ATHLETICS.

FIXTURES.

Dec. 4..Seventh Regiment Athletic Association, Winter Games, at their Armory.
Dec. 11..Prospect Harriers, Moonlight Run.
Dec. 25..Spartan Harriers, Paperchase, from Nyack, N. Y.
Dec. 25..West Side Athletic Club, 'Cross-Country Run.
Dec. 25..Prospect Harriers, Paperchase.

1887.

Jan. 1..Spartan Harriers, Club Championship 'Cross-Country Run.
Jan. 22..Company B, 22d Regiment, N.G.S.N.Y., Open Amateur Games, at their Armory, 14th Street, near 6th Avenue, New York City.
Feb. 26..American Athletic Club, Third Annual Gymnastic Competition for the Amateur Championship of America, at Tammany Hall, New York City.

THE TRIAL OF MALCOLM W. FORD.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Walton Storm, President of the National Association of Amateur Athletes of America, we are able to publish the official stenographer's report of the proceedings before the Sub-Committee, Nov 29.

In the matter of the investigation of the amateur standing of MALCOLM W. FORD, *by the National Association of Amateur Athletes of America, on charges preferred by the Brooklyn Athletic Association.*

NEW YORK, Nov. 29, 1886, 8 P. M.

Hearing before the Sub-Committee, Messrs. Rowland and Sullivan.

Present: Mr. Storm, President of the National Association, as counsel for the prosecution; Messrs. Meeker and Smith for the defense.

It is admitted that the charges have been made, and the Committee regularly appointed.

Mr. Meeker asks Mr. Storm if he prefers the charges upon actual knowledge, or upon information and belief.

Mr. Storm replies that he presents the evidence as it is submitted to him.

Mr. Meeker asks the Committee to discharge Mr. Ford on the ground that the charges preferred are preferred on information and belief.

Mr. Storm: Mr. President, I would state that the charge has been preferred, and the evidence will be presented on behalf of the Brooklyn Athletic Association, and it is then for you to decide whether the charges are good or not.

Mr. Meeker: Mr. Chairman, I object to the trial of any man in a case of this importance when the charge is preferred on information and belief, and not on positive knowledge, and, therefore, I ask you to acquit Mr. Ford now, because there is no one here who can prefer charges, except upon information and belief.

Motion denied. Exception.

E. W. JOHNSON, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

Examined by Mr. Storm.

Q. Where do you reside, Mr. Johnson? A. At present in Brooklyn.
Q. What is your business? A. I am a professional athlete.
Q. Do you know Malcom W. Ford? A. Yes, sir.
Q. How long have you known him? A. Upwards of ten years.
Q. Did you, Mr. Johnson, prior to the 5th day of July, 1886, have any conversations with Mr. Ford in regard to his competing in professional games at Springfield, Mass., on the 5th day of July? A. Yes.
Q. Will you please state to the committee what those conversations were—the substance of them? A. Some time before the Fourth of July, probably two weeks. Mr. Ford spoke of going to Springfield games, I told him that they were professional games. Well, he seemed to make up his mind to go any way, and to the best of my knowledge he went.
Q. Did he, Mr. Johnson, have any conversation with you in regard to you and he not competing at the same games or going to the same place? A. Yes; I told him that I would not go to Springfield; that I would go to Hudson County; that is, in Jersey City. I didn't care to go to compete where he was competing.
Q. Did he ask you to make for him or to obtain for him a set of professional running clothes? A. I told him that I would get him a pair of nippers, or trunks—professional trunks.

Mr. Meeker: That is not the question that was asked.

(*Question repeated.*) A. *No. He asked me for a pair of trunks.* I told him that I would get them.

Q. Did you obtain for him or make for him a pair of professional tights or running trunks? A. I did.
Q. What was the color of those? A. Well, they were inclined to be of a reddish color—a pinkish red. I cannot describe the color exactly, but it was of that color anyway.
Q. To your knowledge, Mr. Johnson, was Mr. Ford in Brooklyn on the 4th, 5th, or 6th days of July, 1886?

Objected to on the ground that it is claimed that he was in Springfield on the Fourth, and it is now asked if he was in Brooklyn.

Objection overruled.

A. Mr Ford was in Brooklyn on the 4th day of July. That was Sunday, I believe.

Q. But you don't know that he was there on the 5th and the 6th, to your own knowledge? A. Not to my own knowledge. I was not there. He was not there on the night of the 5th, because I got back from Hudson County then.

Q. Mr. Johnson, did you after the 5th day of July have any conversations with Mr. Ford in regard to his having competed at Springfield, Mass., on the 5th day of July, and if so, what were those conversations?

Objected to.

Mr. Storm: Mr. Chairman, I claim that any admissions made by Mr. Ford in regard to what Mr. Ford did at the time we claim is admissible evidence. We claim that Mr. Ford did come back from Springfield and did admit to this witness certain facts. Now we claim, if Mr. Ford admitted those facts to this witness, that it is admissible evidence. I do not claim it would be admissible evidence if Mr. Johnson was told by anyone else what Mr. Ford had had done, but that what Mr. Ford said himself is evidence.

Objection overruled.

A. I did. I asked him how he did. He said that he didn't do as well as he expected, because the events on the programme that he expected were not all down. He also said that he had won the running high leap and took the second place in the 100-yard dash.

Q. Did he say anything further about his having been there or about his having competed at those games? A. Not in regard to competing. There was some other conversation occurred about the time.

Q. Mr. Johnson, you are the trainer for the Brooklyn Athletic Association, are you not? A. I am.
Q. As such you have known Mr. Ford as a competitor there and as a man who practised at the grounds? A. Yes.
Q. You are familiar with Mr. Ford's running costume, his shoes, and the like of that? A. Yes
Q. I would further ask you, Mr. Johnson, did Mr. Ford always use the same kind of shoes in all competions, in all events? A. No, he had a different shoe pretty much for every event, but they were all made, I should judge, by the same maker. The running shoe was a little different from the leaping shoe.
Q. Was his jumping or leaping shoe, as you call it, any different in its construction from his ordinary running shoe? and if it was peculiar in any respect, what was it? A. Oh, yes. In his general-purpose shoe, as I would call it, there was a strap—I suppose that he put it on himself—a strap from the heel, running out under the sole to the second sole or fore-sole.
Q. Mr. Johnson, I show you a running shoe here (producing shoe). Is that a shoe that you can say was one of Mr. Ford's shoes? A. Yes. That is one of his shoes.
Q. That piece that you refer to on there, is this the usual piece that was on? A. Well, the shoes that he has been using of late, they had more of a run up here; ran up rather to this first sole.
Q. Will you take a pencil, please, and mark on that shoe how the piece ran? A. (marking the shoe) It was run up about as far as that.

Mr. Storm: Mr. Chairman, we offer that shoe in evidence, as showing that this piece was on the usual shoe used by Mr. Ford in jumping.

Mr. Meeker: We object to that. We admit that this is a shoe that might be like Mr. Ford's, but not that it is his shoe.

Q. Mr. Johnson, did you subsequent to the 5th July, 1886, go to Springfield, Mass.? A. Yes. I went up there.
Q. Did you go to any hotel by the name of the Pychon House? A. Now the American House; I did.
Q. Did you see that piece cut from the hotel register (producing a slip of paper)? A. Yes sir.
Q. Did you see that piece cut from the hotel register (showing witness another slip of pape)? A. I did.
Q. It was cut from the hotel register in your presence? A. In my presence.

Mr Meeker: I object to you showing the papers to the witness, as not revelant to the case.

Mr Storm: The papers have not been offered as yet in evidence. I simply ask the witness to identify the paper.

Mr. Meeker: I object to the witness testifying on that point at all. For the sake of saving unnecessary delay, we will admit that Mr. Ford was in Springfield on the 5th day of July, 1886, but we decline to admit that evidence.

Cross-examination by Mr. Meeker:

Q. Mr. Johnson, you are a professional athlete? A. I [illegible] professional athlete, yes, sir.
Q. Did you ever see Mr. Ford compete in any pro[illegible] A. I did not.
Q. Were you at Springfield on the 5th of July, [illegible]
Q. Do you know anybody who was there?

Objected to. Withdrawn.

Q. You know Mr. Ford personally, of [illegible]
Q. Did you ever quarrel with him [illegible]
Q. Have any dispute? A. Yes [illegible]
Q. Are you on good terms w[illegible]
Q. Did you recognize him [illegible] recognized him on the stre[illegible]
Q. Did you shake hands [illegible]
Q. You are on good terms [illegible]
Q. To the best of your [illegible] field July 5, 1886? Do you [illegible]

SAMUEL MCLEAN, a wit[illegible] been duly sworn, test[illegible]

Examined by Mr. [illegible]
Q. Mr McLean [illegible]
Q. What is you[illegible]
Q. You are a [illegible]
Q. Were yo[illegible] A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did y[illegible] on that [illegible] Park
Q. Do [illegible]

les 1, 2, 3.
R PAIR.
& BY
MAN & BRO
St., NEW YORK
F.
Lirly

Q. When did you first meet him? A. At Springfield.
Q. When? A. July 5, 1886
Q. Where? A. Hampden Park.
Q. Were you there introduced to him? A. No, not introduced to him.
Q. How do you know that you met Mr. Ford at that time? A. Well, Mr. Ross told me it was Mr. Ford.

Objected to on the ground that the witness does not know of his own knowledge.

Q. Did you see there a man compete under the name of T. Williams? A. Yes, sir.
Q. You saw that man compete in the professional races? A. Yes, sir.
Q. What races did he compete in, that you, of your own knowledge, saw him? A. He competed in the running high jump and in the hundred yards dash.
Q. Mr. McLean, I will ask you did you notice anything peculiar about the running shoes and costume of this man T. Williams?

Objected to.

Mr. Storm: By this witness I can prove, I think, that this man who was there entered as T. Williams, had certain peculiar shoes and a certain peculiar costume, and I think that later on I will prove that Mr. Ford had those very same articles. That is my object in asking the question

Mr. Meeker: I don't see that that will prove anything, Mr. Chairman; anybody can assume Mr. Ford's costume, and it is very natural that any athlete might adopt the same shoes or clothes that he did. He may have found some particular shoe that was very good for him, and he used that shoe, and it is very natural that any other man in the same line of business or sport might use the same shoe. That don't prove anything. It is a question of identity whether Mr. Ford was at Springfield, or not, and competed, or not. That is the question before this organization. If he was there to compete he is guilty, if he was there as a spectator he is not guilty. We claim he was there as a spectator. The only thing before this committee is to prove if he was there and competed. I object to the introduction of any testimony as to the peculiar shoe or costume or anything else. I might wear the same underclothes as you do, and this gentleman might undertake to prove that I was guilty of a murder because I wore the same underclothes as the man who committed the murder.

Question withdrawn.

Q. Mr. McLean, were you ever, subsequent to the fifth day of July, 1886, introduced to Mr. Ford? A. Yes, sir.
Q. Where, when, and by whom? A. I was at Boston, Mass., at Oak Island, on the 26th or 27th of Aug.; I ain't positive, at the Caledonian games. Introduced to Mr. Ford by Mr. Johnson.
Q. These were professional games? A. Yes, sir.
Q. What was Mr. Ford doing there at that time? A. The games were about to open; he was standing on the field.
Q. Will you state what happened when you were introduced to Mr. Ford? A. I spoke to Mr. Ford. Mr. Johnson introduced me to Mr. Ford. I said, "Hello, Mr. Williams." I knew the man as T. Williams, who competed in Springfield. I spoke to him as Williams.
Q. What did he say, if anything? A. He didn't say nothing.
Q. What did he do then? A. He smiled.
Q. Did you have any further conversation with him on that day? A. Nothing further than that I asked him if he should ever compete at professional games after that.
Q. What was his reply? A. He said he never should.
Q. Mr. McLean, would you know Mr. Ford if you saw him now? A. Yes, sir.
Q. Will you please point Mr. Ford out to the Committee? A. This is the gentleman, here (pointing to Mr. Ford).
Q. Do you swear, Mr. McLean, that this is the gentleman who, under the name of T. Williams, at Springfield, on the 5th day of July, competed at the professional games? A. Yes, sir; that is the man.

Cross-examination by Mr Meeker:

Q. Mr. McLean, you live in Massachusetts? A. Yes, sir.
Q. You attended the games at Springfield? A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did you compete there? A. Yes, sir.
Q. In what races? A. I was in the shot competition and hammer competition.
Q. Not in the running races? A. No, sir.
Q. Did you see Mr. Ford there? A. Yes, sir; I saw this Williams.
Q. You saw Williams? A. Yes, sir.
Q. You recognized Williams as Ford? A. Yes, sir.
Q. You saw him there at Springfield? A. Yes, sir.
Q. Saw him compete? A. Yes, sir.
Q. In what race? A. In the running high jump and in the 100-yard dash
Q. You swear positively that you saw him there and saw him compete? A. Yes, sir.
Q. For a money prize? A. For a money prize.
Q. Did you ever see Mr. Ford before you met him at Springfield? A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. You are not sure; you might be mistaken in Mr. Ford? A. No; I'm not mistaken at all.
Q. Would you know a man whom you saw in running clothes? A. O, I took particular notice of the gentleman.
Q. Why? A. Because I was told he was Mr. Ford.
Q. Did you believe it? A. Yes; I did.
Q. You thought he was Ford? A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever compete outside of Springfield anywhere? A. Yes, sir.
Q. Whereabouts? A. Competed in New York City.
Q. That is all? A. No; I competed in Albany.
Q. Anywhere else? A. Several places.

Mr. Storm: I object to this. I don't see what this has got to do with whether Mr. Ford competed at Springfield or not.

Mr. Meeker: I want to prove that this witness is not worthy of belief.

Q. Did you ever compete at Philadelphia? A. I did: yes, sir.
Q. You didn't say anything about that before? A. I have competed in several places

Mr. Storm: It is immaterial where this gentleman has competed. He swears he competed at Springfield on that day, and that he recognized that Mr. Ford is the man who competed under the name of T. Williams.

Mr. Meeker: Mr. Chairman: The credibility of any witness is always a question before the Court. He said he competed in New York, and wanted to stop there. It turns out he competed at a number of other places.

The Chairman: I don't see that it is necessary to know where he competed.

Q. You met Mr. Ford at Oak Island, you say? A. Yes, sir.
Q. You spoke to him? A. Yes, sir.
Q. And he didn't say anything? A. He shook hands with me.
Q. What did he say? A. Mr. Johnson introduced him to me as Mr. Ford and I said, "Hello, Mr. Williams."
Q. Did you address him as Mr. Williams when you approached him? A. I said, "Hello, Mr. Williams."
Q. What did he say? A. He didn't say anything.
Q. Simply looked away and laughed and went about his business? A. That is about all he did.
Q. Did you meet Mr. Ford in Philadelphia when you competed there? A. Not that I remember.
Q. You don't remember it? A. No.
Q. Wasn't Mr. Ford a judge there? A. I remember him being a judge in New York.
Q. Don't you remember his being a judge in Philadelphia when you competed there? A. Actually I don't remember.
Q. Did you ever meet him in New York when you competed here? A. As a judge; yes, sir.
Q. And you remember him as Mr. T. Williams at Springfield? A. Yes, sir.
Q. Didn't you know he was Mr. Ford? A. I didn't know that he was Mr. Ford at that time.
Q. Did you tell any body he was Mr. Ford? A. Yes, sir; I did.
Q. Whom did you tell? A. Mr. Akin, from Providence.
Q. Tommy Akin, as they call him? A. Yes, sir
Q. Whom else did you tell? A. That is the only party.
Q. Did you go around and bet any money on him? A. No, sir.
Q. Why not? A. Because I ain't a betting man.
Q. Did you know it was against the rules of the Caledonian games for a man to compete under an assumed name?

Mr. Storm objects to the counsel trying to discredit the witness by his own testimony.

Mr. Meeker: I am not trying to discredit him now. I am asking him simple questions.

Q. Did you know it was against the rules of the Caledonian games for a man to compete under an assumed name? A. Yes, sir.
Q. Why didn't you protest Mr. Ford? A. Because I didn't consider that I should do it.
Q. You are not a Caledonian? A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you wanted your Association to live, and yet you didn't make any protest? A. No, sir.
Q. You let Mr. Ford run and let your friends be beaten? A. I didn't want to butcher Mr. Ford.

By the Chairman:

Q. How do you know that the T. Williams that you saw at Springfield was the Ford you now see? A. Because I particularly recognized him when I seen him at Oak Island at the Caledonian Games.
Q. Did you recognize the Mr. Ford that you see now, at Springfield? A. I did.

By Mr. Smith:

Q. Did you see Mr. Ford there in his running costume? A. At Springfield I seen him in his running costume.

By Mr. Meeker:

Q. Did you see Mr. Ford before 1885, or 1886, at Springfield? A. No, sir; I don't think I did. I might see him, but not to know him.
Q. Do you swear positively before these gentlemen that you saw him at Springfield; saw him compete in the 100-yard race? A. And in the high jump; yes, sir.
Q. You swear positively that you saw the gentleman? A. Yes, sir.

By the Chairman:

Q. When this man, Williams, or Ford, came out, how did you know it was Ford? Had you ever seen his picture in the paper? A. Yes, sir; in several papers.
Q. Did you recognize him from his picture, or did somebody tell you it was Ford? A. I never thought of his picture when I seen the man, but afterwards I compared his appearance with the picture.
Q. Did you know it was Ford from his appearance, or did somebody tell you it was Ford? A. Mr. Ross told me it was Ford.

Mr. Meeker: He told me on the cross-examination that he knew him.

The witness: I knew him after that.

By the Chairman:

Q. How did Ross come to tell you it was Ford? A. He was lying on the grass in Springfield, Mr. Ford was, near where the competition was to take place, back of the grand stand, or at least of the judges' stand; Mr. Ford was lying on the grass, and I was walking across the field with Mr. Ross, and asked him, "I wonder who that fellow is who is lying on the grass?" He says, "Don't say nothing; that is Mr. Ford, the amateur athlete."
Q. What did he tell you that for? A. I couldn't tell you that.
Q. Did you ever see the man that ran under the name of T. Williams compete at any of the Caledonian Games before? A. No sir.
Q. Or have you since? A. No, sir.
Q. Before or since, at the Springfield Caledonian Games? A. No, sir.

By Mr. Meeker:

Q. Will you tell me how Mr. Ford was dressed at Springfield? A. Yes, sir; he had on dark underclothes.
Q. What do you mean? A. I mean his drawers and shirt—a drab color: and he had on pink trunks.
Q. We cannot reconcile that exactly. He had on pink drawers? A. I call them trunks.
Q. He had on dark drawers and pink slingers; what kind of a shirt?
A. A shirt similar to his drawers.
Q. And did anybody ever tell you who Mr. Ford was, except Ross?
A. Not on that day.
Q. Nobody; and the first introduction you had to Mr. Ford, his personal appearance and face, was from Mr. Ross, who told you: "That is Malcolm Ford, the amateur athlete;" and that is the only knowledge you had about it? A. At that time.
Q. You didn't remember him as the man you had seen at Philadelphia?
A. I didn't see him at Philadelphia.
Q. He was a judge at Philadelphia? A. After that.
Q. Not before? A. I never was in Philadelphia the year before.
Q. You didn't remember him at Springfield, except from what Mr. Ross told you? A. No, I never took no knowledge before.

By Mr. Storm:

Q. Do you swear that the man whom you saw that day compete as T. Williams at the Springfield games, in Massachusetts, on the fifth day of July, is Mr. Ford, who is now sitting there? A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Meeker:

Q. Do you know Mr. Mahony, of Fall River? A. No, sir.
Q. Do you know Mr. Harriman? A. No, sir.
Q. Don't know any of the professional athletes of Massachusetts? A. No, sir.
Q. Do you know Dufur, the wrestler? A. No, sir.
Q. Work at your trade or some business? A. Yes, sir.
Q. But you swear positively here that all you know about Mr. Ford is what Mr. Ross told you, and you would not know who in the world Mr. Ford was at Springfield, unless he, Mr. Ross, had told you?

Objected to.

Mr. Meeker: He swore that all his knowledge of Mr. Ford was, at the time, that Mr. Ross told him.

The Chairman: He admits that that was all his knowledge at the time.

Mr. Storm: Mr. Chairman. I would say that there is another witness who, I am informed, is now on his way from Springfield, having been detained, whose affidavit, however, we have, and that he would testify to the same facts precisely as Mr. McLean has testified to.

Mr. Meeker: We object to any such testimony from counsel, as the witness is here.

Mr. Storm: We, however, will put the affidavits in that we have in the case; and ask the permission of the Committee, if that man appears here, as I am informed he is to appear here to-night, that he will be allowed then to come on the stand and testify.

Mr. Meeker: In response to my friend, I have this to say, that Mr Ford is on trial here. At stake is his social reputation, his reputation as an amateur athlete, his reputation as a gentleman. He has denied these charges in public, and therefore his veracity is in question. I object to the introduction of any affidavit from anybody, on this ground, that, in the first place, your honorable body, sitting as a Court, have not the chance to examine the witness and have not the chance of looking at him when he tells his own story, and have not any opportunity to judge from his appearance and his manner and so on, what his credibility may be; and, on the other hand, we have no chance of cross-examination, we have no chance to ask the witness a question, and it would be unjust to produce here an affidavit when the party could not be cross-examined and his story could not be the subject of examination, and therefore I object to the introduction of any affidavits whatever in this case. This case has been before the public for a long time. Your body has had cognizance of it. The gentleman who represents the other side has had plenty of opportunity to prepare his case

Mr. Storm: I have not been preparing it, Mr. Meeker.

Mr. Meeker: I beg your pardon; your questions to the witness have clearly proven to me that this case is all prearranged—and if he has not had opportunity, I surely have had none, and I object to the introduction of affidavits on the ground that we have no opportunity to cross-examine the man or pull his story to pieces. There has been no evidence here except the evidence of one man who says he did not know it was Ford except from the statement of one man.

Mr. Sullivan: You must understand, Mr. Meeker, we are getting at the bottom of these facts for Mr. Ford's benefit as well as for the benefit of the association.

Mr. Storm: Mr. Chairman, I offer in evidence the affidavit of George Ross.

Mr. Meeker: Mr. Chairman, I object to the introduction of any such evidence. Mr Ross can be here. He can be anywheres when he is wanted. He can compete in Philadelphia, Oshkosh, Portland, Oregon, whenever he is wanted. If he has preferred these charges against Mr. Ford, and tried to blacken his reputation, he can be produced here, and I object to the introduction of anything except the production of Mr. Ross himself.

Mr. Storm: If you desire it, I will recall Mr. Johnson, to swear that every effort has been made on his part to get Mr. Ross here, and they have been unable utterly to find any trace whatever of him.

Mr. Meeker: I object to the production of Mr. Johnson for that purpose, on the ground that if Mr. Ross is such a man that he cannot be found anywhere, he is not credible as a witness. On his testimony alone hinges the decision in the trial of Mr. Ford, except the evidence of Mr. McLean, and that we will rebut.

The Chairman: We will hear the affidavit.

The affidavit is read in evidence, by Mr Storm, as follows:

"STATE OF NEW YORK, CITY OF BROOKLYN, COUNTY OF KINGS, *ss:*

GEORGE ROSS, of the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, being duly sworn, says: That he is a resident of said City of Philadelphia, is twenty-seven years of age, and is, and for many years past has been, a professional athlete. That on the fifth day of July, 1886, he was at Springfield, Mass., and was an eye-witness of, and an actual participator in, the Caledonian games that occurred there on that day. And he there saw Malcolm W. Ford, of Brooklyn, N.Y., take part in the following games: Running hop, step, and jump; running high jump, and running 100 yards flat run, wherein he won the first prize of fifteen dollars in the second event, and the second prize of ten dollars in the third event, competing under the name of T. Williams, of Baltimore, Md., against the following professional athletes: M. Slattery, of South Boston; E. Farrell, of Brockville, Conn.; Thomas Aitken, of Providence, R. I., and others. Deponent was an eye-witness of all the above events, and testifies from personal knowledge. GEORGE ROSS.

Sworn before me the 27th day of September, 1886.

A. W. S. PROCTOR, *Notary Public*, Kings Co., N. Y."

Mr. Meeker: Mr. Chairman, I object to the introduction of that affidavit upon the grounds I have stated before. Mr. Ross is a man, as I understand, of very, very bad reputation, a man who has preferred charges against a man which involve his personal character and his reputation for veracity, and so on, and dare not appear himself. Well, I will not characterize him here, but he is a man that deserves no credit at all, and I don't see how you can accept that affidavit when a man can be here and prefer his charges himself. He is the principal witness against Mr. Ford. He says that he went to Springfield and competed there, and so on. Why don't he appear here and prove those charges? You have no chance to ask him a question; Mr. Ford has no chance to ask him a question; the prosecutor of Mr. Ford has no chance. His absence shows that he is devoid of any desire to promote amateur athletics, and that he has no character. He does not dare present himself before an honorable body, and I object most strenuously to the introduction of any such affidavit as that, because we have no chance to see the witness and examine him, to ask him a question, or to see his appearance on the stand, and I think it will be the most flagrant violation of justice to Mr. Ford and to amateur athletics to admit any such affidavit as that. Nobody knows where Mr. Ross lives, where he comes from, or goes to. Nobody knows how he lives, or anything about him, and you are going to accept his affidavit. What does his sworn affidavit amount to, because you cannot find the man? It is not perjury? There is no crime attached to that. He can blacken my reputation or yours, and he don't show his face here against the man whom he accuses of doing wrong, and I say to admit such an affidavit would be a most flagrant violation of justice to Mr. Ford, and a most unkind thing to do.

Mr. Storm: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this same objection has been made now three times. It has twice been overruled; the Committee decided to admit the affidavit in evidence before it was read, and now it is certainly very late for the gentleman to come and try to have it put out of evidence after they have heard the contents. The Committee decided to admit it in evidence. Now he turns around, after hearing it, and asks to have it struck out on the same grounds precisely on which the objection has twice been overruled.

Mr. Sullivan: Will you kindly inform us where that affidavit came from?

Mr. Storm: It was handed to me by some gentleman in the room just as I came in.

Mr. Price states that he handed the affidavit to Mr. Storm.

The objection is overruled.

Mr. Storm offers the affidavit of Edward J. Keating, who, he states, is the gentleman who is now on his way from Springfield, and will be here at about ten o'clock.

Mr. Meeker objects to the affidavit of Mr. Keating, who lives in Springfield, from which the trains run every hour.

Mr. Storm: Mr. Chairman, I will then rest the case, with the understanding that if Mr. Keating does not appear here, that I shall submit the affidavit in evidence. If he does appear, I shall put him on the stand.

The Chairman: I understand, then, that that is the balance of the evidence.

Mr. Storm: That is all the evidence I shall produce at present.

Mr. Meeker: I shall object to the introduction of Mr. Keating's affidavit, for the reason that Springfield is in easy access of New York. He could have left Springfield at six o'clock and been here at ten to-night, and in a question that involves the importance that there is in the case of Mr Ford, he might have been here if he is going to swear anybody's reputation away. If he is not here now, or before the prosecution rests, we shall go on with our case, and I shall move to exclude any testimony further on the part of the prosecution. I would like to ask when the affidavit of Keating came here

Mr. Storm: The affidavit came in this evening. It was prepared months ago, I believe.

The Chairman: We will admit the affidavit if Mr. Keating does not come.

The prosecution rests.