

Statement of Controversy with Claude Arnold about the Electric
Lights put in The Thorheim.

When we had decided to make over Thorheim into 4 apartments, before, however, any work was begun on it, I asked Dr Belknap, who I could get to give an estimate on the plumbing and electricity, as I had been so long absent that I was totally uninformed about such matters in Mayville. He recommended that Claude Arnold look the matter over, and came down with him to the house, looked over the plan for the alterations which the daughter had made, and with her and Dr Belknap they talked the matter over. I was only a spectator only casually making any remarks on the subject. My idea was that Mr Arnold's estimates included the lighting of the whole house. I am sure that every light that was to be put in was not specified. Neither the daughter or I knew anything about the lighting of a house by electricity, and when we were asked about "switches", we so informed Mr Arnold. I remember saying definitely that there was to be lights in the cellar, and that I wanted to control the hall lights which were to be put on the meter pertaining to our apartment. Mr Arnold was informed that we did not care for anything fancy or expensive for the appearance, but did desire everything of good material and the work to be well and economically done. A few days after Dr Belknap told me that Mr Arnold's estimates for the plumbing was \$450.00, and for the lightning \$250.00, which he thought was as reasonable as I could get the work done anywhere. Mr Arnold has given the

(2)

job without any demur or farther talk on the subject as far as I am aware. No contract in writing was asked for or thought of. I suppose Mr Arnold knew his business and would do his work in a proper manner. On my return to Mayville, on May 10th, the house was about ready for occupancy except the electric lights, the wiring was about done, but nothing more. On June 3rd, we all came down to the house from Dr Belknap's and found the globes and fixtures had been put in place. No lights or wiring had been put in the cellar or in either of the back halls, though sixteen candle lights had been put in every closet, no matter how small. There was but one switch in the whole four apartments, and that was in the kitchen of our apartment. This switch turned on the lights in both the upper and lower halls--all of them--three sixteen candle lights. To get any light in the halls if one came in in the dark, it was necessary to go up stairs and feel around in the kitchen to find the switch and this turned on two lights in the upper hall and one below all at once--about as unhandy and expensive a contrivance as could be imagined. When this was discovered, I told Dr Belknap that I would not accept this work, and that I desired that he should not pay Mr Arnold until this blunder was rectified--having a switch put in the vestibule which would turn on the light there and another to turn on the light in the upper hall; that two lights in the upper hall were wholly unnecessary and I wished one taken out and put in the vestibule where there had been placed. On Monday, June 4th, Mr Arnold went to Dr Belknap for the remainder of

(3)

the money due him on the job. On April 7th, he had been paid \$250.00 and he claimed as then due him, \$485.00, which on his promise to at once put in the lights that had been omitted and arranging the switches in a proper manner, a check was given him for the amount. Though Mr Arnold was importuned almost daily to attend to this matter as we could have no light in either hall without turning on the whole three which was too extravagant to be thought of, he did not begin it until October 13th--four months after he had promised to do so at once when he was paid. This time he only arranged the switches, not putting in the hall lights at the back stairs, ~~for~~ either below or above. As there were tenants in both apartments opening out on these halls, much complaint was made to me because of the lack of lights. Mr Arnold was again implored to finish his work. In the meantime he had sent in a bill for the work done in changing the switches, to which, I had, of course paid no attention, considering that he had only rectified a blunder in work for which he had already been paid. In the course of a couple of months, Mr Arnold again appeared and finished the work for which he had been paid the 4th of June--the date being December 28th. For this he also sent in a bill, I do not consider that I owe him anything as he has only done the work for which he contracted--that is, put the electricity in the four apartments, and the cellar--for which he was paid fully.

Mr Arnold also took from the parlor the glass chandelier for which we had no use. I was asked by some one what I would take for it as Mr Arnold wanted to buy it. I replied \$25.00. (It cost when put up \$125.00.) Dr Belknap was asked to deduct this from Mr Arnold's bill when he paid him, but it was not done and now I believe he says he never bought it. He at least has it in his possession as he took it
from the house. E. K. J.