of Hereford, for valuable letters published by the *Hereford Times*, the *Reading Mercury*, and other papers. The *British Economist*, or *Scottish Bankers' Magazine*, of Edinburgh, has favoured me with the desired recognition; also *Black's Guide to Scotland*; and I have received the following letter from the Right Hon. Sir Thomas Clark, Bart., late Lord Provost of Edinburgh:—

"City Chambers, Edinburgh,
"*February 23rd*, 1888.

"Dear Sir,

"I have received the papers you have sent me regarding your father's claim to be the originator of the Adhesive Stamp.

"The evidence is very conclusive, and as one who used long ago to have constant relations with your father, I rejoice at your success in establishing his claim.

"I am,

"Very truly yours,

"(*Signed*) THOMAS CLARK,

"*Lord Provost of Edinburgh.*"

In Arbroath, the birthplace of James Chalmers, a volume of much interest and erudition, entitled "Arbroath, Past and Present," compiled by Mr. McBain, banker, Arbroath, has lately been published. In this work a biographical notice of James Chalmers is given, from which I extract the following:—

"To James Chalmers, a native of Arbroath, is due the distinguished honour of being the inventor of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, which was not only the means of saving the Penny Postage Scheme of this country, but of conferring a lasting benefit on the commerce of the world. . . . This honour for a time was claimed for Sir Rowland Hill, but thanks to the untiring exertions of his son, Patrick Chalmers, of London, James Chalmers' claim to the honour has been indisputably established, and is now universally admitted.* The benefit

Unfortunately, this is yet by no means the case, the *Times* and others of the leading London papers continuing wholly to ignore the services of James Chalmers. Of this, however, Scotchmen cannot well complain, as these papers might fairly retort, "Why should we admit our mistakes, seeing how indifferent Chalmers' own countrymen remain to the matter? Not one of your patriotic lords, or leaders, or merchant princes takes the smallest interest in the subject: the symbol of Scottish appreciation of Chalmers is his desecrated grave."

which have accrued from this invention are incalculable, and to-day every civilized nation is still reaping the fruit of the inventive genius of this distinguished Arbroathian."

In Dundee, in a late publication entitled "The Roll of Eminent Burgesses of Dundee, 1513 to 1886," "published by order of the Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council," edited by a distinguished writer there, Mr. A. H. Millar, and entailing much labour and research, a lengthened article is given detailing the career of James Chalmers, in the course of which his services are brought forward in terms similar to the Arbroath article. The resolution of the Dundee Town Council, of date 3rd March, 1883, formally recording their townsman to have been the originator of the Adhesive Stamp, "that indispensable feature in the success of the reformed Penny Postage Scheme," is here again brought forward, and the work is in the hands of many Scottish noblemen, wealthy merchants, and the public.

Something more than newspaper recognitions may now be recorded. In Wednesbury, Staffordshire, not far from Kidderminster, where a statue of Sir Rowland Hill has been erected, a paper was lately read by a literary gentleman, Mr. J. E. Ryder, at a meeting of the Springhead Mutual Improvement Society, entitled "A Monumental Mockery," alluding to the adjacent statue at Kidderminster. In this paper Mr. Ryder points out that Sir Rowland Hill invented nothing whatever, giving the prior sources from which he obtained the Penny Postage Scheme, and further recognising James Chalmers as the man to whom we owe the Adhesive Stamp, which saved and has carried out that scheme. "A discussion followed, and the evidence and arguments adduced in the paper were found to have resulted in convincing those present of the justice of the claims set forth. Votes of thanks to the essayist and chairman terminated the meeting."

Again, in the important town of Sheffield, Mr. G. R. Vine, a local *savant* and philatelist, has read a paper entitled "The Postage Stamp; or, the History of a Fascination," before the "Sheffield Literary and Philosophical Society," in which the services of James Chalmers are set forth, and "the honour, no mean one," of having been the originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp unhesitatingly ascribed to him. "The working out of a plan, based upon previous Parliamentary Reports, &c., of a low-priced postal rate is due in a general sense to Rowland Hill." Mr. Vine writes me: "When I delivered this paper there were present some old Sheffield Post Office reformers, notably the Brittains (one the late Mayor of Sheffield), Alderman Hobson, and others; but in the discussion which followed the delivery none of those present cared to dispute your claim." The well-known and influential paper, the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, has, some time ago, appeared in the list of my adherents.

I have already mentioned that four out of the five philatelic papers published in this country have recognised Chalmers. *The Stamp Collector's Gazette*, contains the following: "How about the 'Chalmers-Hill controversy?' I have had correspondence with both, and have read pamphlets on both sides, and I am of opinion that Mr. Chalmers has the best of it. When abuse steps in, and a man questions the sanity and honour of his adversary, I think one may safely give the other side the benefit of the doubt, if any. But there is no doubt in this case that Mr. P. Chalmers has made his case clear."

Coming now to the recognitions of James Chalmers abroad, it is mainly to the pursuit of Philatelism or postage stamp collecting that I am indebted for the warm interest which has been taken in the fresh light I have thrown upon the origin of the Adhesive Stamp. In the United States of America, and on the Continent of Europe, stamp collecting forms a large branch of business; this study is pursued to an extent quite unknown here, and Philatelic Societies flourish in abundance. Hitherto the name of Sir Rowland Hill alone has been recognised as the inventor of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, or of the Penny Postage scheme itself; but from the evidence now adduced by me, these impressions have been widely admitted as having been a mistake, and the origin of the stamp transferred to James Chalmers. Nor has this transfer been confined to the Philatelic world. Historical Societies, University and State Libraries, with members of the Press, having likewise admitted my claims.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

To the 13 Philatelic Societies in the United States already mentioned, I am now enabled to add several others which have formally recognised James Chalmers as the inventor of the stamp, the various designs of which in all countries of the world it is the special object of the Philatelist to collect, and the list is now as under:—

The Chicago Philatelic Society	...	Chicago, Illinois.
The Pomeroy ,, ,,	...	Toledo, Ohio.
The St. Louis ,, ,,	...	St. Louis, Missouri.
The Lansing ,, ,,	...	Lansing, Michigan.
The Newton ,, ,,	...	Newtonville, Massachusetts.
The Jamestown ,, ,,	...	Jamestown, New York.
The Charleston ,, ,,	...	Charleston, South Carolina.
The Black Hawk ,, ,,	...	Rock Island, Illinois.
The Belle City ,, ,,	...	Racine, Wisconsin.
The Luther ,, ,,	...	Luther, Michigan.
The Salem ,, ,,	...	Salem, Massachusetts.

The New Milford Philatelic Society	New Milford, Connecticut.
The Detroit ,, ,,	Detroit, Michigan.
The Minneapolis ,, ,,	Minneapolis, Minnesota.
The Rhode Island ,, ,,	Providence, Rhode Island.
The Fitchburg ,, ,,	Fitchburg, Massachusetts.
The Denver Stamp Collector's League	Denver, Colorado.
Clan Cameron, No. 7, O.S.C. ...	Providence, Rhode Island,
Grand Clan of Rhode Island, O.S.C.	Providence, Rhode Island.
The Pennsylvania Stamp Collectors' League	

Ten of the above Societies have been good enough to elect me an honorary member, and several of the Philatelic journals have published a biographical sketch of James Chalmers, with portrait.

But the Philatelists of the United States, in addition to their local societies have formed themselves into one grand united body, termed the American Philatelic Association. This Association meets once a year, attracting members and delegates from all parts of the Union to enjoy a fortnight's discussion in support of their favourite pursuit. At the meeting held in Chicago, in August, 1887, the following resolutions were passed, with one dissentient:—

"Secretary's Office,
"Grand Crossing, Ill.,
"*September* 12*th*, 1887.

"Mr. Pat. Chalmers, London.

"Dear Sir,

"It is my pleasant task to inform you that at the second Annual Convention of the American Philatelic Association, held in Chicago, Ill., on August 8th, 9th, and 10th, the following resolutions were adopted —

"'*Resolved;* That this Association, upon proof submitted by living witnesses, does endorse the claims made by Mr. Patrick Chalmers on behalf of his father, the late James Chalmers, as inventor of the Adhesive Stamp; and be it further—

"'*Resolved:* That the congratulations of this Association be extended to Mr. Patrick Chalmers for the success his untiring efforts have attained in establishing beyond doubt an important historical fact; and be it still further—

"'*Resolved:* That the Secretary be instructed to forward a copy of these resolutions to Mr. Patrick Chalmers, and have the same published in the official journal.'

"With deep personal regard, I beg to remain,

"Yours very truly,
"S. B. BRADT,
"*Secretary American Philatelic Association.*"

To which Mr. Bradt added in a further kindly letter :—

"Accept my profound congratulations on the ever-increasing strength you are adding to your cause, and my wishes for the speedy arrival of the time when its justice shall be universally conceded."

My Philadelphia friends will read the following with interest :—

"320s, 11TH STREET, PHILADELPHIA,
"18*th October*, 1888.

"DEAR SIR,

"Your kind favour duly to hand. I cannot understand the blindness of your adversaries for *res judicata est*, and any further opposition can be only from stupidity and obstinacy. I speak entirely without prejudice, and hope your filial efforts will be ultimately crowned with the fullest success,

"Very respectfully yours,
"HENRY PHILLIPS, JUN.

"Mr. PATRICK CHALMERS,
"Wimbledon."

Dr. Phillips is author of numerous historical and practical works on Currency, &c., and has followed this controversy for years.

Many letters to similar effect continue to reach me; but I now leave the United States and proceed to

PARIS.

Here the Société Internationale de Timbrologie, with branches at Moscow, Odessa, and Stockholm, has passed formal recognition in favour of James Chalmers as having been the originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, and has further been pleased to elect me an honorary member of the Society. The official journal of the Society, *L'Union des Timbrophiles*, having a circulation of 5,000 copies monthly, editor M. Nalés, has given a biographical sketch and portrait of James Chalmers, and has continued to publish matters of interest and progress on the subject as they arise.

The *Écho de la Timbrologie*, official journal of the Société Française de Timbrologie, published at Douai by Ed. Fremy Fils, has issued a series of articles in recognition of James Chalmers.

It is with no small satisfaction that I present the following letters from the headquarters of the French and Italian Post Offices :—

" RÉPUBLIQUE FRANCAISE.

" PARIS, *le* 13 *Avril*, 1889.

" MONSIEUR,

" J'ai reçu la brochure concernant la revendication des droits de feu James Chalmers, votre père, à l'invention du timbre-poste adhésif que vous avez bien voulu m'adresser avec votre lettre du 10 courant. Je l'ai lue avec beaucoup d'attention et intérêt et je l'ai déposé à titre de document historique parmi les collections de la bibliothèque de l'Administration à côté de vos autres publications que nous possédons déjà.

" Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, avec mes remerciements pour votre gracieux envoi, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

" P. Le Conseiller d'Etat,
" Directeur Général des Postes et des Télégraphes,
" Le Chef du Secrétariat,

" Monsieur PATRICK CHALMERS,
" 1, Mayfield Road, South Wimbledon, S.W.
" Angleterre.

" ROME, *le* 6 *Mai*, 1889.

" MONSIEUR,

" Par votre honorée lettre du 29 Avril dernier vous avez bien voulu me transmettre une brochure concernant la revendication des droits de feu James Chalmers, votre père, à l'invention du timbre-poste adhésif, et je vous offre pour votre obligeant envoi mes remercîments très empressés.

" J'ai lu avec intérêt cette brochure, qui éclaire un point important d'histoire postale, et je vais le déposer dans la Bibliothèque de cette Administration.

" Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, l'expression de ma parfaite considération.

" Le Ministre,
" LACAVA.

" À Monsieur PATRICK CHALMERS,
" 1, Mayfield Road, South Wimbledon, S.W.,
" London."

The recognition contained in the official journal of the Berlin Post Office will be found under the head "Berlin."

VIENNA.

Here I have been specially fortunate in having been favoured with the support of the keen Philatelist and able writer, Lieut.-Col. Charles Von Gündel, from whose pen has issued a translation, published in the *Postwertzeichen* of Munich,

of Mr. Macintyre's article in the *Glasgow Magazine*; likewise a sharp criticism in the *Philatelischen Borsen Courier*, of an article which lately appeared in the *Liverpool Daily Post*, in which article that eminent paper, while giving up Rowland Hill, could not recognise Chalmers who had never asserted himself or been before heard of. [This, it will be seen, is a mistake.] Col. Von Gündel has likewise contributed many articles in favour of James Chalmers to the German Philatelic journals, giving an account of the Penny Postal Reform and the services of Chalmers in having initiated the stamp which saved it. Von Gündel has further contributed to the *Wiener Briefmarken Zeitung* an able criticism of the late pamphlet of Mr. Pearson Hill, in which article the fallacies contained in that pamphlet are exposed, and the allegations dealt with *seriatim*, and effectually answered.

The same Vienna journal, Editor H. Koch, has published articles in recognition of Chalmers, who has, moreover, been recognised by the Austrian Philatelic Club of Vienna.

The *Welt Post*, conducted by Herr Sigmund Friedl proprietor of the extensive International Stamp Museum, Unter-Döbling, Vienna, has afforded me warm support, and has published a biographical sketch of James Chalmers, with portrait.

The Neues Wiener Tagblatt, in lately noticing the remarkable museum of Herr Friedl at Unter-Döbling, remarks :—

"Portraits, pamphlets, and similar matter, remind us that the Postage Stamp introduced in 1839 by Rowland Hill, of the English Post Office, is not considered as his creation, but as that of James Chalmers, a printer of Dundee. We see the first English stamp—a most wonderful sight! We need not be surprised did the Imperial German Postal Museum possess one, since there the Museum is maintained by the State, but the institution in Döbling owes its establishment to the exertions of a private individual."

BERLIN.

Here James Chalmers has been formally recognised by the Berlin Philatelic Club, and an article in two numbers, descriptive of his services, has appeared in the *Mittheilungen des Berliner Phil. Club*, the journal of the Society.

In *Der Sammler*, "organ der Berliner Briefmarken-Borse, and der Vereins der Briefmarken Sammler zu Berlin," published and edited by Dr. Brendicke, has appeared an excellent likeness and biographical notice of James Chalmers.

It is further with no small satisfaction that I present the following translation from the *Deutsche Verkehrs Zeitung*, or German Traffic Journal, "organ of the General Post Office and Telegraphic Affairs, and their officials," of Berlin, August 31st, 1888 :—

"Until a short time ago Sir Rowland Hill, the late British

Post Office Secretary, known through his reforms in Postal matters, has been looked upon as the inventor of the Adhesive Postage Stamp. However, lately, only through careful investigations, it has been ascertained that this service is due to the bookseller, James Chalmers, of Dundee, who died in 1853.

"Chalmers' carefully worked-out ideas and plans were laid before the British Treasury, and his system of the Adhesive Postage Stamp was adopted by Treasury Minute of the 26th of December, 1839. At this time Rowland Hill was an official of the British Treasury.

"On the 6th May, 1840, namely, forty-eight years ago, the first issue of Adhesive Postage Stamps appeared in England."

The article goes on to notice the periods at which other nations adopted "the indispensable invention of Chalmers, until such had been adopted by all the countries of the globe as time passed on."

The above article has been reproduced by such leading German papers as the *Frankfort Gazette*, and others. Same has appeared in the original German in the *Londoner Zeitung* circulating amongst the German community in this country.

LEIPZIG.

In this Philatelic stronghold my success has been very marked. In the first place, the *Illustrirtes Briefmarken Journal*, the organ of thirty-seven Philatelic Societies, published by Gebruders Senf, and having a bi-monthly circulation of 20,000 copies, has recognised and written about the services of James Chalmers in four articles continued in nine numbers of the issue. On the frontispiece of this important journal appears the head of James Chalmers in conjunction with that of Sir Rowland Hill.

Several articles, in six numbers, from the pen of Col. von Gündel, descriptive of the Penny Postage Reform and the services of James Chalmers have, with the sanction and assent of Dr. Moschkau, the editor, appeared in his journal, the *Illustrirte Briefmarken Zeitung*, the organ of several societies. I regret that space compels me for the present to withhold translations of these able contributions.

FRANKFORT.

Here the large and important Philatelic Society, the Verein für Briefmarken, Herr Albert Schindler, Secretary, has formally recognised James Chalmers; the *Illustrirte Frankfürter Briefmarken Zeitung Universum*, editor H. J. Dauth, has published throughout eight numbers a long article having reference to the services of Chalmers.

DRESDEN.

The *Deutsche Briefmarken Zeitung*, edited by Herr E. W. Grossman, Secretary to the Dresden Philatelic Verein (not the Internationaler Society), has published two articles in recognition of Chalmers.

MUNICH.

In the *Mittheilungen des Bayarischen Philatelisten Vereins*, the official journal of the large Bavarian Philatelic Society, Herr Anton Bachl, the Secretary, has produced two articles on the fresh light I have thrown as to the origin of the Adhesive Stamp. Other articles in recognition of Chalmers have appeared in *Das Postwerthzeichen*, editor Th. Hass.

MARISCH-OSTRAU.

The *Philatelischer Borsen-Courier*, editor Herr C. C. Sauer, has published three articles in support of my cause, including the criticism already mentioned under the heading of "Vienna," upon the article in the *Liverpool Daily Post*.

CZERNOWITZ-AUSTRIA.

The Czernowitz Philatelic Society *Orient* has formally recognised James Chalmers. To Herr Mittelmann, of this Society, my special thanks are due for much appreciated correspondence and warm support.

STOCKHOLM.

In the *Tedning für Frimerkamlare*, the editor, M. R. J. Bruzelins, has published an account of the services of James Chalmers as originator of the Adhesive Stamp, with portrait.

CONSTANTINOPLE.

An excellent Philatelic journal published here in the French language, *Le Timbre Levantin*, editor-in-chief, M. Hissard, has a wide circulation throughout the Levant and elsewhere. In this able paper lengthened articles have appeared in vindication of the services of James Chalmers; and to its editor and conductors, M. M. I. Tchakidji et C^{ie}, I am under great obligations.

LATER RECOGNITIONS.

Since the foregoing pages were in type some further recognitions of the highest value and importance read throughout the

entire German Philatelic world, comprising thousands of studious and intelligent men, have reached my hands. One of these is comprised in Schwanberger's, of Leipzig, Postage Stamp Collecting Book, or Album (awarded the first prize at the Amsterdam Convention), the tenth edition, for 1890, termed his Jubilee Edition. This work, price 18 marks, presents the likeness and autograph of James Chalmers, with a biographical notice of his services as originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp, written by Lieut.-Colonel Karl von Gündel, of Baden-Vienna. It is published at Leipzig by Ernest Heitman, publisher of Dr. Moschkau's journal, the *Illustrirte Briefmarken Zeitung*, and commands an extensive circulation.

Nor are these recognitions confined to the Philatelic Press, but extend to papers read by the public at large. The illustrated papers *Uber Land und Meer*, published at Stuttgart, and having wide circulation, and the *Neue Illustrirte Zeitung*, published at Vienna (papers holding a position on the Continent corresponding to our *Graphic* and *Illustrated London News* here), have each published a biographical notice in recognition of James Chalmers, with a well-executed likeness.

The *Zeitgist* (*Spirit of the Age*), Berlin, editor L. Horn, has published a long and able article on Postage Stamps, including such passages as the following:—"Adhesive Postage Stamps are, it is well known, an invention of modern times, and in May, 1890, it will be fifty years since their introduction in England. Gradually all other countries have followed suit. . . . . Up to only a very short time ago the late Sir Rowland Hill was generally regarded as the inventor; we now know that such is not the case. . . . . In the year 1834 James Chalmers, a printer of Dundee, who had already devoted much attention to postal matters, recommended their use, specimens of which he produced." A sketch of the introduction of penny postage in 1837 up to that of the Penny Postage Bill in July, 1839, is then given, "when absolute ignorance reigned as to how the scheme was to be carried out." Plans were invited, the Adhesive Stamp adopted, the merit of which Hill improperly took to himself. Upon his death "letters were published in the Dundee papers claiming the invention for James Chalmers, who died in 1853. The attention of his son, Patrick Chalmers, was thereby drawn to the matter, and he at once proceeded to follow it up; and notwithstanding the opposition of Pearson Hill, a son of Sir Rowland Hill, he succeeded so well in his efforts that at the present day no one has any doubt that his father, James Chalmers, was the inventor of Adhesive Postage Stamps. Thus with Chalmers' invention, which Hill so unscrupulously laid claim to, and with the work of Bacon & Petch, the engravers, the first step was accomplished. Continental improvements have been made ever since," with an account of which and of the mode of preparing stamps, the article concludes.

Another valuable addition to my list consists of an article extending to twenty columns in two numbers of the Leipzig journal, the *Illustrirte Briefmarken Zeitung*, already named, and entitled "Chalmers' Merits," written by Herr Franz Himmelbauer, a distinguished German Philatelist. This article consists of a learned exposition of the various plans or suggestions in the way of prepayment of postage which have existed in former times in several countries, and showing that all or any such were essentially different from the simple and effective invention of James Chalmers. We are told, "There is no better proof of Chalmers' merits, so long unrecognised, than the circumstance that his adversaries are still diligently engaged in seeking all possible opportunities of wresting from him the recognition which he has at last succeeded in obtaining. When it was no longer possible to maintain Hill's claims to having invented the Adhesive Postage Stamp on account of the satisfactory proofs in favour of Chalmers," then it was sought to show that Chalmers had been anticipated. But no such thing—such attempts have wholly failed—a critical and learned examination proves the plan of Chalmers, "this thinking, calculating, disinterested, patriotic postal reformer," to have been quite original, and in this confirming other learned writers on both sides of the Atlantic, including Sir Rowland Hill himself, who has left it on record that up to the year 1834 "adhesive postage stamps were undreamt of." "Adhesive stamps," writes Himmelbauer further, "constitute Chalmers' great invention, by which he has earned the thanks of posterity. Stamps are an historical monument in the culture of the world, and their inventor is therefore a man who merits the best thanks of the world of culture. . . . . Chalmers practically carried out the idea which no one had previously even expressed in words—this is his merit. He recognised the superiority of his letter-stamp over Hill's stamped wrappers and sheets of paper, as well as the great future awaiting his invention, and that constitutes his further merit." The mode of obliteration as shown in one of Chalmers' specimens by crossing same with the *quasi* Post Office mark, "Dundee, 10th February, 1838," and as suggested by him, "remains to the present day." The article concludes: "The Chalmers-Hill dispute may be regarded as having been decided in favour of the former. The most difficult task for the industrious investigator has been overcome. All that his adversaries can do is to adduce statements with a view to annoy him, which statements, however, can easily be disposed of. But they have had to be gone into, and the writer of this has therefore ventured by his modest endeavours to elucidate the questions referred to, and to add a notice of the obliteration, which was also Chalmers' idea. We should always separate adhesive stamps from wrappers or envelopes—the latter are a practical embodiment of an idea which is centuries old; the former an invention of James Chalmers, citizen of Dundee."—

The above article and that from the *Zeitgist* have likewise both appeared in full in the colums of *Philatelia*, published at Brunswick, a journal "devoted to the general interests of the science of stamps," and organ of the Society bearing that name domiciled at Brunswick, with a branch at Reval.

No better illustration of the inconsistency of Mr. Pearson Hill and his friends, of their incoherent attempts to disparage the work of James Chalmers could be asked than now to point to these articles, especially to that of Herr Himmelbauer, effectually disposing as they do of his opponent's latest move of pooh-poohing the value of the Adhesive Stamp as being after all only "a very minor detail," and no novelty whatever! And this in the face of the record of Sir Rowland Hill himself already quoted, and moreover after Mr. Pearson Hill had begun by telling us in his publication that "prior to Sir Rowland Hill's proposals in 1837 prepayment of postage would have been impossible and *any suggestion for stamps useless.*" That objection having been disposed of it is now sought to show that the Adhesive Postage Stamp is a very old affair indeed. Such contradictory and despairing attempts to underrate the services of Chalmers now that the Rowland Hill delusion can no longer be kept up, sufficiently answer themselves; and, did not much prejudice still exist, scarcely required Himmelbauer's learned article to scatter to the winds; while it is universally admitted by all other countries and their post-offices, as proved by the letters from Paris, Rome and Berlin I have given, that the Adhesive Stamp originated in our own.

A late copy of the *Wiener Briefmarken Zeitung* has just reached me, containing an able and important article by Lieut.-Col. Von Gündel in reply to some criticisms which have appeared in certain Philatelic papers by the friends and supporters of Sir Rowland Hill, "who, by the way, are rapidly decreasing in numbers." "In these," says Von Gündel, "we find nothing but empty, sophistic phrases, distractions, and perversions of the facts, spiced with offensive remarks; but we never meet with any proofs." He quotes an article from the *Philatelic Record*, of London, the chief supporter of Mr. Pearson Hill, yet containing the following important admission:—"It is stated therein as follows: 'Neither in the writings of Sir Rowland Hill, nor anywhere else, do we find the slightest proof that he (Hill) ever claimed to be the inventor of Penny Postage.'" Then it goes on to say: "We believe that Hill was the inventor of the Adhesive Postage Stamp just as little as that James Chalmers was." Von Gündel then pertinently asks: "Therefore, if even the opponents of Mr. James Chalmers have been compelled to admit in the most unmistakable language that Rowland Hill invented neither the Penny Postage nor the Adhesive Stamp, why do certain parties show such hostility that P. Chalmers on his part is compelled to say the same and to adduce proofs? The reasons

for such conduct are too transparent to require enumeration. Indeed, the writer evidently appears not to know the pamphlets of Mr. P. Chalmers at all, or if he may have read one or two of them, it can only have been in a very perfunctory manner; otherwise he would have found that they are written in a dignified tone, that they do not contain any offensive remarks, and that the true merits of Sir R. Hill are impartially recognised therein and appreciated. He would also have known the real reason why Mr. P. Chalmers did not come forward with his claims until after the death of Sir Rowland Hill."

It is thus seen that at last my opponents admit as respects Sir R. Hill precisely what I have been striving to prove; yet, so far from offering any explanation or apology for so tardy an admission, visit their displeasure upon my devoted head for having at length succeeded in dissipating this world-wide delusion of fifty years.

CONCLUSION.

It is thus seen, that *where attention has been given by any impartial mind* to this matter of national and historical interest, the result has been something like a unanimous verdict that James Chalmers was the originator of the Adhesive Postage Stamp. That my list of Continental recognitions does not include the entire Philatelic body is much owing, as I am informed by some of the heads of these societies, to the difference of language preventing their members at large from grasping the facts of the case so as to overcome long-cherished delusions. The same may be said with respect to many editors, literary men, and others here, too prejudiced even to *read* what has been published, with many important cases of which nature I am well acquainted.

Effingham Wilson & Co., Printers, Royal Exchange, E.C.