GUITEAU'S NEW COUNSEL.

EX-DISTRICT ATTORNEY REED OF CHICAGO JOINS MR. SCOVILLE.

Two More Experts Testifying that They Have Examined the Assassin and Found him Sane—Guiteau's Argument to Show he was Insane when he Shot the President.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 23.—The approach of the Christmas holidays is not without its effect upon the attendance at the Guiteau trial. There was this morning none of the rush for seats that has been usual, and though the court room was well filled, there were no persons obliged to stand in the aisles. No sooner had the prisoner been brought in than he broke out with:

"It is said that I have been abusing Mr. Scoville. Now, the fact of the matter is I want to make a speech about that. Scoville is doing very well in this case considering his theory, but he is not a criminal lawyer. He is a fine examiner of titles. He can tell you all about your abstracts of titles. He is a good fellow and a first-class examiner of titles, but I cannot have Mr. Scoville here compromising my case. There is no lawyer in this court room but knows he has asked questions for the defence which have been a positive injury to the defence. I cannot sit here when my life is at stake and have him compromise my case in this way. My friend Charles H. Reed, who was for twelve years District Attorney at Chicago, and a first-class lawyer, has very kindly consented to assume the charge of this case, and I introduce him to your Honor, the jury, and the American people. He is a good fellow. Scoville is a good fellow, too, and I want him to continue in the case and help in every way."

Mr. Scoville said that he had endeavored, as the Court knew, to obtain such assistance in the case as would be appropriate. He had had an intimation that Mr. John D. Townsend of New York would assist after the case had been in progress two or three weeks. On the Monday evening after he received that information, he telegraphed to Mr. Townsend, and Mr. Townsend sent a reply by telegram the same evening saying he would come on Wednesday. That reply, however, for some reason or other, was not delivered until Thursday noon, and he had therefore applied to Mr. Reed to assist him in the expert part of the case. Mr. Reed kindly consented to do so, and on the same evening met with the experts. Mr. Townsend, having received no notification from him had made other arrangements. A few days afterward, knowing Mr. Reed's reluctance to appear as counsel on the case after having testified as a witness, he again applied to Mr. Townsend, but he had made other arrangements, and it was impossible for him to come. Then he went back to Mr. Reed and urged him to help in the case. Mr. Reed had consented to do so, and to appear openly in the case, provided the Court should consider that it was not inconsistent with the fact of his having appeared as a witness.

Mr. Porter—I must strenuously object to the Court being called upon to decide questions that are not before it. Counsel has no right to ask a stipulation from the Court that a certain condition of things shall exist, merely what Mr. Scoville has stated of the difficulties under which he has laboured; but I think it would be entirely inappropriate for the Court to express an opinion on this subject. However, I will relieve my friend by saying that on the part of the Government there will not be any objection, and I express no opinion on the action which shall be taken by his associate.

Judge Cox—I think that that will be satisfactory to Mr. Reed, without any expression of opinion on the part of the Court. I should have no objection, however, to express my opinion.

District Attorney Corkhill—Mr. Reed has been here all the time, assisting in the defence.

Mr. Reed—That is not true, Mr. Corkhill.

Mr. Corkhill—He has been here in attendance, advising Mr. Scoville all the time, and it is a perfect farce now to talk about it.

Mr. Scoville—I have had assistance from many professional gentlemen. Mr. Reed among others.

Mr. Corkhill—Mr. Reed has not been outside of the court room during the trial.

Mr. Reed—That is not true, Mr. Corkhill.

The Prisoner—Corkhill cannot tell the truth, so do not count on him.

Mr. Davidge—I wish to say that neither the section of the Court, nor of that side, nor of this side, will have any confidence whatever with me in making just such strictures of Mr. Reed in this case, down to the present time, as in my judgment may be proper.

The Prisoner—that is right, Judge. You argue my case.

Judge Cox—I have said privately that I did not see any impropriety in Mr Reed taking the place he is now doing but only as a witness, I think that he is at liberty to take part as counsel if he desires it.

Mr. Corkhill—Now we have our own right to criticise it.

Judge Cox—Certainly.

Mr. Davidge—I shall not criticise the propriety or impropriety of Mr. Reed's assuming openly the part of counsel, but will be obliged to him if he will make a fair subject for comment and criticism before this jury.

This question having been disposed of, and it being understood that Mr. Reed was henceforth to be recognized as one of the counsel for the defence, the case was proceeded with. Mr. Scoville read the letter of Dr. Spitzka of Boston, who testified for the prosecution, in which the Doctor wrote to Mr. Scoville that, from what he had heard, he believed Guiteau was insane and should be sent to an asylum. Mr. Scoville also called attention to the letter from Dr. Spitzka, to which the prisoner alluded yesterday. It was but just to say that the letter was addressed to him (Scoville), and not to the prisoner.

The prisoner broke in violently:

There is a vast amount of rubbish getting into this case which has nothing whatever to do with it. Can these experts tell the condition of my mind on July 2 and for thirty days previous? What is evidence of the condition of the organs of that jury or in his Honor's mind? That would be pertinent. All this rubbish about whether I am insane now is not pertinent. It will probably save me from a good deal of hanging, and I hope it will be the means of God to straighten this case it it has to take one of these jurymen off that panel. One of the jury has left his wife, and I am sorry for it. I do not want to be as hard on those jurymen as I was at first, but I do, and I can't get justice in any other way. God knows that I would not have shot the President if He had not told me to. This rubbish disgusts me. It is enough to make any man mad.

William A. Edwards of Brooklyn was called, and was greeted by the prisoner with:

"This is a clerk Shaw used to have in his office ten years ago. I have not seen the fellow since."

The witness testified that he had known the prisoner from October, 1871, to April, 1872, and had seen him every day. He heard the conversation to which Mr. Shaw testified, in which Guiteau spoke of inditing Wilkes Booth. He heard them talk about President Lincoln. The prisoner said to Mr. Shaw: "Well, what about Booth? Booth's name will be notorious as long as Lincoln's," Shaw said: "Yes, notorious, but in what way? Lincoln, a statesman and patriot; Booth, an assassin." The prisoner said that he would be notorious, too. Mr. Shaw said: "What you are notorious in that way you will be hanged." Guiteau said: "I don't know about that." The witness was cross-examined by Col. Reed, with frequent interruptions and sneering comments by the prosecuting attorney.

"I would suggest to your Honor," said Col. Reed finally, "that when we are cross-examining a witness the counsel upon the other side shall keep quiet, unless objectionable questions are asked."

Judge Cox fully coincided in this opinion, and Col. Reed resumed. The witness acknowledged that the talk of Guiteau about Booth made no impression upon him at the time, because the prisoner said so many queer things. He thought at that time the prisoner was the last man in the world who would do an act that would involve any personal danger to himself.

In the course of the examination the witness made some remark to which the prisoner took exception, and caused some laughter by his comment. Mr. Scoville tried to quiet him, but received the reply:

"Keep quiet and mind your business: I will take my chance of getting a lunch on him."

Then the prisoner began to interrupt the examination generally.

"This whole thing is an absolute lie," he declared excitedly. "What is the use of wasting any time. My counsel are too serious about this matter. The whole thing is a lie. Call things by their right names. The Court ought to kick the man out. We are making fun much of him. Give him a kick and let him go."

These remarks, interpreted at various points in the testimony, gave rise to a good deal of noise and confusion, which was increased by the sharp disputes between counsel.

The next witness was Dr. S. H. Talcott of Middletown, N. Y. As soon as he came to the stand the prisoner exclaimed:

"This man is going to tell you how far my free agency was destroyed on the 21 of July last (ironically). He will tell you all about it."

The witness said he had made a special study of insanity for about seven years. He is Medical Superintendent of the State Homœopathic Asylum for the Insane at Middletown. He had treated over a thousand cases of insanity. He had had some patients who had committed murder under the insane delusion that they had instructions from the Lord. The characteristics of such persons were those of great excitability. Those whom he had charged of had not only insane delusions, but also had delusions of sight and hearing, and they based their arguments before delusions upon their murderous work. He made examinations of the prisoner on the 30th of November and 4th of December. He had been present in court at the trial since the 25th of November, heard the testimony of the prisoner, and watched his movements and noted his demeanor.

The witness then gave an opinion that the prisoner was sane at the time he shot the President, and was so at the time of the trial. He was asked to state the grounds of his opinion, and in answer to the question he said that the prisoner was sane at the time of the shooting because he was able to distinguish between right and wrong. He was able to distinguish between right and wrong at the time of the trial, because he was able to recognize the relations of the different persons in the court room, to understand the charge against him, and to understand his own position. He was able to recognize the relations of the different persons in the court room, to understand the charge against him, and to understand his own position. He was able to distinguish between right and wrong at the time of the trial, because he