THE NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE,
DUFOUR & LIMET, PUBLISHERS.
Office, No. 73 Chartres Street.

TERMS OF THE BEE:
Rates of Subscription—Daily, per annum, in advance, $10; half-yearly, $6; quarterly, $4.
Price of the Paper—Single copies, 10 cents.
The Semi-Weekly is published every Tuesday and Saturday. Subscription, $5 per annum, invariably in advance.
Rates of Advertising—Transient advertisements having the run of the paper, first insertion $1 50 per square; each subsequent insertion, 75 cents per square.
First, or Editorial Page Transient Advertisements, each insertion, $1 50 per square.
Advertisements inserted at intervals, to be charged as new each insertion.
First or Editorial Page, Monthly Advertisements, each square, $30 per month.
Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, shall be allowed such discount from the above inserted transient rates as may be agreed upon. In no case shall such discount exceed 33 per cent.
All business Notices of Advertisements to be charged 25 cents per line, each insertion.
All bills with regular advertisers must be paid for in advance.
All bills with regular advertisers shall be rendered monthly.

NEW ORLEANS:
MONDAY MORNING, NOV. 12, 1866.

PITTSBURG COAL.—It will be seen by an advertisement elsewhere, that the best quality of Pittsburg coal will be delivered in all parts of the city at the cost of one dollar per barrel, free of cartage, by W. G. Coyle & Co., who have also on hand English cannel and egg size anthracite, at low rates.

DOLBEAR COMMERCIAL COLLEGE.—In another column will be found the advertisement of Mr. Rufus Dolbear, President of this useful and popular institution, which was founded as far back as 1832, under the most disadvantageous circumstances, and in the face of great prejudice against strictly Commercial Colleges, has, through the enterprise of Mr. Dolbear, become something more than a specialty, and by reason of its increased branches of instruction it may now be regarded as ranking among the best institutions in the country.

Mr. Dolbear, if we mistake not, is the originator of the idea of a practical Commercial College, and the extent to which such institutions have been established throughout the country, goes to prove the success and usefulness of the system. The College which is situated at the corner of Camp and Common streets, is amply provided with teachers and with room to accommodate a thousand pupils.

THE COMMERCIAL NEWS ROOMS.—The Committee on organization to draft a Constitution and by-laws for the "Merchants High Change," proposed to be organized at the News Rooms, will meet there this evening, at 7 o'clock. The report of the committee will be presented for ratification by the subscribers and others desirous of co-operating in the proceedings.

THE PRESIDENT, THE PEOPLE, AND THE RADICALS.

The New York *Times* asserts that "the dominant sentiment of the country differs at this time more widely than ever from the position of the people." It points to the late elections as proving this assertion beyond dispute. In view of the fact, as alleged by the *Times*, that the verdict of the people has gone in favor of Congress, after the President "has taken his last appeal" to their decision, this journal advises that he pursue the only course which is open to "a discreet Executive when he unfortunately finds his policy to be absolutely determined upon by the Legislature." The course thus recommended is "to voluntarily conform his policy as nearly as possible to that of the latter—to give way voluntarily as far as he can, and by every means to try and reconcile differences and settle in a pacific and republican manner the conflicting ideas and measures which are for the time being before the country."

The New York *Times* seems to outstrip even Wendell Phillips in some of its notions of the organization of the Federal Government and of the relations to each other of its various departments. Phillips *regretted* that Congress could not, under the letter and in the spirit of the Constitution, compel the President to a full and unqualified acceptance of its views, as the English Parliament can compel the Ministry to a like course. But the *Times* leaves no room for a regret of this nature by virtually conceding to Congress the power above indicated. The President, it holds, is under moral, logical, and political compulsion, the element the constituency of the present Congress has indorsed its opposition to his policy, to relinquish the further assertion of his own views and to adopt, as nearly as possible, its policy—whatever it may be—in preference to his own. This position would be irrefutable if the *Times* were an English journal and were discussing a case in which a Ministry came to issue with the Parliament which it was created to represent. The Ministry may appeal to the constituency of Parliament, and if the result is adverse, it must succumb, according to the unquestioned traditions and requirements of the British Constitution.

But the President is not the creature of Congress and the designed reflection of Congressional will, nor does the Constitution make him amenable to the constituency of Congress. According to that instrument, he is President of the United States, chosen by State Electors and not by a direct vote of the people, and there is no power which can, during his term of office bring him to account for any official act which he may perform for any Executive Policy which he may maintain, except one—the United States Senate, organized as a court of impeachment presided over by the Chief Justice of the United States. The Constitution specifies, as the offences for which the President is impeachable, "treason, bribery, or other high crime or misdemeanor." Now, if President Johnson, as contended by the *Times*, is urged by great state necessities, in view of the indorsement of Congress by the constituency of Congress, to abandon the position which he has heretofore, held he can only be thus imperiously urged under grief of Congressional displeasure manifested in the form of impeachment; and hence, according to the logic of the *Times*, it must be an impeachable offence, coming under the head of treason, or other high crime or misdemeanor, for the President to persist in differing with Congress on questions of policy which may cause under the consideration of both the Legislature and Executive Departments.

The predominance and the enforcement of such a theory would, of course, practically obliterate the Presidential office. The President would be only Congress developed in executive form.

It seems to us also that the New York *Times* is adrift as far astray in its statement regarding President Johnson's "last appeal to the people" as in its theory of Presidential responsibility and compulsion. Remarking on this "last appeal," it says:

He has labored with Congress, and has taken his last appeal—the last appeal he can take—to the people. The decision has upon all hands been adverse to him. The people have given their support to Congress and its policy against the President and his policy. President Johnson has a thousand times expressed his confidence in the people, his faith in their judgment, and his willingness to abide by their decision. On a hundred occasions he has said, "The people are always right." It can, therefore, be no violence to his principles or his character to listen to their voice and obey it. He held out against Congress last session, because he believed the people were with him. He held on in his course through the summer, because he saw no sufficient reason to change it. He held on after the earlier elections in the fall, because he believed the later and more important ones would result in his favor. But after he has heard from the Eastern, Western and Central States—after he hears from New York and New Jersey and Illinois and the other States that utter his mouth, he can have no shadow of doubt as to the popular will; and he will only justify his record in voluntarily recognizing that. It is not the Executive but the people whose right it is to rule.

But has President Johnson made any appeal to the whole people of whom he claims to be President? He has, in truth, in official form and by Constitutional requirement or sanction, made no appeal whatever. His relations to Congress are not in the least changed, as respects Executive authority on the one hand and Legislative rights on the other hand. The present Congress would not be constitutionally bound by opinions represented by the members at the next Congress chosen in late elections. But it will doubtless be strongly disposed to respect those opinions from the fact that its own constituency was almost identical with that of the succeeding Congress. If Congress is not constitutionally bound in this case, the President is not for a stronger reason. For he was not chosen by popular constituencies, and he does not, like a Member or a Representative in Congress, represent a single State or a single district. He was chosen by an Electoral College acting jointly for all the States then voting for President; and, coming by constitutional succession into office, he holds, according to the only theory which is consistent alike with the supremacy of the Constitution and the indestructibility of the Union, that, if President at all, he is President of all the States of the Union—that is to say, of the United States. In this position it does not appear that he has made an appeal to *his* proper constituency or that its verdict has gone against him. Supposing him to make an appeal to the whole people comprised within the sphere of his Presidential functions and Representative office, it is by no means clear that he would not have a much larger majority in his favor than Congress now claims for itself. In fact, it is unquestionable that, on counting the votes of the people in the unrepresented States—nearly certain in case of an election to be for the President—with the anti-Radical and anti-Congressional votes in the North, the result would be an endorsement of the policy of the President and the disapproval of that of Congress. If this be so, the President will feel impelled, by the very principles and declarations regarding respect and obedience to the popular will, which the New York *Times* urges him to illustrate, to still stand out against Congress and to insist on recognizing that it is not the Executive or Congress but the whole people whose right it is to rule.

DOUBLE MURDER.—A double murder occurred on the night of the 3d inst. at Coldwater, Mich. Mr. Ebenezer Leach met his wife walking with George Brown, a lawyer, (not that you can't deal. Crim. Law, lawyer, but that you can't deal. Crim. Lawyer,) and shot them both dead. Crim. Lawyer, has sandy H. H. Hayes & co—20 do. C. Harris—100 bbls apples—75 W. Pat Hunter & co—50 do. Freeman & Wilson—50 bbls potatoes—C. Lanman—174 bbls apples—25 cases poultry P. O. Reily—20 bbls cranberries—6 bbls apples—100 bbls and 50 sks potatoes O. Richardson—111 bbls do—P. C. Bahon—20 bbls apples to Oliver, Waite & co—5 cases honey P. O. Reily—20 bbls cranberries—10 bbls apples—1 case—1 Wake bean B. Foster—48 bunches grapes G. Peake—1 do Fleming—2 crates cabbage to M. Dreyfous & co—1 case kegs and 6 do land P. S. Dalbourg—1 do—1 case lard—1 do—poultry 8 kegs sweet potatoes—1 do—1 bbl sheep Vernon—Miller & Meyer—20 sks shorts Hotzell Smyth & co—32 bbls potatoes—3 crates cabbage N. Jergen—10 bbls do—11 sacks potatoes—5 do—1 bbl beans—1 bbl do—1 bbl do—8 pkgs mdse A. W. Mumford—2 do—A. Wessels—11 boxes O. N. Cook—1 do—1 keger J. N. Nolle & co—12 plows Stark, Mendell & co—15 bales hay—1 O. Harker—2 do—1 do—1 do—1 do—1 do—1 bale—1 crate M. W. Smith—20 cases pickles Chenworth Case & Co—4 do—poultry—1 crate—50 sks bran—1 do—wax—potatoes, etc. etc. Total—1,000 bbls apples—17 bbls potatoes—50 sks do—50 sks bran—11 crates cabbage and sundries for coastwise—30 sacks Hotzell Smyth & co—32 bbls potatoes—3 crates cabbage—N. Jergen—10 bbls do—11 sacks potatoes—5 do—1 bbl beans—1 bbl do—1 bbl do—8 pkgs mdse—