

**THE WATER WORKS QUESTION.**—The *Register* is very industriously engaged just now in trying to throw *dust* instead of *water* in the eyes of the people on the Water Works question. Failing to secure an illegal election of Water Works Commissioners, which would have had the effect to delay the enterprise interminably, if not defeat it entirely, it is laboring zealously to accomplish its object in another way. It now asserts roundly, that the Commissioners appointed by the Legislature in the charter "resigned their position nearly two years since," and that the Board now has no existence. This statement, we learn on good authority, is totally untrue, and we challenge the *Register* to produce the proof.

The Board appointed by the Legislature (Messrs. O. W. Matheny, R. F. Ruth and John Williams,) were appointed to serve respectively for three, four and five years, and until their successors were elected. We find that in March, 1862, the Board made a report of progress made in the work, but in view of the deranged finances of the country in consequence of the war, recommended a suspension of the work for that year. Again, in the spring of 1864—a little more than one year ago—the Board made another report, and the last report of the Comptroller of the city of Springfield acknowledges the receipt of \$1,322 18, from O. W. Matheny, Treasurer of the Board, on account of the Water Works—showing that the Board was recognized as being in existence since March 1st, 1864, thus conclusively refuting the statement of the *Register* that they "resigned nearly two years since." The Commissioners themselves say that they are not aware of having resigned or of their bonds having been cancelled, and to what "hocus-pocus" the *Register* will now resort to sustain its assertion, we are curious to see. And what is better, it is their intention to proceed at once to the measures necessary to furnish our citizens an abundant supply of water—which will effectually "lay the dust" now attempted to be raised by the *Register* about this matter.

It is the merest quibble on the part of the *Register* to attempt to seek for motives for the action of the City Council in rescinding the order for an election in the face of the first section of the Registry Law, which is as follows:

The persons authorized by law, or appointed pursuant to any town or city ordinance, to act as judges or inspectors of elections in any town, city, or ward, or other election district or precinct, in this State, (except the moderator of the town meetings, in towns adopting township organization,) shall constitute a "board of registry," for their respective towns, cities, wards, districts, or precincts, and shall meet on Tuesday, three weeks preceding any state, county, city, or town election, (except "town meetings" in towns adopting the township organization law,) at nine o'clock A. M., and proceed to make a list, as hereinafter prescribed, of all persons qualified and entitled to vote at the ensuing election in the election district of which they are judges or inspectors; which list, when completed, shall constitute and be known as the "register of electors" of said election district, &c.

When the *Register* has shown that this plain and direct provision of law does not apply to an election under an ordinance of the city of Springfield—which it has not yet had the foolhardiness to attempt to do—it will be time enough to attend to the motives which that paper imputes to the Council. Until it does this, however, we can afford to treat its ridiculous accusations with the contempt which they deserve.