PLEADING FOR GUITEAU.

Mr. SCOVILLE'S SPEECH TO THE JURY NOT YET CONCLUDED.

Guiteau Renews his Request to be Permitted to Address the Jury. Mr. Scoville Points Out What he Regards as the Real Defence.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 17.—In spite of the very inclement weather this morning, the court room contained its usual crowd of spectators, the ladies being largely in the majority. The prisoner sat quietly in the dock for some minutes before Mr. Scoville rose to proceed with his argument, the prisoner reminded him that he (Guiteau) was to address the Court, and Mr. Scoville yielded the floor for that purpose. The prisoner then began to read, in a very pretentious oratorical style, the following statement:

"I intend no disrespect to this honorable Court. I desire no controversy with this honorable Court. In general I am satisfied with the law as proposed by your Honor. But I have a still broader view of the law, which I ask your Honor to follow, to wit, that if the jury believe that I believed that it was right for me to remove the President because I had special Divine authority so to do, and was forced to it by the Deity, they will acquit me on the ground of transitory mania. Sickles, MacFarland, and Hancock (meaning Cole) were acquitted on the ground of transitory mania. In my speech, published yesterday in all the leading newspapers of the country, and which, I presume, your Honor has read, I gave my reasons for asking your Honor so to charge. Mr. Reed made a brilliant and lawyerlike plea for the defence; and Mr. Scoville is making a strong argument on his theory. But neither Mr. Reed nor Mr. Scoville represents me in this defence. I am here as my own counsel, and have been from the beginning. No one represents me to this jury. I know the feelings and inspirations in removing the President, and I have set it forth in my speech yesterday and I ask your Honor in the name of justice, in the name of the American judiciary, in the name of the American people, to allow me to address that jury of my country as a man in a case where my life may be at stake. If a man upon that jury has a doubt as to his duty to acquit me, my speech will probably settle it in my favor. Therefore, in the interest of justice, it is of the greatest importance that the jury should hear me in my defence."

Judge COX—I will take the matter into consideration.

The Prisoner—Thank you, sir.

Mr. Scoville then proceeded with his argument. He criticised very severely the conduct of the District Attorney in sending experts to the jail not to ascertain the real mental condition of the prisoner, and which was done in the 24 of July, but to make up a case for the Government. He complained that the District Attorney had suppressed all evidence of the state of the prisoner's mind for the first two weeks after his incarceration.

Mr. Davidge, Attorney, denied this and read the Attorney's letter to Dr. Spitzka, and that gentleman had made an examination of the prisoner at the request of the Government, and had sought by friends to bring Dr. Spitzka and co-worker with the office of his opinion, namely, scientific statements, that he was not a fit subject for the gallows, rather than a fit subject. Referring to the distinction between sane and insane delusions, as laid down by some of the experts, he illustrated the subject by the case of Mrs. Mary Lincoln, Guiteau's kinsfolk, and the case of the evil, H. Luther, who he thought he saw the evil, had summoned his familiars, and realized that it could not be done than would have been done delusions, he was unable to do that. It was an insane delusion. Speaking of the insane delusion of Luther, he stand Detective Dedrick, who accompanied the prisoner to the jail on July 2, and to the subsequent observations of the District Attorney to the effect that Guiteau had said that while setting fire to the jail, of the case might be construed to the effect of insanity contrary to the rules of eternal justice. The same objection had been made to the defense examining Dr. McFarland and the insanity of Luther W. Guiteau, and Clark Mills, which had been admitted in evidence. He (Scoville) and those associations by the prosecution he did not want to hear any more from them as to their disposition to give the prisoner a fair and impartial trial. So too, with the refusal of the prosecution to allow him to put to Dr. Board the hypothetical question, and referred to the fact that the prisoner's mind was clear, so as to permit a conversation with photographs taken of him years previously. He also commented on