

## MEMORANDUM.

---

In his printed reply to the Dundee Burns Club, dated June 1888, amongst a host of other mis-statements, Mr. P. Chalmers repeats one so deliberate that it cannot possibly be the result either of accident or ignorance. This mis-statement when first put forward by him four years ago was so thoroughly exposed in a leading article in the *Postal, Telegraphic, and Telephonic Gazette* that a perusal of that article will, I think, convince most people—if any still require conviction—of the impossibility of placing any reliance on anything Mr. P. Chalmers says, so long, at least, as he avoids being obliged to make his statements on oath. The following is a reprint of that portion of the article in question which bears upon this matter. Mr. Chalmers, I should add, is perfectly aware of this contradiction, to which, at the time, he attempted a very lame answer.

*From the POSTAL, TELEGRAPHIC, AND TELEPHONIC GAZETTE,  
14th March 1884.*

But perhaps the most lamentable instance in which Mr. Chalmers indulges in the *suppressio veri* is where he quotes, as conclusive evidence of his charges against Sir Rowland Hill, the paragraph from the Treasury Minute of 11 March 1864, in which a passing allusion is made by "My Lords" to such honour as "may be due to those who, before the development of the plans of Sir Rowland Hill, urged the adoption of Uniform Penny Postage." The highly complimentary minute on Sir Rowland Hill's retirement, in which this passage occurs, our readers will find quoted at full length in the "Life of Sir R. Hill," Vol. II., p. 391,\* and they will see that a note is appended to this very passage showing that the statement was at once challenged and disproved by Sir Rowland Hill; that the Treasury in reply admitted the correction, and stated that they had had no intention of questioning his originality. Mr. Patrick Chalmers' letters and pamphlets prove that he has read this book. His suppression of the above fact, which shows that the statement he quotes as an authoritative decision in his favour was a mere clerical error, immediately corrected and admitted, can therefore hardly have been accidental.

Surely every fresh utterance of Mr. Patrick Chalmers only makes the case blacker than ever against himself.

PEARSON HILL.

26 June 1888.

---

\* See also "The Post Office of Fifty Years Ago," p. 32.

Grouford 1116(11)

# THE ORIGIN OF POSTAGE STAMPS.

## THE CHALMERS CRAZE.

Hill (Pearson)



### Memorandum.

The following correspondence which has recently passed between the Lord Mayor of London (through his private Secretary) and myself, sufficiently disposes of the latest development of the Chalmers craze.—PEARSON HILL, 30th March, 1889.

.....

THE MANSION HOUSE,

LONDON, E.C.,

February 11th, 1889.

DEAR MR. HILL,

The LORD MAYOR desires me to send you the enclosed letter and pamphlet, which he has received from Mr. Patrick Chalmers. I am to say that his Lordship ceased long ago to regard Mr Chalmers's communications as worthy of the slightest notice.

Yours very faithfully,

W. J. SOULSBY.

PEARSON HILL, ESQ.

.....

6, PEMBRIDGE SQUARE, W.,

February 13th, 1889.

DEAR MR. SOULSBY,

Pray convey to the LORD MAYOR my thanks for having been at the trouble to send me Mr. Patrick Chalmers's latest effusion on Postage Stamps.

No person who has ever taken pains to test Mr. P. Chalmers's statements will, I think, disagree with his Lordship in placing upon them a purely negative value.

As regards the false and cowardly attacks upon the memory of my father, the late Sir Rowland Hill, which for the last eight years Mr. Patrick Chalmers has manufactured and circulated, I

am, as you know, powerless to prevent them. In this country the law of libel affords no protection to the memory of the dead, and anyone who finds he can make a few pence by fabricating and publishing slanders on a dead man's reputation, can do so without incurring any other penalty than public contempt.

But while I am thus without legal remedy, no such difficulty, I have often pointed out, stands in the way of Mr. P. Chalmers as regards the very serious charges I have over and over again brought against him. I have some eight or ten times publicly charged him with mutilating letters, with falsifying dates, and with giving pretended quotations from official and other documents, ~~where~~ quotations he has distorted from their meaning by the omission in some cases of essential portions, or by the insertion in others of words not to be found in the original. Twice over I have publicly dared him to bring an action for libel if my accusations were in the slightest degree untrue, pointing out that if he were innocent he would inevitably obtain from me his legal costs and the heaviest pecuniary damages, while at the same time he would get what to any honest claimant in his position would be even more acceptable, viz.: the finest possible opportunity of bringing his father's claims before a tribunal where every statement for or against him would be given on oath, and be subjected to the severest cross-examination.

This challenge he has never ventured to take up, but he prefers to retaliate for these exposures of his proceedings by reiterating his false, but legally safe, slanders against my father's memory. Surely the mere statement of these facts should be sufficient to enable everyone to estimate Mr. P. Chalmers's assertions at their proper (negative) value.

I hardly ever trouble myself now to read any of Mr. P. Chalmers's productions, but have looked through the pamphlet the LORD MAYOR was good enough to send. It is as unscrupulous as any of its many predecessors, and may be taken as a sample of the nonsense Mr. P. Chalmers constantly puts forward as "fresh and most valuable" proofs of statements which he knows to be untrue.

Suppressing all reference to the fact (which he well knows) that Sir Rowland Hill, in his pamphlet and evidence of February, 1837, proposed, among other minor details of his plan of Postal Reform, the use of adhesive postage stamps, he quotes, or professes to quote, a notice of Sir Rowland Hill's plan in the *Athenæum* in 1838, in which Mr. John Francis, the editor, referred to the proposed use of stamped covers for prepayment of postage, but did not happen also to mention that *adhesive* stamps were likewise suggested. This newspaper paragraph Mr. P. Chalmers now puts forward as a "fresh and most valuable contribution in proof" of his (Chalmers's) contention that the use of adhesive postage stamps "formed no part of the proposals or intentions of Sir Rowland Hill"!! Would any sane person accept a description of Sir Rowland Hill's plan by *someone else*, as better evidence of what that plan was than that furnished by Sir Rowland Hill's own pamphlet?

I will not waste your time by dealing with the other misrepresentations, new or old, which Mr. P. Chalmers's present production contains. He seems on this question to be a monomaniac; and the public probably care as little now-a-days who first suggested penny stamps as they do who first suggested penny whistles, but if by any chance the subject interests you, you will find a full explanation of the real facts connected with their introduction in a little pamphlet on "The Origin of Postage Stamps," published by Messrs. Morrison and Mallett, of 68, Leadenhall street, which, at the request of some friends, I issued a few months ago.

That any person should have been taken in by the so-called "evidence" which Mr. P. Chalmers has from time to time put forward, is simply astonishing, but the fact may at all events be accepted as "a fresh and most valuable contribution in proof" of the contention that Board schools were not established a single day before they were needed.

Yours very truly,

PEARSON HILL.

W. J. SOULSBY, Esq.,

*Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor of London.*