THE NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE,
PUBLISHED DAILY (SUNDAYS EXCEPTED) AT
No. 73 Chartres Street.
NEW ORLEANS:
MONDAY MORNING, APRIL 2 1866

RATES OF ADVERTISING:

Spaces	1 day	2 days	3 days	1 week	2 weeks	1 month
1	$1 00	$1 50	$2 00	$3 00	$4 00	$6 00
2	1 50	2 00	2 50	4 00	6 00	8 00
3	2 00	2 50	3 00	5 00	7 00	10 00
4	2 50	3 00	3 50	6 00	8 00	12 00
5	3 00	3 50	4 00	7 00	9 00	14 00
6	3 50	4 00	4 50	8 00	10 00	16 00
7	4 00	4 50	5 00	9 00	11 00	18 00
8	4 50	5 00	5 50	10 00	12 00	20 00

Monthly advertisements, inserted every other day, by the square, $10 per month.

Plain or Editorial Monthly Page Advertisements each square, $20 per month.

Quotations Advertisements (giving the run of the paper), fifteen lines, $1 00 per square; each subsequent insertion, $1 00 per square.

Plain or Editorial Page Prominent Advertisements, each insertion $1 00 per square.

Advertisements inserted at intervals, to be charged as successive insertions.

Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, shall be allowed such discount from above rates, as may be agreed upon; provided, that in no case shall such discount exceed 25 per cent.

All business Notices of Advertisements to be charged 5 cents a line for each insertion.

All bills with regular advertisers shall be rendered monthly.

The Sheriff sells at auction this day, at 5 o'clock, P. M., at No. 323 Olivier street, First District, the fixtures and of the Levee Steam Cotton Press, Third District, twenty five bales and half bales of cotton.

See advertisement.

JOCKEY CLUB RACES.—As appears by the programme elsewhere, the Jockey Club race will be inaugurated at the Fair Grounds on Thursday next. The track, we understand, is in fine condition, and the buildings and general accommodations for visitors are duly prepared for the occasion; to which add the presence of a number of worthy contenders, the reputation of the Club, the character of its officers, the spring weather, the adaptive scenery, the opportunities afforded for pleasant excursions beyond the bounds of city pent air and various other considerations, and there would seem to be every assurance that the six days' races will prove a sporting term eminently brilliant and enjoyable.

AMUSEMENTS.

ST. CHARLES THEATRE.—Lively little Lotta enters this evening upon the second week of her engagement, and appears again in the "Seven Daughters of Eaton." If we may judge from her success last week, she has every reason to anticipate crowded and brilliant audiences during the present week.

VARIETIES THEATRE.—Manager Floyd makes in the Easter holidays by the reposition of "Sam." A large number of persons, now that Lent is over, will doubtless make him a call. Should they do so, they may be sure of passing a pleasant time. Sam is hospitable and keeps "open house."

ACADEMY OF MUSIC.—To-night in addition to a profusion of specialities in opera, concert, ballet, theatre and circus, there will be received the great military and local pantomime of "the Refugee," which was so successful upon its first representation last winter. Her member, of course, is in it.

INEVITABLE DISRUPTION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

The New York Times has devoted itself mainly since the open rupture between the Republican and Democratic majority in Congress, to the painful task of proving that the Republican organization is unshaken and indivisible, that there is no material discord in its ranks or unconquerable hostility of the President to its principal leaders, and that all true loyalty and true Unionism were comprised in the principles and principal measures enrolled in that organization, while disloyal, treasonable and rebellious spirit instinctively attached themselves to the ranks of the Democrats and Copperheads. In this work it has had every day to make violent applications of names to things. The incompatibility between the words and the facts thus described, was frequently enough to make the very types cry out against the outrage upon reason and congruity which they were employed to perpetrate. The plan of the Times was to call by the name of "Union" the party of which Sumner and Stevens are the shining lights in Congress, and which is its various local representatives has nearly invariably in demed them leaders in their bitter war upon the President, and to characterise as disloyal the Democratic party in general and every Democratic ticket. With what seemingness it could do this may appear, when we remember that at the same time it professed an unqualified approval of the President, not only in respect to his general course, but in respect to the particular language in which he denounced Sumner, Stevens, and their co-laborers, as disunion and revolutionary in their principles and aims, and dangerous to the peace of the country and constitutional government. Yet the party claimed by the Times to be the only "Union" party, is represented by those disunion leaders. On the other hand, since the Democratic party has everywhere declared in favor of the President's policy, the same journal confessed that the only party which supports the President, as unqualifedly as it professes to support him, is one which it stigmatizes as disloyal.

More recently, however, the Times seems to have been brought home to Connecticut and vexed to a perception of the absurdity and embarrassment of its position. It calls that convention a "meddle" because the candidate of the "Union" party there is openly opposed to the President and friendly to his "disunion" enemies, Stevens, Sumner and the rest, whereas the candidate of the Democratic party is a loyal representative of the platform of his party and an earnest friend of the President. The Times describes the situation thus:

It is evident that Hawley, an Abolitionist, as the Tribune says, hides the rebellion, is a bad tool indeed. But he is the nominee of our Democratic friends, and was earnestly hoped for by them, even against Col. English, himself a loyal man, but the representative of a disloyal party. We have more confidence in the principles of the Union Party of Connecticut than in their choice for Governor; while on the other hand we have much less regard for and confidence in the party by which Col. English is supported than we have in Mr. Hawley, who manifested his devotion to the Union by his votes in Congress and his services in the field. The question, therefore, is to be considered in connection with the consequences. While the defeat of Gov. Hawley would be a defeat of the good and true men of Connecticut, the election of Col. English would be a triumph of a disloyal, Copperhead organization. Hence the "meddle."

It would be interesting to know what is the test of loyalty with the Times. It has repeatedly told the Radicals that the acceptance by the Southern people of the terms of restoration held out by the President, and their ardent desire to re-enter the Union under his policy, afforded sufficient evidence of their restored loyalty and their honest Union disposition. No matter what may have been the history of the Democratic party during the war, no matter their opposition to the President, they have done towards the South, their avowed adherence to his whole policy at then far developed, and their urgent wish to have the Southern States restored on his plan, be taken for even a stronger touch, as proof of their loyalty! The Times insists that they are disloyal, disunion, treasonable, they were disloyal, during the war. But the Southern people were still more disloyal during the war, and to them the Times attributes loyalty on the score of their cordial adhesion to the President's policy, while it denies loyalty to the Democratic party in spite of such adhesion, and claims all loyalty in the North for that party whose leaders are the President's bitter assailants.

But this miserable work of engineering the Republican party, as the "Union" party and the President's party, through the process troubles, with all its Radicalism in full blaster, and vigor, had to cease at some time, and judging from the unfeigned wonder of the Times, even that journal believes that the time is now at hand.

In the meantime the Radicals in Congress are waging a vindictive warfare, partisan and personal, against the President. Mr. Hooper, of Illinois, read the following language in the House of Representatives on Saturday:

"Republicans had even been regarded as a crime of the most damning character; but yet, in his opinion, Andy Johnson would go down to posterity, not only as the traitor to his party, but as an ingrate, traitor and liar of the most all honorable men. All the instincts of Andy Johnson, he said, were instincts of Southern life behind Northern men, as intensely as did Davis or Toombs, Beauregard or Lee."

This thing is carried on without disrupting the Republican party. In view, therefore, of our inevitable rupture, it behooves the people to collect evidence for and against the President and his friends and the leaders in Congress on the other, and decide which is nearest right. It is quite then a party question. It resolves itself into a question of the relative merits of Johnson and beyond doubt. And in determining our own course we should, each for himself, endeavor to learn how we can best promote the interests of the Union, the stability of the Government, and the prosperity of the country.

PRESTIDIGITATION.—Mr. Maitland, one of the world's wonder worker in the prestidigitation way, assisted by the equally wonderful Miss Jack Diamond, will give the first of a series of professional soirees on Monday evening in Masonic Hall. Piano and other participants will be found in another column.

MIDLAND'S BILLIARD SALOON.—Mr. M. M. Miller, unique billiard establishment has been fitted up for the thirteen months in the rear of the Commercial and place of New Orleans, and beyond the reason, which now contain twenty-six Phelan's tables, the best made in this country. Billiard play will be in complete order on the 6th inst., when Mr. Miller expects his friends and the public to visit his popular and well regulated saloon.

The New Orleans Bee.

OFFICE 73 CHARTRES STREET. NEW ORLEANS, MONDAY MORNING, APRIL 2, 1866. Vol. XXVII—New Series. Vol. XVII—Whole—13,750.

CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

In New York city considerable progress has been in the plan of co operative purchase and consumption. One co-operative society supply stores in New Jersey, numbered and classified and working with obvious advantage and to the confirmed satisfaction of all concerned. Such a result is perfectly constitutional and logical. The plan is extremely simple in principle, and the benefits which it involves are easily attended in practice by no more intricate or difficult action than are to be encountered in reducing out a sum upon one of the ordinary rules of arithmetic. The plan rests on the fundamental idea of retailing supplies at wholesale prices, so that consumers may, so to say, pay into their own pockets the net profits which would otherwise go into the fills of retail dealers. The exterior conditions of the enterprise are, of course, most designed to carry out this idea may be generalized into honesty and efficiency in its administration, and good faith and reasonable constancy on the part of the co-operators. If co-operative customers are limited strictly to cash terms in purchasing, and if those who are entrusted with the business of co-operative stores discharge their trust with judgment and fidelity, nothing more can be needed to secure the economical object of such a system. Where the conditions of success are so easy, in appearance at least, and where the proposed benefits are so great, there only common honesty and common sense are required to reduce expenses and enhance the comforts of life to the extent of the difference between wholesale and retail prices. It would really seem strange, supposing the theory to be sound practicable, that men should so long have neglected to avail themselves of this species of co operation. Without pretending here to explain this neglect, we think it safe to assume that it was caused quite as much by moral and social, or dis-social factors as by economical considerations or commercial difficulties.

The system of co-operative production and selling is based, like that of co-operative buying and consuming, on the idea of saving intermediary profits. That is to say, by combining together on specified terms in partnership, instead of selling their labor to an employer, undertake to sell their products, and then to make for themselves, not only the wages which they would otherwise give, but the profits which the employer would otherwise gain as the vender of their products. In this sphere of co operation we see laborers seeking to realize an approximation to full prices, as in the sphere of consumption, we see purchasers seeking, by co-operation, to come as near as possible to wholesale prices. There is an apparent, but perhaps no real antagonism, between co-operative movements that set out from those different starting points.

The co-operation of laborers certainly involves more practical difficulties than the co operation of consumers. One of the chief differences in favor of the latter consists in the fact that it is much easier to count money than to measure the quantity and estimate the quality of labor. Personal character and habits have little to do in the purchasing of supplies in common; but it must have much to do with the working together of men where, to say nothing of the honest administration of the common funds, a nice adjustment of various skills, regular habits, faithful labor, mutual confidence, and harmonious dispositions are demanded to insure efficiency and satisfaction.

The New York Sun, referring to a co operative undertaking in this city, has this to say:

The foundrymen of New Orleans have adopted the only practical and effectual plan for terminating the interminable quarrels between capital and labor. They have organized a co-operative association, have taken possession of the working and stocking a shop of their own, and have given notice that they will do all kinds of work in their line cheaper by 25 per cent than any other establishment in the city. We commend this example to the workmen of New York, as an improvement upon the policy of "striking." We would do well to advise them to abandon remunerative labor and desirable employment, just if capital and labor cannot agree upon the objects of wages, and to set up shop on their own account, and thus illustrate the co-operative plan, as in the case of the New Orleans foundrymen. To shower practical lessons of the value of policy as compared with that "striking" system, let us suppose a case: A Congressional about wages causes five hundred workingmen to throw up their situations. They were each earning three dollars per day. By means of the strike they lose five months time, equivalent, in the aggregate, to twenty eight thousand dollars. Now, we venture to say that in nine-tenths of the various branches of business, twenty eight thousand dollars would be capital enough to establish a business concern of sufficient capacity to employ the said five hundred workmen. If they had acted upon that two months wages in establishing a co-operative shop, they would not only free themselves forever from the annoyance about wages and the hours of labor, but they would own their own houses, receiving the profits of their work. They would have another advantage in being able to defy the competition of their former employer. The employer is a middleman, who stands between the actual producer and the buyer, is a very heavy one, and he buttons the profits into his hands. By the co-operative plan the workingman and the buyer are brought face to face, and one profit is thereby saved.

As the Sun observes, the expedient of co operation has unquestionable advantages over the system of strikes when laborers and employers can not agree as to wages. There is then simply a question whether the laborer can make more by hiring himself to himself or by hiring himself to another. The best way to convince such laborers that the wages they offer are too low is to show by example what higher wages can be given with profit. Whenever workingmen should convince themselves that in all respects it is more advantageous to capitalize joint labor and draw dividends therefrom than to work for wages paid by outside capital, they would most assuredly abandon the wages system. But meantime capital remains as a distinct, though, if not foolishly and wickedly employed, a sufficient power in the commercial and industrial world; and labor remains as another power independent to civilization and progress. Unfortunately the two powers in question have been the subjects of conditions of the country, or that only apply to a part of that body or a part of the States.

Fourth—He has given no reason to believe in the Stevens doctrine of "State Suicide."

Fifth—He is opposed to negro suffrage at this time; thinks they are unfitted for, and have not the requisite capacity to intelligently exercise that sacred yet dangerous privilege.

MY CONCLUSION.

Congress and the President will never harmonize. They will remain sundered and divided even unto the end.

It is immaterial how this separation is caused—the result is equally dangerous in its consequences to the Republic. It may be charged, on one side, that the President has switched off the party track, and on the other hand, that Congress has switched the land off these crazy Radicals until they have run them into the camp of the enemy—the disunionists. The fact remains—they are separated. My own conclusion is, that Congress, under the lead of these old parliamentarian Radicals, has gone a little too far and too fast, and got away from both the President and the people; that the President has stood still since the day of his election, and has failed to keep pace with the progress of the people.

The President will not go over to the "Copperhead" party of them to office, but will not be widely faithful with his views, and who writes in the spirit of a Western Conservative Republican. We extract his closing remarks:

THE FACTS.

First—The President does not get drunk—is temperate and abstemious in all his habits—does not touch liquor of any kind, and has not since the day of the inauguration.

Second—He is not going over to the Copperheads, nor is he going to organize any men to office who was not with the Union party during the war.

Third—He is going to have every man who holds office under him support him and his measures, his "policy," as set forth in his 22d of February speech, his veto and his message. Those who do not support him, and do unite sides with the Radicals in Congress, had better look out for the executive ax, for it will surely fall.

Fourth—Andrew Johnson is an honest and patriotic a man as lives on the earth. He is just as confident and stubborn as he is honest.

Fifth—Dear to him as his first-born, yes, precious as the breath of his nostrils, is his "policy." He will sacrifice friends to sustain and carry through that policy, all other considerations must go down. To that "policy" he would sacrifice the Union party, were it necessary. He would sacrifice his dearest personal friendships,—yes, his very life would weigh nothing in the scales against his determination to carry it through. Why? Because he has, after long days and weeks and months of earnest thought, study and prayer, concluded that the salvation of his country and the welfare of the people depend upon it.

However much we may differ with him in judgment, we can but admire his Spartan heroism and dauntless courage.

"What is the President's policy, upon which he is risking so much? many inquire. "What is this obstacle, this phantom, this great fetish 'policy' that is leading the President this wild dance?"

Yes I cannot fully answer. His message, veto and speech will best give it. The principal ingredients of that policy are:

First—That the Constitutional rights of the States and the people thereof shall not be infringed or trampled upon the General Government.

Second—That the States have the right to determine for themselves the qualification of voters, and that the General Government can not more interfere with that right in South Carolina than in Massachusetts.

Third—That whenever a member of Congress from any one of the thirty-six States presents himself for a seat in Congress, and can take the oath prescribed for each and every member of that body, Congress has no right to exclude him; that Congress can prescribe rules that will apply to all its members, but can not invidiously discriminate in the formation of rules of the country, or that only apply to a part of that body or a part of the States.

Fourth—He has given no reason to believe in the Stevens doctrine of "State Suicide."

Fifth—He is opposed to negro suffrage at this time; thinks they are unfitted for, and have not the requisite capacity to intelligently exercise that sacred yet dangerous privilege.

MY CONCLUSION.

Congress and the President will never harmonize. They will remain sundered and divided even unto the end.

It is immaterial how this separation is caused—the result is equally dangerous in its consequences to the Republic. It may be charged, on one side, that the President has switched off the party track, and on the other hand, that Congress has switched the land off these crazy Radicals until they have run them into the camp of the enemy—the disunionists. The fact remains—they are separated. My own conclusion is, that Congress, under the lead of these old parliamentarian Radicals, has gone a little too far and too fast, and got away from both the President and the people; that the President has stood still since the day of his election, and has failed to keep pace with the progress of the people.

The President will not go over to the "Copperhead" party of them to office, but will not be widely faithful with his views, and who writes in the spirit of a Western Conservative Republican. We extract his closing remarks:

THE FACTS.

First—The President does not get drunk—is temperate and abstemious in all his habits—does not touch liquor of any kind, and has not since the day of the inauguration.

Second—He is not going over to the Copperheads, nor is he going to organize any men to office who was not with the Union party during the war.

Third—He is going to have every man who holds office under him support him and his measures, his "policy," as set forth in his 22d of February speech, his veto and his message. Those who do not support him, and do unite sides with the Radicals in Congress, had better look out for the executive ax, for it will surely fall.

Fourth—Andrew Johnson is an honest and patriotic a man as lives on the earth. He is just as confident and stubborn as he is honest.

Fifth—Dear to him as his first-born, yes, precious as the breath of his nostrils, is his "policy." He will sacrifice friends to sustain and carry through that policy, all other considerations must go down. To that "policy" he would sacrifice the Union party, were it necessary. He would sacrifice his dearest personal friendships,—yes, his very life would weigh nothing in the scales against his determination to carry it through. Why? Because he has, after long days and weeks and months of earnest thought, study and prayer, concluded that the salvation of his country and the welfare of the people depend upon it.

However much we may differ with him in judgment, we can but admire his Spartan heroism and dauntless courage.

"What is the President's policy, upon which he is risking so much? many inquire. "What is this obstacle, this phantom, this great fetish 'policy' that is leading the President this wild dance?"

Yes I cannot fully answer. His message, veto and speech will best give it. The principal ingredients of that policy are:

First—That the Constitutional rights of the States and the people thereof shall not be infringed or trampled upon the General Government.

Second—That the States have the right to determine for themselves the qualification of voters, and that the General Government can not more interfere with that right in South Carolina than in Massachusetts.

Third—That whenever a member of Congress from any one of the thirty-six States presents himself for a seat in Congress, and can take the oath prescribed for each and every member of that body, Congress has no right to exclude him; that Congress can prescribe rules that will apply to all its members, but can not invidiously discriminate in the formation of rules of the country, or that only apply to a part of that body or a part of the States.

Fourth—He has given no reason to believe in the Stevens doctrine of "State Suicide."

Fifth—He is opposed to negro suffrage at this time; thinks they are unfitted for, and have not the requisite capacity to intelligently exercise that sacred yet dangerous privilege.

MY CONCLUSION.

Congress and the President will never harmonize. They will remain sundered and divided even unto the end.

It is immaterial how this separation is caused—the result is equally dangerous in its consequences to the Republic. It may be charged, on one side, that the President has switched off the party track, and on the other hand, that Congress has run