

## Crescent City Water Works.

I am aware that the remarks in the *Picayune* of Friday were intended to apply to a bill introduced into the Senate entitled an act "to incorporate the New Orleans City Water Works Company." No other act had been submitted to this paper for review. There are many objectionable sections in this act, and section sixteen, which gave to this company the right to assess all improved property for the annual water rates, whether the water was used or not, and a privilege upon the real estate for the assessment of the same, and also to compel all owners of real estate to pay five cents per foot for all pipes laid, with a privilege upon the real estate, whether improved or not, were very objectionable. The remarks in the *Picayune* of January 15 referred to the bill which was then introduced. That bill was also objectionable in many respects. But the bill entitled an act "to incorporate the Crescent City Water Works, which was introduced in the House, and then passed with but one vote in the negative, and which passed the Senate yesterday, contains none of the objectionable features of the bill of January 15th, and of the bill first alluded to. The incorporators of the Crescent City Water Works, among other obligations, assume the payment of the principal and interest now owing by the city, for the purchase of the Water Works, and it will thus relieve the city of the amount of indebtedness. It is also understood that Mr. B. Holly's system of fire protection and water supply will be introduced. This plan supersedes the reservoir system, which has been from experience found to be deficient in many respects. In this city, it is well known, that the water supply is inadequate to extinguish a fire of any considerable extent. The Holly system has been introduced in the following places: Lockport, Auburn, Gouverneur, Ogdensburg, Binghamton, Batavia, Buffalo, Saratoga Springs, Schenectady and Syracuse, N. Y.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Vergennes, Vt., Peoria, Ill., Canton, Dayton, Columbus, Norwalk, Ohio; Kalamazoo, Marquette, Jackson, Mich.; Connersville, Indianapolis, Columbus, Evansville, and LaPorte, Ind. In all of these places the reservoir system was abandoned, and the Holly system introduced. It will take a very long article to explain the Holly system, and now I will only allude to one fact, and a very important one, and that is the reduced rates of insurance in all places in which it has been introduced. Only one letter in this branch is given. It is as follows. Mr. J. C. Hansell, of Peoria, a large insurance broker, writes as follows:

PEORIA, Ill., Feb. 2, 1870.

J. R. Pease Esq., Norwalk, Ohio:

Dear Sir—Your favor of the 20th inst., received, and I take pleasure as far as I am able in replying to your questions. As to rates, there is an average reduction of nearly fifty per cent. As a fire extinguisher the Holly is all that is claimed. The largest loss since their introduction is, I think, \$600 on any one fire, and our two largest hotels have been on fire, one of them twice, and a few evenings since our leading factory, piano shop, stock and buildings, worth, perhaps, \$150,000, stored by their own 2½-inch pipe in the building, damage perhaps \$50,000.

The reduction in the rates of insurance will save more than is necessary to pay for the use of the water.

When this system is once known, when the public become convinced that a copious supply of pure water, for all purposes, will be furnished at reduced rates, when fires can be extinguished promptly, and when the rates of insurance will be fifty per cent. less, the bill as passed will be regarded as a great benefit to the city.

X. Y.