THE NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE
DUFOUR & LIMET, PUBLISHERS,
No 73, Chartres Street.
TERMS OF THE BEE:
Terms of Subscription—Daily, per annum, in advance, $10, delivered, $12; quarterly, $4.
Price of the paper—Single copies, 10 cents.
Terms—We only publish every Tuesday and Saturday. Subscription, $5 per annum, invariably in advance.
Rates of Advertising—Transient advertisement having the run of the paper, first insertion $1 50 per square; each subsequent insertion, 75 cents per square.
Regular advertisements, each insertion, $2 50 per square.
All advertisements inserted at intervals to be charged as transient insertions.
For contracts—Yearly, monthly advertisements, each square $4 00 per month.
Regular advertisers who advertise largely, shall be entitled to the rate for the above named transient advertisements regardless of space. In no case shall any advertisement be charged less than one square.
Advertisements not specified, to be charged as transient insertions, each insertion.
All transient advertisements must be paid for in advance.
Advertisements not marked for any number of insertions will be published ntil forbidden.
Advertisements in regular advertisers shall be rendered monthly.
Semi-Weekly Edition.
TERMS PER YEAR.....$5
NEW ORLEANS:
FRIDAY MORNING, NOV 12, 1869

TRY GEORGE ALCES' CIGARS, 185.....Hampson Street.....185

Amusements This Evening

ACADEMY OF MUSIC—English Opera and De Lange Troupe.
VARIETIES THEATRE—Miss Johnson in "Fairy Fingers" and Lancashire.
ST CHARLES THEATRE—Complimentary Benefit Mr. Collins—"Born to Good Luck" and "Irish Post."
AMES CIRCUS AND MENAGERIE, Tivoli Circle.

THE LATE CONFEDERATE CURRENCY DECISION.

We are entirely disposed to accept the full and candid explanation of our esteemed contemporary, the *Bulletin*, touching the charge we made against it of misrepresenting our views on the late decision of the Federal Supreme Court on the subject of the Confederate currency obligations. Between the *Bulletin* and ourselves, nothing as we are animated by the friendly spirit, which we are happy to believe prevails on both sides, there could not well be any permanent or lasting difference.

Before dismissing the matter, however, our readers will perhaps pardon us if we say that the gravamen of our complaint was not that he had overlooked what possibly might be termed an equivocal expression of ours in the last paragraph of the article he criticised, nor that he had misprehended the illustration we presented in citing the value of greenbacks in Kapides parish to show that after learning he had misunderstood us by the fuller and clearer exposition we made on the following day of our views as to the use of money in which unexecuted Confederate contracts must now be settled; after seeing that we had divided the subject into two parts, the second being the complement and the key to the first, he had yet suffered us to remain under the misrepresentation and neglected to correct the erroneous impression he had created. There was perhaps a remissness in this in that he did not consider greenbacks to be the legal money of the United States contemplated by the court when it rendered its decision, but we certainly made up after a while for any want of plainness and know that our contemporary will be prompt to admit that it is hardly fair to criticise a work which is incomplete, especially when its author takes care to admonish that the work is incomplete. That was precisely our case, and to call it a "misinterpretation" is with all deference to the *Bulletin* and exactly in proper diction. It is true, we unconditionally approved the decision as a matter of equity, because we believed it to be the construction and entailed the consequences since indicated by us. We shall not, therefore, acknowledge the temper after we had by the *Bulletin* as being proper by a plea that when we were wrong, exactly in the spirit of the article, we had their leave to be so. We claim the right of vindication in the pure and simple manner we ask them to allow us the same leave for the development of their meaning in the fullest discussion. We seem to have up for discussion. We seem to have never order or intend to order our complaint on other day for we felt confident he would do us justice, since he had inadvertently misrepresented our views. Although from explanations it is apparent that it was very far from our purpose to deny the every just powers of any or all tribunals, judicial or unprofessional, we knew of no one more capable of giving or drawing inferences from distant or near, and no one more in the habit of so doing. We felt sure, in laughing dangers, that our contemporary would not be offended at our mistake. Its interpretation are generally of a character and on subjects which common sense and common law teach to them, and the attention is always cheerfully bestowed on them. We fully full of derive instruction and pleasure in the careful observation.

A further explanation and we have done. We believe the decisions of 1868 and 1869 in the Confederate currency was then and now, in greenbacks, because we know it to be a fictitious value there as contrasted to the Confederate currency. It was not a fictitious value in value there as contrasted to the Confederate currency. It was not a fictitious value in value there as contrasted to the Confederate currency. It was not a fictitious value in value there as contrasted to the Confederate currency. We felt it to be a fictitious value in value there as contrasted to the Confederate currency. We felt it to be a fictitious value in value there as contrasted to the Confederate currency. We felt it to be