THE WATER QUESTION.—A correspondent of the Democrat last week raised the objection to the taking of water from Hemlock Lake for city use—that it was required by the mills on the outlet of the Lake. That objection would be equally forcible against going to any of the Southern Lakes, and has arisen almost everywhere that water has been taken for the supply of cities. It is not insurmountable, if the facts were as stated by this correspondent. The quantity which will be required by this city will not be missed by the mill owners for nine or ten months in the year, as it would be far less than their surplus. Hemlock Lake will be made a reservoir from which all the water the city will require may be drawn without affecting the ordinary flow of the creek. A dam across the outlet, raising the Lake one or two feet—which may be done without injury to lands—will store all the city will require. No fears need be anticipated in this respect. Two or three millions of gallons per day—all that the city will require—may be drawn from Hemlock Lake for many days in succession, without causing an appreciable difference in the quantity stored there. At no time in years past, that the water subject has been considered, has this important point been overlooked. We must have water for Rochester, and there is none so pure as that of Hemlock Lake.—That appears to be the inevitable source of supply for Rochester. Taking this view of the matter we are surprised that any paper published here should be so indifferent to the interests of the people as to lend its columns to the publication of articles like that to which we have referred. It was designed to prejudice the people of the towns through which the water flows by giving an unfair statement of facts. It is not an objection to the present scheme for bringing water alone, but to all attempts that may be made to the procurement of water in that direction or any other for that matter. It was not an attack upon the present Water Works Company or the contractor, but upon the city and the people who have a vital interest at stake in the water question. Will our cotemporary give his views on this question and tell whether he endorses the statements made by its correspondent? or will he leave that to be inferred by his silence?