TELEGRAPHIC.

BIMETALLIC LEAGUE.

Annual Dinner Held at the Residence of London's Lord Mayor.

SEVERAL NOTABLES PRESENT

Either Speaks in Favor of A Double Standard—Fail to Prove a Benefit to None.

LONDON, April 3.—The annual meeting of the Bimetallic League was held today at the Mansion House, the official residence of the lord mayor of London, the Right Honorable Pendell, presided. Among those present were Lord George Hamilton, the Duke of Fife and Sir Donald M. McKenzie and Mr. Charles H. Parnell, members of the House of Commons. The Hs. Hon. N. J. Balfour, Conservative leader of the House of Commons, made a strong speech in favor of the double standard.

He said that the belief in bimetallism was growing not only in London and throughout the United Kingdom but throughout the civilized world. Our great cause was desirable. It was wrong to use special time consideration in the consideration of the question. Formerly a bimetallist was regarded as a dangerous fanatic. Experience has placed value in the hands of experienced men who have now practically had time to take serious consideration of the question, the par of exchange of gold, which never was disturbed for the whole world, despite wars, in actual revolutions and anarchy of the previous decade.

Some people admitted that prices tumbled, but a large portion of the men said depreciated prices and put a loss to trouble. Thus, for instance, Lord Rosebery bought from India and consequently wheat at a price below its intrinsic value, and there persons found that this was an advantage to the consumer, and therefore benefited the community.

Mr. Balfour contended, however, that it was generally that nobody in the city were found to be of opinion that the interest of Great Britain were bettered generally by an increase in the price. Not any large body of men could be ascertained or be discovered in the country who would be in the other event by a depreciation which is accidentally caused by a change in the value of the currency to which they were accidentally.

Another argument was that the varying currency of London would be lessened by a currency change, but no responsible man was able to verify this. He contended that London, as the financial center of the world, would gain rather than lose by stabilizing the currency of the world on a common basis.

The third argument was very short. The use for a single world depreciated gold, and therefore serious harm would result from instability. The change contended that he could see such a catastrophe as the world had never seen. The argument was supported by Lord Rosebery and Sir William Vernon Harcourt.

Though silence was probably unanimous, there appeared to him no reason to suppose that the people were so anything so foolhardy as to withdraw their deposits because world's currency was going to depend on a double basis, which, coupled to national international transactions, would not differ, and except for the one effect on the great movement, which, indeed, would have no effect on private business and transactions.

The fourth and strongest argument was "the last enough stage." But no doubt the time was is well enough. There is not a man who is a bimetallist in principle, but they, but, although they had expected indeed in great numbers, they differ in the currency of Hong Kong and the British settlements, which in India do not see fit to accept as money, which is perhaps the strongest product of modern international transactions. Were not necessary as any forced payment, and as exporters we say broad currency the world has ever seen is a distinct varying according to the currency will of the Russia Silver of India.

The Indian system was unofficially established. Many members of the opposite side thought they would. But the one made strongest. To consider how difficult it would be during a currency which great Britain was endeavoring to be the center, the Indian Bimetallist by every commercial city, was a Russian government which of course depended the Russian Wheat the country depended. In very great on foreign nations, and in the last year it was the belief of very business in Russia that the currency was in the hands of the government. He did not believe the Russian government would continue to be interested regarding the currency question. He did not believe the Russian government would continue to be interested in the question. The Russian government would have some difficulty in the view of what was proposing in London, Germany and France, and even in Great Britain, he was convinced that most of all classes would rise consider it and the opposition to our proposition.

The meeting adopted a report of progress. The report contained an issue a quarterly issue of English to twice which is the impression. The Bimetallic office. Sir Donald Mackenzie presents have already been partially subscribed.

CLAIMS DAMAGES.

An American Citizen Proceeds to Sail in Spain.

SAN PAUL, Tex., April 3.—E. F. Thresher, of Cambridge, Mass., with his family, arrived safely today from Arcos, Colorado, Mexico, where they have resided a time in life.

Mr. Thresher is indignant at his treatment and purpose to leave the country of Mexico and Spanish Mexico.

He says, while in Arcos in Sonoma, it was to engage at the Fonseca mine, with Dr. Gomez. Rico. When he arrived he was arrested by the King Gomez who demanded the money he was to pay. He refused to pay King and did not, he with and then was put in jail, where he remained until Colonel Dwight interfered and. Then the report of the town evidently discovered that the whole business was a scheme to rob the Americans with most profane sayings. Mr. Thresher went with attorneys to Los Angeles, where he will remain in hiding and will leave for the purpose of trying the matter across the state government. With a demand for satisfaction. Mr. Thresher was prostrate by his experience.

VENEZUELA DISPUTE.

Great Britain Intimates that It Made Not Concede the United States.

WASHINGTON, April 3.—There is reason to believe that the British government has given to the United States Mr. Bayard, in substance, in response to an representation in the Venezuela boundary matter, on the suggestion contained in the recent written dispatch, it must point in regarding the subject as one in which only Great Britain and Venezuela are concerned.

Of course the news is not all very disappointing and unfavorably, so as to avoid giving offense as far as possible while still making it plain that the United States could not be regarded as having any proper interest in the matter. As it stands the British government still leaves open the question of its and right to compel all the territory to the eastward of the Schomburg line, while pressing a willingness to submit the other disputed claim to arbitration. The claim of Venezuela is a large one, and it has not been modified in the slightest degree, notwithstanding Mr. Bayard's efforts.

It has been intimated that the United States might acquire a right to intervene in behalf of Venezuela by declaring a protectorate over that country with the assent of this country, and hence this suggestion is at least one of the great European countries, which would be glad to have the relations with the disputed countries of South and Central America placed on a stable basis, which is sorely needed in most thoroughly responsible, highly civilized government to insure the performance of trade and prevent frequent revolutions.

But to force on the assembly for such a protectorate was incompatible to the intelligent to prevent the acquisition of a territory by force by a European power, would amount to a transaction of the Monroe doctrine by the United States, and the necessity emanated by the British settlers.

There are indications that the British foreign officials are willing to discuss the matter in the real spirit of fairness, and at a change any thing along the many middle miles a common ground between the British and American claims in the disputed territory, or the new Minnesota syndicate forces need action by requiring operations about the large concession it has made of from Venezuela to have it.

The report of Sir Richard's of Great Britain's position is not known, but it is understood that the American Commissioner Bayard, Mr. Olney, from personal conversation, to provide a compromise, and a Mr. Olney's report, which is in the hands of the British government, and which contained the most liberal concessions ever made by the United States, and which, in the opinion of the President, Cleveland, ought to be satisfactory to Great Britain, and to be a matter of congratulation to the people of both lands. But, alas, poor Venezuela!

ANSWER THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC

Decisions of Both Courts in Favor of Its Lease Under Consideration.

CHICAGO, April 3.—Judge Jenkins at 4 p. m. this afternoon, in the case of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe company, of New York, against the Chicago & Northern Pacific railroad company, to issue a writ of injunction against the Chicago & Northern Pacific to prevent the lease of the road to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, gave a decision in favor of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, and against the Chicago & Northern Pacific. The decision is substantially the same as that of Judge Grosscup in the case of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe against the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, which was decided in favor of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, and against the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, and which was appealed to the United States circuit court of appeals, and is now before the court for decision. The decision is substantially the same as that of Judge Grosscup in the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul case, and it is understood that the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul company is going to appeal from the decision of Judge Jenkins, and will carry the case to the United States circuit court of appeals, and will make every effort to secure a decision in its favor before the lease of the road to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe company can be carried into effect.

The decision of Judge Jenkins in the case of the Chicago & Northern Pacific company, which was argued in the United States circuit court of appeals, and which was decided in favor of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe company, is to the effect that the Chicago & Northern Pacific company is not a railroad company, and is not a railroad company, and is not a railroad company, and