Daily Globe.

VOL. V. ST. PAUL, THURSDAY MORNING, JANUARY 26, 1882. NO. 26

HE'LL SWING

Guiteau Guilty!

GLORIOUS VERDICT

Quick Work by Jury.

ONLY 30 MINUTES NEEDED

To Come to a Decision.

EXCITING DAY IN THE COURT.

Violence of the Prisoner During Porter's Scathing Plea.

THE DEITY RACKET DON'T WIN.

And Now Scoville Will Blather About For a New Trial.

JUDGE COX'S INCISIVE CHARGE.

Every Utterance of Which Was an Extra Nail in the Assassin's Coffin.

Bulletin No. 1.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 25.—The jury in the Guiteau case brought in a verdict of guilty of murder in the first degree. They were out only 30 minutes.

Bulletin No. 2.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 25.—At 5:35 court was called to order and at 5:36 the jury came in and rendered a verdict of "guilty," as indicted.

PORTER'S ARGUMENT.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 25.—As usual Guiteau opened the proceedings of the court by announcing: "My sister has been doing some silly talk in Chicago. She means well, but she's no lawyer."

Judge Porter immediately resumed his argument. Admonished by the falling snow and severity of the weather from which he had suffered, he felt it necessary to vary somewhat from his original intentions and trust to the intelligence and honor of the jury to supply his defects. He would not therefore linger over the dry details of the evidence feeling it imperatively necessary this case should be brought to a conclusion as soon as possible. He would simply touch upon a few salient points of the evidence. "John W. Guiteau," said Judge Porter, "I believe to be an honorable man. He came here ready to contribute his means, his evidence and his service to save his brother's life, and an honored father's name, and yet the truth comes from his lips that must impress upon every one of you the conviction, that on the 2nd of July this prisoner was as sane as you or I, or the judge upon this bench."

Reading from the evidence of J. W. Guiteau and commenting upon it, Judge Porter said of the prisoner: "He has two faces."

Guiteau—"How many have you got?"

Judge Porter—"He has two faces, one showing the sanctity of the pharisee, and the other the hideous grin of the fiend that possesses him."

As he continued to read from J. W. Guiteau's testimony relative to his last interview with the prisoner, Guiteau continually interrupted with such comments as: "What I say is always true, Judge Porter." "What you say is generally false." "I never said so." "That is absolutely false."

Proceeding Judge Porter contrasted the life, conduct and deceitful practices of the prisoner with the apostle Paul in the light of the prisoner's assumption, that he like Paul was honestly engaged in doing the Lord's work. "Paul never palmed off brass watches for gold."

"Neither did I," spoke Guiteau.

"Paul never swindled his creditors out of their just due."

"Oh, you'r a blood man," retaliated Guiteau. "You belong to the Judas tribe."

The picture drawn by Judge Porter was anything but a lovely one, and provoked the prisoner to the most abusive retorts: "You are a liar and you know it, and I tell you so to your face, Judge Porter," he called out.

"This man," said Judge Porter, "who says he never deceived anyone"—

"That's a fact," piped the prisoner. "Put that in frequently."

"This man, who says he never deceived anyone, says in one of his handbills, 'Lecture by Hon. Charles Guiteau.' He never deceived anyone! Where did he get this title of honorable?"

"That's the way my letters came addressed, sir."

Judge Porter—"The Lord murdered Garfield."

Guiteau—"Yes, and he'll murder you before long."

Judge Porter—"The Lord murdered Garfield. The Lord defrauded printers and boarding houses, and every night and morning the Christian prisoner thanks the Lord for his work."

Continuing to read from the evidence, Judge Porter was again and again interrupted by the prisoner who called out: "Read the record. That's bigger than my brother. He's no brother to me, and never has been till he came to this trial. It's contemptible in you to speak about my brother in the way you do."

"Judge Porter in an apparently incidental way spoke of the horror with which men of all parties and all shades of opinion look upon the prisoner, and the unanimity with which they execrate this act."

"Your a liar, and you know it," shouted the prisoner with the energy of desperation. "The American people are on my side, and so is the press."

As Judge Porter continued his arraignment of the prisoner, Guiteau winced and nervously twisted in his seat, and finally drowned the voice of Judge Porter, who gave way to his clamor. In savage tones he shouted: "A saint from heaven couldn't stand the abuse of that man Porter, and I won't stand it. I will relieve my mind. The idea of this man trying to make me out a fighting man, a man of bad character, and all that. It's a lie, and he knows it. He's a liar, and I will call him so."

Judge Porter—"I am simply giving the sworn statements of his own brother."

Guiteau—"He's no brother of mine, and I wouldn't have spoken to him at the Fifth avenue hotel last summer. I have nothing against him, but I don't like his style. I did not like my father's style either. My sister sympathizes with me, and my brother sympathizes with my father. I want that understood. It's contemptible in that man Porter to undertake to convince the jury that I'm an unprincipled, bad man."

Judge Porter read from the letter of the latter, W. Guiteau, when the prisoner again called out, "Scoville was very smart about that letter, wasn't he. It shows what a blockhead he is anyway."

The first interruption by counsel for the defense occurred when Judge Porter undertook to quote the opinion of the English judiciary upon this case. Reed interposed an objection, but without heeding him Porter continued his remarks. Reed insisted upon his objection. Corkhill, springing to his feet, protested against the interruption: "You have made your objection—that's the extent of your prerogative; you've no right to interrupt the gentleman."

Judge Cox—"What Judge Porter has said is neither very relevant or very objectionable. I don't see that you can object."

The prisoner added his comment: "Your honor ought to put that man under arrest. He is a perfect nuisance this morning."

After this outburst Judge Porter continued to speak for some minutes without further interruption. Alluding to the incident of the watch, Judge Porter arraigned both the prisoner and counsel for their contemptuous manner in speaking of the witness Edwards as a miserable Jew. "I have yet to know," said the speaker, "that any man lives who could have cause to feel ashamed that he sprang from the same race as the Savior of mankind."

Guiteau—"That's all very fine, but you forget that the Lord and the Jews had a falling out at the destruction of Jerusalem. The Jews are all right now, though a very good sort of people."

Judge Porter continued. As a matter of fact, however, the insinuation of counsel is not correct; yet not content with the attempt to blacken the character of this witness counsel for the defense would circumsise him here in the presence of this court.

The interruptions of the session in violence and frequency continued till reinforced in an objection of Scoville. The clamor and din for a moment resembled a small Babel.

Scoville finally made himself heard and desired exception notice to the statement of construction put on evidence by Judge Porter.

A sharp discussion ensued, during which the prisoner made himself heard from the dock, shouting: "It's an outrage for that man to be allowed to speak. He ought to be under arrest for his insolence. It has been notning but one stream of abuse from him all the morning. It is enough to provoke a saint from heaven. It's a disgrace upon a court of justice." The bailiffs undertook to quiet the prisoner, and succeeded in drawing his attention from the dispute of counsel and the attraction of his abuse to themselves. It seemed for a moment more than possible that his vicious demonstrations might provoke some of the officers beyond the point of endurance and perhaps to the point of assuming the functions of the court in administering whole. some and much needed discipline. Judge Cox called for reading from stenographer's notes of a passage which had caused dispute, and promptly decided against Scoville's demand that counsel be stopped; passing to the testimony of Dr. Spitzka. Judge Porter said: I wonder if Lucifer were on trial would Dr. Spitzka pronounce him a moral imbecile, a moral monstrosity; when Satan fell from his high estate there was a change in satan but in this man, according to Dr. Spitzka, there never could have been a change. He was from start a moral imbecile, a former of morbid projects, says Dr. Spitzka. Why are most of mankind poor? Because of morbid projects yet do we pronounce the majority of mankind insane. What does he say of this prisoner's sanity on the 2d of July? "Probably insane." Do you propose, gentlemen of the jury, to bring in a verdict that he was "probably insane?" Was he sane or insane, that is the question. What does he say of the prisoner? As a lawyer he calls him a third-rate shyster, in a criminal court I suppose. Scoville can tell you what that means, I cannot, said Judge Porter.

"Well, some of your clients can tell what it is," retorted the prisoner.

Referring to the reference by Reed to Charlotte Corday, Judge Porter said it was left to Reed to make the discovery and to announce to this court and to the world that Charlotte Corday was insane. Rehearsing the circumstances of Charlotte Corday's life and death, Judge Porter contrasted her act of patriotism with Guiteau's foul murder in most eloquent and stirring sentences. The prisoner was roused almost to fury and bellowed like an infuriated beast, at times completely drowning Porter's voice.

God Almighty will curse you, Porter, you miserable whelp you. You can't make the American people believe I am not a patriot today. I suffer in bonds as a patriot, and God will curse you if a hair of my head is injured.

Pausing a moment, Judge Porter said: "Contrast the conduct of this vindictive, cowardly wretch with Charlotte Corday, who who walked peacefully to the scaffold with her hands folded over the cross upon her breast, and a serene smile that denoted her willingness to suffer death for her country, and the patriotism which instigated h r act."

"I ain't afraid to die either," shouted the prisoner. "You may put my body in the ground if you can, but I tell you this nation will go down in blood if you harm a hair of my head."

Next Judge Porter compared the prisoner to Wilkes Booth, and showed the latter to be almost a patriot compared with the cowardly assassin now on trial, for Booth was actuated by mistaken motives of patriotism, and was a man of manhood and manliness but this sneaking, cowardly, wretch conceived the plan for his victims death and his own safety at the same time. He murdered this man for revenge and notoriety.

Guiteau—"I shot my man in broad daylight and don't you forget it, Porter."

Pressing the assertion that Guiteau was actuated by revenge and desire for notoriety. Judge Porter compared him to a noted criminal in Europe. I don't recall his name, said Judge Porter. He said I am the ugliest man in Europe.

"Well, you wasn't there," interrupted Guiteau.

"You'il be the ugliest man in history though," continued Porter

"I would rather be the ugliest man in Europe and have notoriety than remain in the ranks of mediocrity for the next half hour," said Guiteau,

There was one continual stream of interruptions and abuse from the prisoner. A score of times he denounced Porter as a liar, varying the expressions as adjectives suggested themselves. His vindictive disposition showed itself as never before and for once his cunning was merged into his angry spite and as Porter piled up Ossa of invectives upon Pelion of denunciation, the prisoner unwittingly emphasised and corroborated the diagnosis of depravity and wicked heartedness which counsel was with such telling effect pronouncing upon him.

"You know that's all an absolute, desperate, wicked, devilish lie," finally shouted Guiteau, stammering with rage. Recess.

Afternoon Session.

After recess Guiteau announced he should not interrupt unless it was warranted, but the harangue he seemed about to start on was cut short by Judge Cox, who commanded him to keep silent.

Judge Porter resumed: There is one man between you and the grave of the slaughtered president who knows whether his defense is a sham one or not.

Guiteau—It is a true defense and you know it.

Porter—The truth will, however, burst forth and reach the consciousness of every one, if from other sources. It will make its way from the murderer himself.

Judge Porter then read from the letter of the prisoner to his father, in which he said, "For years I was haunted with the idea that I was cut out for some great mission, but now am convinced it was a devilish delusion and denounce my vanity and egotism.

Guiteau—Well I've changed my mind since then. That was ten years since then.

Reading from Guiteau's criticism upon the religious and moral growth of the past six thousand years. Judge Porter said could Judas Iscariot himself have pronounced a more sinister judgment?

Guiteau—Judas Iscariot would have employed you as his attorney, you big liar you.

His whole life, said Judge Porter, was in accord, and all evidence substantiated the assumption that revenge and a morbid desire for notoriety actuated the prisoner. Judge Porter passed to the discussion of the direct issue of the case, whether or not the prisoner was insane on the 2d of July. The prisoner himself, he said, does not claim to be insane.

Guiteau—I don't now, but I was on the 2d of July, and for thirty days previous. Transitory mania, that's what I claim.

Replying to this claim judge Porter pointed to the absurdity that like a stroke of lightning all his insanity should vanish in an instant; that it should envelope him completely day after day for the purpose of murder; that it still clung to him after he saw his victim sinking helpless to the ground and then instantly was taken off and left him a perfectly sane man,—

Guiteau—Well the transitory mania was the plea that Sickels got off on and you were on the prosecution of the case and got beaten on the very same doctrine. You were trying to fool that jury on,—

In passing on to criticise Dr. Spitzka's testimony, Porter said: "I wonder whether if Lucifer had happened to be on trial, Dr. Spitzka would say of him he was a moral imbecile, a moral monstrosity. When satan fell, if we may believe the book of inspiration, he fell, from where? From Empyrean heights and he sank into depths from which come those temptations that lead men to crime and lure them to punishment here and hereafter.

Judge Cox's Charge.

Judge Cox, at 3-15 p. m., proceeded to deliver his charge to the jury. He commenced by saying the constitution provides that in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right of a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury in the state or district where the crime shall have been committed. That he shall be informed of the course and natare of the accusation against him. That he shall be confronted with witnesses against him; that he shall have compulsory process to obtain witnesses in his favor, and that he shall have assistance of counsel in his defense. These provisions are intended for the protection of the innocent from injustice and oppression and it was only by their faithful observance guilt or innocence could be fairly ascertained. Every accused person was presumed to be innocent until the accusation was proved with what difficulty and trouble it has been administered in the present case the jurors have been daily witnesses. It was, however, consolation to think that not one of those sacred guarantess of the constitution had been violated in the person of the accused. At last the long chapter of proof was ended. The task of the advocate was done, and it now rested with the jury to determine the issue between public justice and the prisoner at the bar.

No one could feel more keenly than himself the great responsibility of his duties and he felt that he could only discharge them by close adherence to law laid down by the highest authorities. Before he proceeded further he wished to notice an incident which had taken place during the recent argument. The prisoner had frequently taken occasion to proclaim that public opinion was evidently, by press and correspondence, in his favor. These declarations could not be prevented, except by process of gagging the prisoner. Any suggestion that the jury could be influenced by such lawless clattering of the prisoner, would have seemed to him absurd, and he should have felt he was insulting the intelligence of the jury if he had warned them not to regard it. Counsel for the prosecution had felt it necessary, however, in the final argument to interpose a contradiction to such statements and exceptions had been taken on the part of the accused to the form in which that effort was made. For the purpose of purging the record of any objectionable matter, he should simply say, anything which had been said on either side in reference to public excitement or to newspaper opinion was not to be regarded by the jury.

The indictment charged defendant with having murdered Jas. A. Garfield, and it was the duty of the court to explain the nature of crime charged. Murder was committed where a person of sound memory and discretion unlawfully killed a reasonable being in the peace of the United States, with malice and forethought. It had to be proved first that death was caused by the act of the accused and further it was caused with malice and forethought. That did not mean however, that the government had to prove any illwill or hatred on the part of the accused toward the deceased. Whenever homicide was committed without lawful authority and with willful intent, it was sufficiently proved to have been done with malice aforethought, and malice was not disproved by showing the accused had no personal illwill toward the deceased, and that he killed him from other motives as for instance through mistaking him for another or (as claimed in this case) to produce a public benefit.

If it could be shown the killing occurred in the heat of passion or under provocation, then it would appear there was no premeditated attempt, and therefore no malice aforethought, and that would reduce the crime to manslaughter. It was hardly necessary, however, to say there was nothing of that kind in the present case. The jury would have to say the defendant was guilty of murder or he was innocent.

In order to constitute the crime of murder the assassin must have a reasonably sane mind. In technical terms, he must be "of sound mind, memory and discretion." Any irresponsible, insane man could not commit murder. If he was laboring under a disease of mental faculties to such an extent that he did not know what he was doing or know it was wrong, then he was wanting in that sound mind, memory and discretion that was part of the definition of murder.

In the next place every defendant was presumed innocent until the accusation against him was established by proof. In the next place, notwithstanding the presumption of innocence, it was equally true that defendant was presumed to be sane, and to have been so at the time the crime was committed. That is to say, the government was not bound to show affirmatively as part of its proofs that defendant was sane. As insanity was an exception, and as a majority of men are sane, the law presumed the latter condition in every man until some reason was shown to believe to the contrary. The burden was therefore on the defendant who set up insanity as an excuse for the crime. To produce proofs in first instance to show that the presumption was mistaken so far as it related to the prisoner's crimes. Therefore it involved three elements. The killing, malice and responsible mind in the murderer. After all the evidence was before the jury, if the jury, while bearing in mind both of those presumptions, that is that the defendant is innocent till he is proven guilty, that he is sane till the contrary appears, still entertained what is called unreasonable doubt on any ground, or as to any of the essential elements of crime, then defendant was entitled to the benefit of that doubt and to acquittal. It was important to explain to the jury herein the best way that the court could determine what is a reasonable doubt. He could hardly venture to give the exact definition of the term, for he did not know of any such successful attempt to do so. As to questions relating to human affairs, knowledge of which is derived from testimony, it was impossible to have a sane mind. Certainly that is created by scientific demonstration, only the jury could have no moral certainty depending on the confidence which the jury had in the integrity of witnesses, and in their capacity and opportunity to known the truth. If, for example, facts not improbable in themselves were attested by numerous witnesses, credible, and who had every opportunity to know the truth, a reasonable or moral certainty would be inspired by that testimony. In such case doubt would be unressonable or imaginary or speculative. It ought not to be doubt as to whether the party might not be innocent. In the face of strong proofs of his guilt it must be a sincere doubt whether he had been proved guilty, even where testimony was contradictory and where much credit should be given to one side than the other. The same result might be produced. On the other hand, opposing proofs might be so balanced that the jury might justify the doubt in which side, under all the circumstances the truth lay, and in such case the accused party was entitled to the benefit of the doubt. All that the jury could be expected to do was to be reasonably and morally certain of the facts which they declared to be their verdict. In illustration of this point, Judge Cox quoted the charge of Chief Justice Shaw, of Massachusetts, in the case of the Commonwealth against Webster.

With reference to the evidence in this case, very little comment was required by court except upon one question, others being hardly matters of dispute. That defendant fired the shot and shot the deceased president was abundantly proved. That the wound was fatal had been testified to by surgeons who were competent to speak and they were uncontradicted. That homicide was committed with malice aforethought (if defendant were capable of criminal intent or malice) could hardly be gainsaid. It was not necessary to prove that any special or express hatred or malice was entertained by the accused toward the deceased. You will find little difficulty in reaching a conclusion as to all elements that make up the crime charged in the indictment except it might be as to one of sound memory and discretion; but that was only a technical expression for a responsible and sane man. He now approaches that difficult question. He had already said the man who is insane in the sense that makes him irresponsible and cannot commit crime. Defense of insanity has been so abused as to be brought into great discredit It was the last resort in cases of unquestioned guilt. It had been the excuse for juries bringing in verdicts of acquittal when there was public sympathy for the accused and especially where there was provocation for the homicide, according to public sentiment but not according to law. For that reason defense of insanity was difficult. It was sufficient to prove that the act was done by deliberate intent, as distinct from an act done under certain impulse in the heat of blood and with malice aforethought.

This is the closing part of Judge Cox's charge: Jury should bear in mind that the man had not become irresponsible by the mere fact of his being partially insane, as the law assumed every one at outset to be sane and responsible. The question was what was there in this case to show the contrary as to defendant?

The jury was not warranted in inferring the man was insane from the mere fact of his committing the crime, or from the enormity of the crime, because the law presumes there is bad motive, and that the crime is prompted by malice, if nothing else appears. He had dwelt upon the question of insane delusion, simply because the evidence relating to that was evidence touching defendant's power, or want of power (from mental disease) to distinguish between right or wrong. This was the broad question for the jury to determine and it was what was relied upon by the defense. The only safe rule was for the jury to direct its attention to one test of criminal responsibility, namely, whether the prisoner possessed mental capacity at the time the act was committed, to know that it was wrong or whether he was deprived of that capacity by mental disease. There was one important distinction which the jury must not lose sight of, and they must decide how far it was applicable to this case. That it is not a distinction between mental and moral obliquity, but, between mental incapacity to distinguish between right and wrong and moral insensibility.

The judge, in conclusion, said, and now gentlemen to sum up all, I have said to you if you find from the whole evidence that at the time of the commission of the homicide the prisoner was laboring under such defects of his reason that he was incapable of understanding what he was doing or of seeing it was the wrong thing to do, as for example, if he were under the insane delusion that the Almighty had commanded him to do the act, then he was not in a responsible condition of mind, but was an object of compassion and should be acquitted. If, on the other hand, you find that he was under no insane delusion, but had possession of his faculties and had power to know his act was wrong, and if of his own free will he deliberately conceived the idea and executed the homicide then, whether his motives were personal vindictiveness, political animosity, desire to avenge supposed political wrongs or morbid desire for notoriety, or if you are unable to discover any motive at all, your verdict should be guilty.

RENDERING THE VERDICT.

After the jury had been out about twenty minutes a recess was taken until 5:30. Many of the audience, who had virtually been imprisoned since 9:30 in the morning, availed themselves of the opportunity to obtain fresh air and lunch.

The prisoner at his request had been allowed, soon after the jury left the court room, to retire to a little room he has occupied since the trial began, as a waiting room. During the recess, before leaving the court room, he evinced considerable nervousness, but on getting away to comparative seclusion his usual composure and assurance soon returned to him. He sent out for some apples, with which he treated his attendants, meanwhile chatting familiarly and good naturedly. He was asked what he thought the jury would do, and replied, "I think they will acquit me or disagree, don't you?"

Within ten minutes after recess had been taken the jury called to the bailiffs that they were all ready with their verdict. They were informed a recess had been taken and Judge Cox had left the court room, so they remained in their room until court reassembled. A rumor that they had agreed was quickly spread from one to another and the excited crowd surged back into the court room and anxiously awaited what all seemed to expect, a verdict of guilty.

The room was devoid of gas, and a score or more candles which had been placed upon the desks of judge, counsel and reporters, imparted a wierd and fancifully unnatural aspect to the grim old place. Shadows thrown upon the dark back ground of the wall seemed like flittering spectres to usher in the sombre procession of those who held in their hands the destiny of human life. First came the prisoner with a quick nervous step and as he seated himself in the dock, perhaps for the last time, the light of a solitary candle fell full upon his face and disclosed its more than usual pallor. Not a tremor of limbs or the movement of the muscles of his face was observable as he threw back his head and fixed his gaze upon the door through which the jury were to enter.

The judge soon afterward took his seat. The crier called "Order!" and the jury at 5:35 filed solemnly into their seats. Every sound was hushed save the voice of the clerk as he propounded to the foreman the usual inquiry. Clear and distinct came the reply:

"We have."

"What is your verdict, guilty or not guilty?"

With equal distinctiveness came the reply: "Guilty as indicted."

The pent-up feelings of the crowd found expression in uproarious demonstrations of applause and approval. "Order," "order," shouted the bailiffs. Scoville and counsel for the prosecution were simultaneously upon their feet. Scoville attempted to address the court, but the district attorney shouted, "Wait till we have the verdict complete and in due form of law." Order was at length restored, and the clerk again addressing the jury, said:

"Your foreman says guilty as indicted. So say you all?"

"We do all," was responded.

Another demonstration of approval followed this announcement but not so prolonged as at first. Scoville, still upon his feet, demanded the poll of the jury, which was granted, and each juror was called by name and each in a firm voice promptly responded, GUILTY.

As the last name was called the prisoner shrieked: "My blood will be upon the heads of that jury. Don't you forget it."

Scoville again addressed the court, saying: "Your honor, I do not desire to forfeit any rights I have under the law and practice in the District. If there is anything that I ought now to do to save those rights, I would be indebted to your honor to indicate it to me."

Judge Cox in reply assured him he should have every opportunity. That the charge would be furnished him in print to-morrow, and he would be accorded all the time accorded by law within which to file his exceptions, and that he would also be entitled to four days within which to move in arrest of judgment.

Guiteau, who from the moment Judge Cox began delivering his charge, had dropped completely his air of flippant arrogance, and sat with rigid features and compressed lips, called out in tones of desperation:

"God will avenge this outrage."

Judge Cox then turned to the jury and said: "Gentlemen of the jury, I cannot express too many thanks for the manner in which you have discharged your duty. You have richly merited the thanks of your countrymen and I feel assured you will take with you to your homes the approval of your consciences. With thanks, gentlemen of the jury, I dismiss you."

With this announcement, the court was declared adjourned, and now the famous trial which has absorbed public interest and attention for more than ten weeks was ended. The crowd quickly left the court room, and the prisoner, gesticulating wildly with his manacled hands, was led out.

What Scoville Says.

Scoville said to-night the next move in the Guiteau case would be a motion for a new trial, which he expects to file Saturday. The main points on which it will be based are that the jury erred in rendering a verdict contrary to law, and they erred in rendering a verdict contrary to vidence. Judge Cox in his charge did not ebase it upon all the evidence, and the jury during trial read newspapers and had conversation with outside persons. Should motion be denied, an appeal will be taken to the court in banc. In referring to the verdict Scoville said after hearing Judge Cox's charge, he was not surprised that the jury rendered a verdict of guilty. He refrained, however, from passing a criticism upon Judge Cox's charge, further than to say he had not been accustomed to hear judges addressing a jury as Judge Cox did, but simply submitted written instructions. This too, upon law, bearing upon the case and not upon the evidence.

Judge Cox, Mr. Scovill thought, did not review the entire evidence given in the case, but only a portion of it.

Guiteau is said by some to have appeared the coolest person in the court room at the time the verdict was announced, but Scoville believes when the excitement attending the trial is over he will become a raving maniac.

Scoville does not talk to-night like a man who thinks his labor in the matter is at an end. There are good grounds, he says, for a new trial, and he proposes to show this from the record of the trial.

How the News Was Received.

CINCINNATI, Jan. 25.—The news of Guiteau's conviction calls out the liveliest expressions of gratification wherever it has been heard. "Thanks to the Deity," was the expression of one business man, when he heard the news. One strong sentiment of satisfaction was found in the promptness of the jury, and, as one man aptly said, this jury acquitted themselves.

CHICAGO, Jan. 26.—About the streets, to-night, the only comment upon the result of the Guiteau trial is an expression of gratification that the verdict was so sharp and prompt. There was very little surprise, and no indication of sympathy for the assassin.

The morning papers, without exception, take the ground that the liberal construction of the rights of Guiteau in the court room and the latitude allowed his counsel, have precluded the possibility of granting a new trial. Editorials also agree in applauding the verdict as just and in accordance with the evidence.

NEW YORK, Jan. 25.—People here are entirely satisfied with the verdict of the jury in the case of Guiteau. "So say we all of us," is the verdict returned by the people everywhere, according to the telegraph. There is general relief that the long trial is ended.

PITTSBURG, Jan. 25.—The news of Guiteau's conviction spread through the city like wild fire, and was received on all sides with satisfaction.

ON 'CHANGE IN CHICAGO.

Wheat and Other Grains Steady—Pork and Lard Advancing.

CHICAGO, Jan. 25.—The wheat market was purely and simply a speculative one. Prices were unsettled and the feeling was nervous and uncertain throughout. The board was full of rumors of corners, and the presence of one or two operators from abroad created unusual remark. The demand was active, and at each rally in prices there was a large offering. Receipts fell below the usual small quantity. The opening was ⅛@¼c lower than yesterday's prices, and declined ⅛c, rallied ⅛c, became weak under free offerings, declined 1¼, ruled strong, advancing 1⅛c and receding ⅛c, with some trifling fluctuations, and closed almost at the close of yesterday's figures. Sales, 1.34@1.35⅛ February; 1.35¼@1.36⅛ March and 1.38¼@1.39⅜ May. On call sales were less than half the usual amount and prices were a shade off.

Corn was more active than usual and prices took a considerable boom, the shorts vied with outside speculators in sending them up, and the anxious purchasers more than balanced the heavy offerings, and big receipts seemed to cut no figure. The advance was about ⅜@1c, and at the close ¼@1c above yesterday. Sales ranged at 60⅞@61½c February and 66⅜@67¼c May. Call was active but prices steady.

Oats steadily improved and closed firm with light trading and no novel features. Sales, 43⅜@43½c February and 45⅜@46c May.

The demand for mess pork was brisk and sales unusually heavy. Prices advanced 30 to 40c, and kept up pretty well under large offerings. Foreign advices strengthened the tone. Sales ranged at 18.27½@18.40 February and 18.41@18.70 March. On call sales were very heavy again and prices dropped a trifle. Lard followed pork, and, under active demand, sold up 10c@15c, and closed firm. Sales 11.30@11.40 February and 11.45@11.55 March.

Newspaper Gossip.

[Chicago Tribune, 24th.]

The board of trade was stirred up to an old-fashioned pitch of excitement yesterday—all on what turned out to be rumors. The flurry was in the wheat market, which advanced 3 cents from the latest prices Saturday. The market strengthened slowly early in the session, but the sudden jump skywards took place after 12 o'clock, when a report was circulated that a big house in New York had failed, and as a prominent local firm was known to have done formerly an extensive business with the Eastern concern the crowd, or rather an individual in it who appears to have possessed extraordinary ability in the way of finding out things, concluded that the house here was also involved, and giving the crowd the idea they added to it a tinge of plausibility because the local parties were supposed to be buying in a big line of short sales. The whole story proved to be a canard so far as the Chicago house is concerned, which has not been doing business with the Eastern concern named for some time back, and the Eastern failure also lacked confirmation.

"The boys merely thought," said a bystander, "that the New Yorker who had laid down was Mr. Smith the big speculator, while it was Mr. Smith the little speculator, or it was not one of the Smiths at all."

ALL AROUND THE GLOBE.

A dispatch from Rome reports Gen. Garibaldi suffering from bronchitis.

S. D. Miller & Sons knitting mill, Niebonville, N. Y., burned yesterday. Loss $30,000

The Carthage, Mo., woolen mill burned Tuesday night. Loss, $60,000; insurance, $12,000.

Conductor Hanford, of the wrecked train on the New York Central railroad, has been arrested.

The public school at Hartford, Connecticut burned yesterday morning. Loss $120,000; insurance $70,000.

Twenty-six new cases of small pox were reported to the Pittsburg and Alleghany boards of health yesterday.

Gov. Cornell has ordered an election on February 28, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Wagner.

John Cayle, jr., is to be hanged March 24 for the murder of Emily Meyers at Cayle's Ferry, Pa., last summer.

The postmaster at Gretz, Pa., having small pox, the sureties have been directed to move the office and effects to a safe place.

Rose Retyhetka, employed in the Cleveland Paper company's mills, accidentally fell into a vat of boiling water yesterday and was fatally scalded.

Four hundred lasters at Rochester, N. Y., struck yesterday for an advance of 25 per cent. in wages. Two thousand men are thrown out of employment.

An application for authority to commence a suit to annul the charter of the Manhattan railway company has been refused by the attorney general of New York.

The fire in Wentelmeyer's brewery, St. Louis, between 1 and 2 o'clock this morning was confined to the malt house, as predicted yesterday. Loss about $15,000; fully insured.

The one-fourth interest of John W. Pittock, deceased, in the Pittsburg *Evening* and *Sunday Leader* was sold at public auction yesterday for $5,500. The surviving partners were purchasers

A cablegram from Sir Henry Haiford announces that the British accept the American conditions for an international match at Wimbledon, but the return match must remain an open question.

The *Republique Francaise*, of Paris, says all the cabinet asks of the chamber is not to bar it from bringing the question of scruten de liste before congress, which may then finally decide the matter.

Yesterday morning fire originating on the roof of the jail and county building at Rock Island, burned part of that structure. Loss by fire and water used in extinguishing fire, $6,000 to $9,000, uninsured.

Constable Alf. Gee shot Dr. Muller, dentist, twice, at the town of Washington, Texas, near Brenham. Muller died yesterday morning. The parties had a difficulty two months ago. Gee was arrested at Dallas.

At Caldwell, Texas, Ben Hunt shot and killed Jas. A. Leach, merchant. Hunt surrendered. Leach was a man of family. It is charged he had seduced a relative of Hunt's, who had given birth to a child.

At St. Joseph, Mo., last night, in a drunken row at the World's hotel, James Lennox was struck on the head with a bottle and poker by Night Watchman Cohen, and received injuries from which he died. Lennox was a bricklayer. Cohen has decamped.

The pattern room of the Rooney machine shop, with its contents, at Athal, Mass., burned last night. Also, the lumber shop belonging to the Gold Medal sewing machine company, containing 160,000 feet of lumber. Loss, $100,000; partly insured.

The safe of Charles Hennebright, a wealthy farmer ten miles south of Akron, Ohio, was robbed of $120, Tuesday night, by four masked men, who also stole his team and wagon. One thousand five hundred dollars in another part of the house was not found.

Lafayette Bland, convicted of the murder of Dr. Cathey, near Alma, Ark., December 18, 1880, and sentenced yesterday to hang at Greenwood, January 27, had his sentence commuted to-day by the governor to imprisonment for twenty-one years in the penitentiary.

Chaffee, trustee and assignee of the A. & W. Sprague manufacturing company, received from William H. Hopkins and one hundred and fifty associates an offer of $2,600,000 for the entire property in his hands. He has accepted the offer, subject to the approval of the court.

James Minock, an old man living ten miles in the country from Detroit, yesterday killed his hired man, named James Carr. The parties were alone. Minock says he was stealing money from his room, and the latter attacked him with a knife and he killed him in self defense.

United States District Judge H. C. Caldwell threw a little white powder into the grate at his residence at Little Rock, Arkansas, yesterday, whereupon an explosion followed, throwing the judge across the room, tearing the flesh from his arms, wrecking the furniture, etc. The affair is mysterious.

A man named Floyd Whitney, was arrested at Detroit, Mich., last night, charged with murdering Warren Stafford, at Chatham, Tioga county, Pennsylvania, July 25, 1880. Whitney admits the killing but says it was done under great provocation, Stafford having, so he heard, brutally beaten his (Whitney's) wife.

Dionycio Garcio, mail messenger in the postoffice at Laredo, Texas, and Ferdinando Garcio, connected with the Laredo Times office, both belonging to highly respected families, were arrested night before last for robbing the mail. The robbery has been going on for six months, and some eight hundred letters are said to have been stolen since the first of December.

GOT TO FIGHT FOR IT.

The Omaha Company Not So Sure of Its Last Purchase.

[Special Telegram to the Globe.]

MADISON, Jan. 25.—A new syndicate backed by the Northern Pacific and Grand Trunk companies, has been formed to secure the land grant of the Portage & Superior. A. E. Elmore, E. W. Keyes, and Senator Burrows are in the scheme, and the object is to build a road from Sturgeon Bay to Superior City. It is now conceded that the Omaha company has got to fight for the grant, if that company ever gets it.

The Irish Question.

The people of St. Paul should not forget that on Saturday evening next Mr. John F, Finerty, an experienced journalist of Chicago, and a very pleasant public speaker, will speak at the opera house in regard to the deplorable condition of civil affairs in Ireland. It is not often that the people of St. Paul have an opportunity to hear a man talk upon this subject so capable of treating it in an intelligent, systematic, instructive a manner as is Mr. Finerty. The general subject is one that he has studied with great carefulness, and in a methodical manner. The result is that he speaks in regard to it in a style that is instructive as well as interesting.

The Land League.

There was a good meeting of the land league last evening, President MacCarthy in the chair. Treasurer Bell reported that he had remitted $200. The president read a communication from the Irish-American national executive committee relative to the Grattan centennial, which occurs on the 22d of February and on motion it was unanimously decided to celebrate the day in St. Paul. The following committee of arrangements was appointed: Wm. L. Kelly, John Bell, J. J. Kennedy, R. J. Markoe and John F. Hanley. The land league proposes to make the celebration thoroughly Irish and American.

OVER THE OCEAN.

GREAT BRITAIN.

DILLON ILL.

LONDON, Jan. 24.—A dispatch from Dublin reports that Dillon is very ill.

FUGITIVE ARRESTED.

Flemming, one of the directors of the City of Glasgow bank, who evaded arrest at the trial of his colleagues, and who recently returned to England from America, has been arrested,

REFUSED.

DUBLIN, Jan. 24.—Lord Lieutenant Cooper has refused to permit the presentation of the freedom of the city to Parnell and Dillon, now in Kilmainham jail.

FRANCE.

LONDON, Jan. 24. A Paris dispatch announces that urgency has been voted for the debate in the chamber of deputies on the report of the committee on bills for revision of constitution. Special correspondents agree in saying it is generally believed a fall of the ministry is certain. The report of the committee on a revision of the bill states that on the scrutin de liste question the will of one person seemed to be substitnted for that of the nation.

FAILED.

Jules Orbib of Marseilles and Paris failed. Liabilities are estimated at 250,000 francs. Transactions chiefly with the levant Bavarian.

PARIS, Jan. 24.—The government has resolved to make the adoption of the revision bill entirely a cabinet question. If the ministry is defeated, it is stated Gambetta will resume his seat as a deputy and defend a number of bills drafted by him since accession to office.

Sixteen persons have been killed by the explosion of a dynamite factory at Port Vendres.

GERMANY.

AUTOCRATIC BISMARCK.

BERLIN, Jan. 24.—In the Reichstag during debate on the Budget to-day a discussion arose concerning the late imperial rescript. Bismarck said he did not aim at a new constitution. The maxim, "The King Reigns, but does Not Govern," did not apply to Germany. The expression, "ministerial responsibility" was equally absurd. He declared the rescript remained unshaken by attacks upon it. He was fully aware of his responsibility in signing it, and was aware also for all the acts of the sovereign. It was to the sovereign, he said, and not to the parliament of Germany, he owes the position he enjoyed. Bismarck asserted a doubt whether anyone could reproach him with cowardice. There was a great uproar on the Left, Bismarck stepped forward and repeated his inquiry, saying: "Is there any one among you who dares bring such a charge?"

Bismarck's speech created great excitement. It was an emphatic reassertion of the doctrines of the imperial rescript as to the relations between the Prussian king and the people a direct challenge to the reichstag and very aggressive in tone. It caused a tremenduous uproar in the house, although otherwise it made a favorable impression.

GENERAL FOREIGN.

SENTENCE OF CONSPIRATORS.

ST. PETERSBURG, Jan. 25.—The assistant commandant at St. Petersburg announces that the sentence of twenty years hard labor passed upon Melnikoff, the accomplice of Sandowski in the attempt on the life of Gen. Tchererein, has been confirmed, but in consideration of the fact that Sankowski petitioned for mercy and has not been proved to belong to any secret society, his sentence of death has been commuted to hard labor in the mines for an indefinite period.

LONDON, Jan. 25.—The *Times*, in its financial article, says: In spite of government and private a