

THE MONROE JOURNAL

PUBLISHED TUESDAYS AND FRIDAYS,

VOL. 23. No. 44.

MONROE, N. C., WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1917.

\$1.50 PER YEAR CASH.

EXTRA!

Efrid Pays \$250 Fine and \$5500 Damages CASE ENDED IN COMPROMISE THIS AFTERNOON

EXTRA!

Prosecution Accepts Offer of Defendant and Judge Pratt and Attorney Stevens Accept Terms---Many Witnesses Examined and Attorneys were Preparing for Heavy Argument.

The case against Mr. J. E. Efrid, charged with assault and battery upon Prof. R. W. Allen with deadly weapon with intent to kill, came to an abrupt conclusion this afternoon at 4 o'clock, when the defendant, through his attorneys, agreed to submit to the charge of assault and battery with deadly weapon, pay a fine of \$250 and costs, and to pay to the injured man the sum of \$5,500. The defendant pays all of the costs connected with the case.

The compromise did not come as a surprise. All morning envoys were talking, and phoning, and at 2 o'clock this afternoon, a meeting of the school board, and other prominent in a business and social way, met in the city hall and arranged the compromise.

Attorney Parker, in announcing to the court that the compromise had been effected, stated that the defendant had desired this for days, but the State would not listen to it until this morning. The compromise was sought by the defendant, and not by Prof. Allen.

When Prof. Allen was approached upon the possibility of a compromise, Attorney Frank Armfield stated, he made it plain that, owing to the interest of the public, he would not take the responsibility of sanctioning the proposal. However, he opened the way by leaving it up to his school board.

The school board, and others, it was stated, agreed that it was for the best interest of all concerned to accept the terms of the defendant. The school board is composed of the following gentlemen: F. B. Ashcraft, T. P. Dillon, J. M. Belk, G. F. Henderson, J. E. Ashcraft, E. C. Carpenter and G. M. Beasley.

Judge Pratt, in commenting on the compromise, brought forth applause from the hundreds packed in the court house when he stated that the case on trial emphasized the fact that it is against the interests of education for patrons to attempt to run the schools to suit their own particular fancies. If this is allowed, he said, education would be a snare and a delusion.

Mr. R. L. Stevens, the Prosecuting Attorney, held the audience breathless for a few seconds when he arose to make a few remarks as the trial was growing to a close: "Your Honor," he said, "as Prosecuting Attorney, I thought it against the best interests of the people to allow this case to be compromised, as the defendant had wrecked grievous injury upon Prof. Allen. However, when I learned that Prof. Allen, who was the injured party, was willing to drop the proceedings on the grounds that have already been enumerated, I opposed it no longer."

"This compromise," stated Judge Pratt, "takes a great burden off my shoulders. I have tried to view the case solely on its merits, but as I saw Prof. Allen, the man who had been grievously injured, sitting over there I found it hard. Yet I have felt sympathy for the counsel of the defendant. The court room has been packed, for two days with hundreds of Prof. Allen's sympathizers. This may have been a commendable act, yet it may have been wrong. It was commendable if these ladies and children came into the court as a mark of respect to Prof. Allen; but it was wrong if they came to see vengeance wrecked upon Mr. Efrid."

"If the case were to have been concluded, and left to me, acting as both judge and jury, I would have made the fine much heavier. It is also possible that I have considered some other form of punishment. Yet, as civil reparation has been made to Prof. Allen, I felt that the court can accept the compromise."

Mr. Efrid has suffered greatly, according to Attorney Parker. "You people, in fact, none but those of us who have been intimately associated with him of late," he said, "can realize how much he has suffered. He regrets the deed, exceedingly so, and is willing to make reparation."

There has never been a case heard in Monroe that has attracted so much attention. Every seat in the court room has been filled for the past two days, and many stood in the aisles, and around the bar. In truth, Tuesday and today were not much more than a holiday, looking at it only from the standpoint of neglected business.

Attorneys for both sides had been preparing to make big arguments. Word had got over the county that James H. Pou and E. T. Cansler, two of the best lawyers in the State, were going to speak this afternoon, and many people from all over the county came into town to hear the big guns. Local talent, also, was expected to outdo itself on the case.

Not wanting to disappoint the many who had come expressly to hear Messrs. Pou and Cansler, the former was prevailed upon to make an address to the audience. He was introduced, at the conclusion of the court, by R. B. Redwine, who spoke of him in happy phrases characterizing him as one of the biggest lawyers in the State.

Wadesboro. J. J. Parker, W. B. Love, and E. T. Cansler of Charlotte ably represented the defendant.

All throughout the trial there were constant objections to parts of the evidence from both sides, but Judge Pratt appeared to have conducted the case in a fair and impartial manner, as every ruling he made was accepted in a satisfied manner by the side taking exception. At times the argument over these little technicalities of law almost reached the brilliant stage, but no anger was manifested by either side.

The hearing was scheduled to start at 10 o'clock, but it was nearer 11 o'clock before the first witness took the stand, as Recorder Lemmond was down stairs trying another case. Prof. Allen came into the court room before the court convened, and was greeted with applause. The entrance of the lawyers for the State, a few minutes later, also provoked a like demonstration. When Recorder Lemmond opened the case for trial application was filed with him for the removal of the case to the Sub-Recorder.

Mr. Efrid was originally arrested on a warrant charging him with assault and battery with a deadly weapon, but was released under a \$1000 bond for his appearance at Tuesday's hearing. There had been a great deal of talk to the effect that the warrant would be changed, so when Mr. Armfield asked to be allowed to amend it, charging the defendant with assault and battery with intent to kill, it did not cause much surprise. Mr. Cansler, for the defense, objected, claiming that the amendment was not proper at this time, but Judge Pratt allowed it, in his discretion.

Some time was consumed in administering the oath to the numerous witnesses. The court house was packed that Judge Pratt ordered Chief of Police Christenbury to clear the first row of benches for the witnesses. As soon as this was done, both sides stated they were ready to proceed with the trial.

Prof. Allen First Witness.
Supported by his nurse and a couple of friends, Prof. Allen took the stand to render the first testimony for the State. He testified, in part, as follows:

"For several weeks prior to the affray, I had been conducting a summer school at the Lancaster Avenue graded school. It was my custom to always be there by 8 o'clock in the morning, but on June 15, the day of the assault, I was a few minutes late starting for the school. I remember this very distinctly, as I had expressed the fear to my wife that I would be late. Walking hurriedly, I soon reached the corner of Lancaster Avenue and Crawford street. There I saw Mr. Efrid approaching. Not having any idea of what was in store for me, I greeted him with the usual salutation of 'Good Morning.'"

"Without returning my greeting, he stopped squarely in front of me, held up his left hand, and said: 'You go to my wife and tell her that you lied when you said she had been sending notes to your teachers.' I told him that I would not. 'G—d—n you,' he said, 'take that,' and grabbing me by my left hand, he commenced cutting me. I warded off the knife thrusts the best I could, striking him with my fist several times. We scuffled until I fell off the sidewalk into the ditch. He jumped on me, again wielding his knife. Finally, I managed to crawl up on all fours, but he kicked me back into the ditch."

"When I got up, I started home. The exertion, however, so weakened me that I was obliged to turn. On doing so, I discovered Lindsey Helms, the school janitor, approaching. When he reached my side I requested him to go for Dr. Stewart, which he did."

Armfield interrupted Prof. Allen at this point, and asked if Ernest Krauss was near the scene. He replied:

"Yes. While I was lying in the ditch, Ernest Krauss and Miss Amelia Krauss were standing nearby imploring Mr. Efrid to desist in his attack. I heard Ernest Krauss say: 'Stop, uncle, you're killing him!'"

Prof. Allen told how he went into Mr. Bundy's residence and secured medical aid. His testimony about this part of the occurrence was about like Lindsey Helms, the school janitor, stated to The Journal on the day of the affair, and which was published several weeks ago.

Armfield questioned Prof. Allen further:

Q. Where did you receive the first cut?
A. On the left cheek.

Q. When did you receive the wounds on your head?
A. When I was down in the ditch.

Q. How long have you been confined?
A. Today is the first time I have been out of the house.

Q. Can you remove the bandages, and show the court the scars?
A. Yes. (Here Prof. Allen, with the assistance of his nurse, removed the bandages, exposing a long scar on both of his cheeks, and a small one across his lower lip, and another one on his neck.)

Q. How many wounds did you receive in all?
A. Twelve.

Q. What effect did those wounds have on your senses?
A. I can't see to read; I hear all right, but can't open my mouth very wide. The lower lip seems to be dead. It does not seem to be sensitive to heat.

Q. When you take liquids, how does that affect you?
A. It runs out my mouth without my knowledge.

The State turned Prof. Allen over to the defense for examination, but it passed him up without asking a single question.

Testimony of Young Lee Boy.
Clarence Lee, the sixteen year old son of J. H. Lee, took the stand. Armfield continued the examination for the State.

Q. You were in school at the time this affair occurred?
A. Yes.

Q. Did you see Mr. Efrid on June 15?
A. Yes.

Q. Where?
A. Walking down Lancaster Avenue.

Q. Which direction?
A. Down the street.

Q. You rang the bell that morning, I believe. Where was Mr. Efrid when you went into the building to ring it?
A. Standing near Mr. Krauss'. The witness was turned over to the defense, and Attorney Cansler cross examined him as follows:

Q. What time were you at the school building that morning?
A. At 7:30.

Q. What were you doing?
A. I was sitting on the steps.

Q. Were you waiting for anybody?
A. Yes, for Mr. Allen.

Q. You saw Mr. Efrid go towards Mr. Hinson's?
A. Yes.

Q. Was there anything about Mr. Efrid to attract attention?
A. No.

Q. Yet you noticed him pass?
A. Yes.

Heard Mr. Efrid Attack School.
Mr. W. B. Brown, a member of the Gordon Insurance & Investment Co., was the next witness presented by the State. He testified that he heard Mr. Efrid state that Mr. Allen had told a lie. In part, his testimony was as follows: "Several weeks prior to the affray, I passed the English Drug corner, and heard Mr. Efrid, who was talking to Mr. Ike Blair and Mr. Clifford Fowler, state that Mr. Allen had lied in the case of the Krauss boys. (This was a case heard some months ago, in which Messrs. Ray and Karl Krauss were charged with assaulting Prof. O. V. Hamrick, the school principal.) I took issue with Mr. Efrid on this statement, telling that I would be careful about making such remarks unless I could prove them. Mr. Efrid replied that the record would substantiate his statement."

The defense, when Mr. Brown was handed over to them, failed to impeach his testimony. Attorney Cansler cross-examined him, as follows:

Q. Mr. Efrid is an uncle of the Krauss boys by marriage?
A. Yes.

Q. In the conversation you and Mr. Efrid waxed warm?
A. Yes.

Q. Did anybody else make any remarks?
A. No.

Q. When Mr. Efrid grew warm, he made the remarks about Prof. Allen?
A. No. The remark he made started the conversation.

Blair Corroborates Brown.
Ike Blair, who was present when the above alleged conversation took place, corroborated Brown in almost every detail. His testimony varied slightly from that of his predecessor, but it was essentially the same. He

declared that Efrid had stated that the school was under the strictest management it had had since he came to Monroe, and that he went on further to state that Prof. Allen had sworn a lie in the Krauss boy's case.

The State turned Mr. Blair over to the defense, and he was cross-examined by Cansler.

Q. When did that conversation occur?
A. Two or three weeks prior to the fight.

Q. What day of the week?
A. I do not know.

Q. It might have been further back?
A. I do not think so.

Q. Both Brown and Efrid became heated in the conversation, did they not?
A. Yes.

Q. And Efrid said Allen swore a lie?
A. Yes.

Q. Were they not mad when this statement was made?
A. No. They took issue over this statement. They became heated as the conversation dragged on.

Q. How long before this had the Krauss trial, of which Efrid spoke, taken place?
A. About a year.

Testimony of Physician.
Dr. H. D. Stewart, who was the first doctor to reach Prof. Allen's side after he had been wounded, was called to the stand. Armfield examined him for the State.

Q. When did you arrive on the scene?
A. A little Morgan girl ran into my house and said to me: 'Come out. Mr. Efrid is killing a man.' I ran out, getting there just in time to see Prof. Allen stumbling along the sidewalk.

Q. You dressed his wounds.
A. I helped to do it.

Q. State the seriousness of the wounds.
A. The most serious wound is on the right cheek. The most dangerous wound is on his throat.

Q. How near the jugular vein was that on his throat?
A. About 1-4 of an inch.

Q. Were the scars bigger than that they are now?
A. Yes. They have healed considerably.

Q. Will the scars always remain?
A. Yes, to some extent.

Q. What effect will the scars have on the senses?
A. The scars, none; but the cut across the muscles may have some effect on the speech.

Q. Did the wound in the cheek affect the teeth?
A. I don't know; I do not think so.

Q. Describe wounds on the back.
A. They were not of a serious nature; were not even required to sew them up. The wounds over the shoulder and on the back of the head required several stitches.

Q. What kind of instrument caused the wounds?
A. A sharp instrument.

Q. How many stitches were required to sew up the wounds?
A. I did not count them. Dr. Ashcraft said about 64 were required.

Dr. Stewart then proceeded to tell about how he had the wounded man carried into Mr. Bundy's residence. He said Prof. Allen was bleeding profusely. Happily, Mrs. Bundy had some absorbent cotton in the house. I secured some of it, and managed to stop the flow of blood to some extent. Prof. Allen, while standing on the porch, complained that he was about to faint. We made him a palate on the floor, and laid him down.

Armfield continued the examination:

Q. What became of Efrid?
A. I do not know. I saw someone get into an automobile.

Q. Would Prof. Allen, owing to the nature of his wounds, have bled to death if he had not secured medical assistance when he did?
A. Yes, I think so.

The State turned Dr. Stewart over to the defense. Cansler cross-examined him in part, as follows:

Q. If he had only been wounded on the cheek, he would have bled to death without attention, would he not?
A. Yes.

Q. Scars, like wounds on a tree, will be wiped out by time, will they not?
A. Yes, to a certain extent.

Q. Year by year?
A. Yes, for a certain length of time.

At the conclusion of Dr. Stewart's cross-examination, the State announced that it would rest.

Miss Krauss First Witness For the Defense.

Miss Amelia Krauss, a sister-in-law of the defendant, was the first witness offered by the defense. Her testimony, on examination by Mr. Parker, was in part, as follows:

Q. You are a sister-in-law of the defendant?
A. Yes.

Q. Where were you at the time the affair occurred?
A. At home.

Q. The difficulty occurred in front of your mother's home?
A. Yes.

Q. Tell the court about the difficulty, or rather, what you saw.
A. I was going to the front from the rear end of the house. I saw two men scuffling. I recognized Mr. Allen first; then Mr. Efrid. I said: "Men, don't do that."

Q. Did you see them on the ground?
A. Yes after they fell.

Q. How far were you from them?
A. About 15 steps.

Q. While the two were on the ground, did Mr. Efrid cut Mr. Allen?
A. No.

Q. After they got up, what did Mr. Efrid do?
A. He went up the street a short distance, and picked up a hat and a knife.

Q. How far from the scene?
A. Just a few steps.

Q. What did he do then?
A. He told me he was going for a doctor.

Q. Did you see Ernest Krauss?
A. Yes. He came across the walk while they were fighting.

Q. Did he say anything?
A. No.

The defense turned Miss Krauss over to the State. She was cross-examined in part by Mr. Vann, as follows:

Q. Did you see any blows exchanged?
A. I did not.

Q. You saw blood?
A. Yes. I saw blood on both of them.

Q. Did you see Ernest Krauss attempt to pull Mr. Efrid off Mr. Allen?
A. I saw him reach for Mr. Efrid. Q. After Ernest did that, Mr. Allen got up.
A. Yes.

Q. Did Mr. Efrid then kick him?
A. He gave him a little shove.

Mr. Parker for the defense, questioned Miss Krauss further after the conclusion of the State's cross-examination, as follows:

Q. Did you see Mr. Efrid that day after the fight?
A. Yes.

Q. Was he bruised up?
A. Yes. His face was bruised; his eye blackened, and his lip swollen.

Q. Did Mr. Efrid make any complaint?
A. No. He didn't complain. He took it very calmly. He was unable to talk very clearly.

Q. How long did the bruises remain?
A. I saw them very prominently on the sixth day afterwards.

Testimony of Ernest Krauss.
Ernest Krauss, a nephew of Mr. Efrid's, followed Miss Krauss on the stand for the defense. On examination by Mr. Love, he testified, in part, as follows:

Q. You are a nephew of Mr. Efrid's?
A. Yes.

Q. Where were you when the difficulty occurred?
A. At home.

Q. What time.
A. About a quarter past eight.

Asked by Mr. Love to tell about what he saw, young Krauss stated: "I was on the back porch preparing to bathe my feet, when I heard a noise. Looking out on the street, I saw fists flying. At first I thought it was a couple of boys fighting, but later discovered that it was Mr. Efrid and Mr. Allen. I saw a hand come up and strike Mr. Allen in the head with a knife. They wrestled, and both fell. Neither was on top of the other. I reached the spot where they were scuffling at this time."

Q. Did you see any blows passed?
A. No.

Q. What happened next?
A. I saw Mr. Efrid shove Mr. Allen back to the ground, and kick him.

Q. Did you see Mr. Efrid pick up a knife?
A. Yes.

Q. What did you do then?
A. I called up the drug store in an effort to get a doctor.

Young Krauss was turned over to the State. Mr. Armfield cross-examined him in part, as follows:

Q. You didn't see the beginning?
A. No.

Q. Can you say whether or not Mr. Allen had been down before?
A. No.

Q. You didn't recognize the knife Mr. Efrid picked up as the one he had in his hand?
A. No.

Q. You pulled Mr. Efrid off Mr. Allen?
A. Just touched him on the shoulder.

Q. You then jumped over the hedge?
A. No. I went through the gate.

Q. Did Mr. Efrid follow you?
A. He did for a short distance.

Q. You went for a doctor?
A. Yes.

Q. Where was Miss Krauss?
A. About fifteen steps away.

Q. Did Mr. Efrid kick Mr. Allen once or twice?
A. Only once.

Saw Mr. Efrid That Morning.
Miss Maggie York Houston testified to having seen Mr. Efrid on the morning of the affray coming down the Griffith road. She did not know how long it was before the fight that she saw him, but knew that it was before as she learned about the assault after reaching town. Mr. Efrid was in front of Mr. Steve Morgan's home when she saw him walking in the direction of town. She did not notice anything unusual in his demeanor. The State, after the defense had completed its examination, passed Miss Houston up.

Defendant Had Business on Street.
Earl Hinson, the 18-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. H. J. Hinson, proved to be an important witness for the defense. He testified that Mr. Efrid had been to his father's home on the morning of the assault to see his mother about an inscription to go on her mother's tombstone, which the defendant was building. On examination by Mr. Love, he stated in part, as follows:

Q. What time was it when Mr. Efrid came to your house?
A. A short while before 8 o'clock.

Q. What was he doing?
A. He came to see about a tombstone that my mother was having built for my grandmother's grave.

Q. How long did he stay?
A. About five or ten minutes.

Q. Where did he go?
A. Over by Mr. Morgan's. (Mr. Morgan lives across the street from Mr. Hinson's. Mr. Hinson's residence faces on the same street on which the assault occurred.)

Q. He has a corn patch in front of your house?
A. Yes.

Q. He crossed the road in front of your house?
A. Yes.

Mr. Hinson, after examination by the defense, was cross-examined by Mr. Armfield for the State, in part, as follows:

Q. Was that the first time you saw Mr. Efrid?
A. Yes.

Q. He had been at your house before?
A. Not that I know of.

Q. How long has your grandmother been dead?
A. She died in March.

Mr. Holmes Also Saw Defendant.
B. H. Holmes, a Western Union lineman, who lives on the Griffith road, testified to having seen Mr. Efrid a short while prior to the assault. He stated that Mr. Efrid had a corn patch near his (Holmes) home. They had a short conversation, he stated, over this patch, the witness asking the defendant if he objected to his letting his chickens out into the field, as the corn had passed the stage where it could be damaged by them. The State passed Mr. Holmes up without cross-examining him.

Defendant's Wife Takes Stand.
Mrs. J. E. Efrid took the stand in behalf of her husband. Mr. Cansler, for the defense, examined her, in part, as follows:

Q. You are defendant's wife.
A. Yes.

Q. How long have you been married?
A. About 24 years.

Q. Where did you first live?
A. In Norwood. We lived there only about 2 months, however.

Q. Then where?
A. In Albemarle.

Q. How long did you stay there?
A. About a year and a half. We later moved back to Albemarle from Monroe and lived there 4 1-2 years longer.

Q. Had you a conversation with your husband a few days prior to the difficulty?
A. Yes.

Q. How long before?
A. On Wednesday before.

Q. When did you have this conversation?
A. At the dinner table after the children had left.

Q. Tell about the conversation.
A. I told him about Miss Norma Bell and myself going to see Prof. Allen about my boy, Hall. Mr. Allen did not seem to want to see us, stating that he was very busy. We finally persuaded him, however, to

(Continued on Page Two.)