

THE PRESS, PUBLISHED WEEKLY (EXCEPTED) BY JOHN W. FORREY, OFFICE No. 111 NORTH THIRD STREET.

WHILE DAILY PRESS, OFFICE No. 111 NORTH THIRD STREET, is published for the proprietors at the City of Philadelphia, and is published for the proprietors at the City of Philadelphia, and is published for the proprietors at the City of Philadelphia.

THE PRESS, PUBLISHED WEEKLY (EXCEPTED) BY JOHN W. FORREY, OFFICE No. 111 NORTH THIRD STREET.

WHILE DAILY PRESS, OFFICE No. 111 NORTH THIRD STREET, is published for the proprietors at the City of Philadelphia, and is published for the proprietors at the City of Philadelphia, and is published for the proprietors at the City of Philadelphia.

THE PRESS

VOL. 7.—NO. 218.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1864.

THREE CENTS.

COMMISSION HOUSES.—
HORACE H. SOULE, 32 NORTH SECOND STREET.

RETAIL DRY GOODS.—
BLACK GROUND FRENCH ORANDY LAWNS, OF A CELEBRATED MANUFACTURE. In Brown, Blue, Green, and Purple Colours. At the very low price of 37 CENTS.

CURTAIN GOODS.—
SPRING DAMASCUS, VESTIBULE LACE CURTAINS, AND A LARGE INVOICE OF BROWN SHADES, OF ENTIRELY NEW DESIGNS.

NEW YORK CITY.—
The omnibus companies of this city have just ventured upon the dangerous experiment of raising the fares on the omnibus lines. It is not very probable that the people will accede to this extortionate demand; and it is to be hoped that the omnibus companies will be obliged to desist from this course.

CONCERNING PRINCES.—
Too rarely has a journalist the satisfaction of speaking well of deceased royalty. This particularly may be mentioned with respect to the money matters of princes and sovereigns. It is often to be regretted that the second held his first council after his father's death. Dr. Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, handed the late King's will to him, supposing, of course, that it would be opened and published, and in so doing, knowing that the document contained a bequest of \$300,000 to the Duchess of Kendal, a royal favorite, and more than double that amount to the Queen of Prussia, the testator's daughter. King George received the will, quietly put it into his pocket, and walked out of the room without saying a word. The Archbishop, who was named executor in the will, wanted either courage or presence of mind to demand that the document should be published or registered, and no one else liked to mention it. The King never referred to it, but alienly took possession of the large personal property and accumulated debts of his royal predecessor, but public rumor stated that the will was burnt. The Archbishop made no secret of its provisions, with which he was well acquainted. Frederick the Great repeatedly expressed his indignation at the bequest to his brother, King George III., who had married the Countess of Walingham, niece to the Duchess of Kendal, instituted or threatened a suit for the recovery of the legacy by his wife's estate, and it is stated that he paid \$100,000 to the King, and the money, by way of compromise. In ordinary life, a man who has burnt his father's will that he might take possession of his father's property, would be a felon, in the eye of the law. In the case of King George III., the bequest was not a punishment for it.

George III., albeit a man who dined five days out of seven on a shoulder of mutton, and neither liked nor understood the more expensive practices, so much "outraged the conscience," at various times, that Parliament granted payment of his debts to the amount of \$15,000,000 in all. His predecessor, King George II., had not more than \$500,000 before he was twenty-one year old, and had added \$300,000 to his debts by the time he was twenty-four. Parliament paid the money, out of the pockets of the people. King George III., on the other hand, had \$500,000 before he was twenty-one year old, and had added \$300,000 to his debts by the time he was twenty-four. Parliament paid the money, out of the pockets of the people.

THE PRESS

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1864.

CONCERNING PRINCES.—
Too rarely has a journalist the satisfaction of speaking well of deceased royalty. This particularly may be mentioned with respect to the money matters of princes and sovereigns. It is often to be regretted that the second held his first council after his father's death. Dr. Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, handed the late King's will to him, supposing, of course, that it would be opened and published, and in so doing, knowing that the document contained a bequest of \$300,000 to the Duchess of Kendal, a royal favorite, and more than double that amount to the Queen of Prussia, the testator's daughter. King George received the will, quietly put it into his pocket, and walked out of the room without saying a word. The Archbishop, who was named executor in the will, wanted either courage or presence of mind to demand that the document should be published or registered, and no one else liked to mention it. The King never referred to it, but alienly took possession of the large personal property and accumulated debts of his royal predecessor, but public rumor stated that the will was burnt. The Archbishop made no secret of its provisions, with which he was well acquainted. Frederick the Great repeatedly expressed his indignation at the bequest to his brother, King George III., who had married the Countess of Walingham, niece to the Duchess of Kendal, instituted or threatened a suit for the recovery of the legacy by his wife's estate, and it is stated that he paid \$100,000 to the King, and the money, by way of compromise. In ordinary life, a man who has burnt his father's will that he might take possession of his father's property, would be a felon, in the eye of the law. In the case of King George III., the bequest was not a punishment for it.

George III., albeit a man who dined five days out of seven on a shoulder of mutton, and neither liked nor understood the more expensive practices, so much "outraged the conscience," at various times, that Parliament granted payment of his debts to the amount of \$15,000,000 in all. His predecessor, King George II., had not more than \$500,000 before he was twenty-one year old, and had added \$300,000 to his debts by the time he was twenty-four. Parliament paid the money, out of the pockets of the people. King George III., on the other hand, had \$500,000 before he was twenty-one year old, and had added \$300,000 to his debts by the time he was twenty-four. Parliament paid the money, out of the pockets of the people.

THE PRESS

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1864.

CONCERNING PRINCES.—
Too rarely has a journalist the satisfaction of speaking well of deceased royalty. This particularly may be mentioned with respect to the money matters of princes and sovereigns. It is often to be regretted that the second held his first council after his father's death. Dr. Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, handed the late King's will to him, supposing, of course, that it would be opened and published, and in so doing, knowing that the document contained a bequest of \$300,000 to the Duchess of Kendal, a royal favorite, and more than double that amount to the Queen of Prussia, the testator's daughter. King George received the will, quietly put it into his pocket, and walked out of the room without saying a word. The Archbishop, who was named executor in the will, wanted either courage or presence of mind to demand that the document should be published or registered, and no one else liked to mention it. The King never referred to it, but alienly took possession of the large personal property and accumulated debts of his royal predecessor, but public rumor stated that the will was burnt. The Archbishop made no secret of its provisions, with which he was well acquainted. Frederick the Great repeatedly expressed his indignation at the bequest to his brother, King George III., who had married the Countess of Walingham, niece to the Duchess of Kendal, instituted or threatened a suit for the recovery of the legacy by his wife's estate, and it is stated that he paid \$100,000 to the King, and the money, by way of compromise. In ordinary life, a man who has burnt his father's will that he might take possession of his father's property, would be a felon, in the eye of the law. In the case of King George III., the bequest was not a punishment for it.

George III., albeit a man who dined five days out of seven on a shoulder of mutton, and neither liked nor understood the more expensive practices, so much "outraged the conscience," at various times, that Parliament granted payment of his debts to the amount of \$15,000,000 in all. His predecessor, King George II., had not more than \$500,000 before he was twenty-one year old, and had added \$300,000 to his debts by the time he was twenty-four. Parliament paid the money, out of the pockets of the people. King George III., on the other hand, had \$500,000 before he was twenty-one year old, and had added \$300,000 to his debts by the time he was twenty-four. Parliament paid the money, out of the pockets of the people.

THE PRESS

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1864.

CONCERNING PRINCES.—
Too rarely has a journalist the satisfaction of speaking well of deceased royalty. This particularly may be mentioned with respect to the money matters of princes and sovereigns. It is often to be regretted that the second held his first council after his father's death. Dr. Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, handed the late King's will to him, supposing, of course, that it would be opened and published, and in so doing, knowing that the document contained a bequest of \$300,000 to the Duchess of Kendal, a royal favorite, and more than double that amount to the Queen of Prussia, the testator's daughter. King George received the will, quietly put it into his pocket, and walked out of the room without saying a word. The Archbishop, who was named executor in the will, wanted either courage or presence of mind to demand that the document should be published or registered, and no one else liked to mention it. The King never referred to it, but alienly took possession of the large personal property and accumulated debts of his royal predecessor, but public rumor stated that the will was burnt. The Archbishop made no secret of its provisions, with which he was well acquainted. Frederick the Great repeatedly expressed his indignation at the bequest to his brother, King George III., who had married the Countess of Walingham, niece to the Duchess of Kendal, instituted or threatened a suit for the recovery of the legacy by his wife's estate, and it is stated that he paid \$100,000 to the King, and the money, by way of compromise. In ordinary life, a man who has burnt his father's will that he might take possession of his father's property, would be a felon, in the eye of the law. In the case of King George III., the bequest was not a punishment for it.

George III., albeit a man who dined five days out of seven on a shoulder of mutton, and neither liked nor understood the more expensive practices, so much "outraged the conscience," at various times, that Parliament granted payment of his debts to the amount of \$15,000,000 in all. His predecessor, King George II., had not more than \$500,000 before he was twenty-one year old, and had added \$300,000 to his debts by the time he was twenty-four. Parliament paid the money, out of the pockets of the people. King George III., on the other hand, had \$500,000 before he was twenty-one year old, and had added \$300,000 to his debts by the time he was twenty-four. Parliament paid the money, out of the pockets of the people.