

172
Send copies all back
for my files
Friederich

PETER FLINT
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW

NEW YORK *July 10* 1913

Dear Luthy:

Send copy letter sent to Siegel & Bean & Lodge. Sherman letter to me is referred to McKim. It looks like a "job" as you thought. If Bean & McKim don't stand by us, McKim dictated all the letters written by Com. Moore of Div of Inland Waters, in which Moore says the Com. repeatedly notified Newell & Harris Estate that a proper dam must be built.

McK

Bean sent McKim over to preserve fish. Nothing else. McKim's affidavit "dam in place halfway" was done for Fisheries Dept. They & Div of Inland Waters had a right to enforce the direction of Fisheries Division of any Division. It looks as though some cautious Engineer had queried the Conservation Com. McKim's direction & Com Com to "try it on" with us to see if we will swallow it. I am now ready with 2nd step, Publicity.

The Official Organ of Canal System of N.Y. his Magazine "Waterways & Commerce" will in its next illustration pub. next week 150 Nassau St, 2nd floor New York, NY. Have the whole Dam Business just as it is without saving any one. Food & Steam is just about the thing.

spillways which would prevent any high water at the outlet in Spring. Mr. McKim went on to point out most particularly how the pike and bass could be prevented from going over the new dam which he advised constructed JUST BELOW the old structure, leaving the old dam where it was to maintain the usual water level in the Lake until the new one should be completed. He told our engineering member, Mr. O. Runge of Plushing, N.Y., that if he would send the blue prints of a new dam, such as he described, to Albany, that he (Mr. McKim) would O.K., them, from his own personal knowledge of the facts and situation and return them to Mr. Luthy, our Secretary-Treasurer and thus enable us to get to work before frost set in.

Various letters passed between Mr. Luthy and your Division, but the blueprints, for some reason, were never sent to us and still remain as evidence of what I assert in your offices, or those of Mr. Moore, Commissioner of Division of Inland Waters, Conservation Commission.

is already & should off an
"Editorial: Editor considers this a
dangerous precedent" of a dam owner
can go on & ruin a valuable community
at will or for a judge or Hold up.
Then get such a decree from the
State as Siemens. Its too much to say.

Newton's remarks about doing what
he thought was best for the lake would
do at all. Can he make an take
unhealthily in order to make it healthier
than it was Sunday was all right

What says
How far is it from
the days?

James. I must be start a damage
suit. pretty soon. That's what they
need. An owner cannot but to
leave the ^{thing} with him - and the
whole state for that matter. But we
must have the dam up right off.
If we have to get a Supreme Court
order for its erection & Special Proceedings
could be taken. Do you suppose Lodge has
all along been playing with Newton to get
that more water. Perhaps it might be well to
consider a first order. but let's not consider
a thing just until the Court comes down
with work.

(20)

Write me at once

We get two letters from Go
How stands the Old Mill

My dear Mr. Hunt - your letter of Jan 10 with the inclosures, arrived
my letter to you of same date. I am glad you wrote to Mr. Lodge in the
matter & hope he got your letter before going to D. as he planned
doing about this time. Your letter to Lodge is all right & exactly
explains the proceedings in this ~~one~~ situation.

as suggested in my letter of 10th if some or any of your living in
my state such as you, Alden, Lodge, Wickes, Rump, Lansing &c would
inter suit vs Mr D. I believe there would be an adjustment as to
who had jurisdiction, not least as to what the rights of the property
owners are either present in the matter as to damage sustained.

Perhaps Lodge, yourself or Alden or Wickes or all of you in the various
counties could sue Mr D.

I hardly believe that Lodge would agree to raising the level of the
lake too far, as it would injure his boat house. It is hardly to
be he would not favor a raise secured by no means be induced to
accede to more than a 6 inch raise. You may remember Watkins statement
to me in the matter of raising the level that it could not be done without the
consent of every property owner & if raised beyond present level wherever
raised it would be liable for damages. In a similar manner then
why consider the party who lowered the level be liable for damages?
Lodge with you not to bring up the question of raising the level of the lake
for the present at all, but just hold down the C. to its work.

It seems the C. never stated ~~the~~ their reason for not accepting or
approving an application & plans, filed for records by the Dam. I wrote to Lodge
several times to ask them this but heard no reply. I wish you could
bring Lodge to some conclusion as to what action is best to take. He has
the whole matter in hand as Y.P. & himself on the spot & on the lake in the best
position to act. I believe if you keep after him with some of your letters he will
get down to "business". With the cues you had with the C. you have all the
facts hand on while I believe you & Lodge ought to work together in this matter.
Lodge would, I think pay you tax. See Goldbury section.
Harris had a word from Wickes or Alden so do not know what their views are
presume to help in counsel with both viewed in from you of their views of findings in the case.
No views from Hunt or anyone else except they all agree that the death of the Dam is an outrage.