

Our Lake-Side Correspondence.

Lake Malopac, Putnam county, N. Y. ... Within the past few years, however, have often reached the metropolis relative to the exceeding beauty of the lake and mountain scenery in Putnam county, in this State, and more particularly specifying Lake Malopac, near Carmel.

In order to obtain clearer evidence as to the truth of these statements, on Saturday last I took tickets at the Harlem railway station for Croton Falls, about fifty miles from New York. They charge one dollar and twenty-five cents for the ride, and it is, without exception, considering the quality of the road, the dearest one that I ever suffered. Indeed, I doubt whether or not it is a railroad at all. It is a sort of corduroy road; and all the rollers who have been speculating in its stock ought to be called corduroy brokers.

Well, after two hours jolting, such as one might have suffered thirty years ago in travelling over the worst roads in the western part of the State, I reached Croton Falls, which are branches of the Croton dam, and part of the source from which New York derives the pure and beautiful supply of Croton water.

We found several carriages, public and private, waiting at the station for the use of residents or travellers, and jumped into that belonging to Baldwin's Hotel—driven by a bright-faced negro, who takes very good care of his horses. We had before us a ride of five miles to Lake Malopac, which was one of the objects of our search.

After a two hours' journey, during which we passed through defiles, up hill and down dale, now climbing one hill, now descending another, now crossing a branch of the Croton river, and now passing in the shadow of a dark mountain, we reached Baldwin's Hotel, near the lake, where I beheld one of the most beautiful scenes that I have ever looked upon.

Lake Malopac is a most beautiful sheet, rather irregular in its formation, and contains three islands. It is surrounded with undulating shores, covered with verdure, huge granite rocks, fine farms and nearly people. Its water is as pure and clear as crystal. I have seen nothing superior to it in point of natural beauty of scenery, not excepting the famous lakes of Switzerland, the poetic Lake of Como in Italy, or the beautiful lochs of Scotland, in praise of which the harp of the North joins its sweetest strains.

Baldwin's Hotel is a comfortable country house, situated on the shore of the lake, and is well patronized. It appears that this place is a great resort for Wall-street men—financiers, brokers, and other business men, who meet here to enjoy a reprieve from the toils of trade and similitude of stock speculations. But it would seem that these gentlemen have kept their place as a resort, for there is not a more delightful region in the world.

The country around Lake Malopac is full of picturesque lakes, and is from these sources that the city of New York derives its water supply. The Aqueduct. The fishing on the lake is very fine, and during the evening I returned to the shore. Twenty thirty boys, with their rods and reels, were engaged in a game of fishing with the lake fish. Each had his secure at least fifty, while one had netted over a hundred, including pike, bass, perch, and nearly all the fresh-water fish of the State.

It is a great curiosity to see a man who is so well educated by the barometry of the surrounding scenery. It is as if he were a philosopher in a cipher to establish an empire. Now, if a party of two or three, or half a dozen, with rods and tackle, go to a lake, and sit on the bank, and fish, and catch the fish, one at a time, it is a game of the most interesting kind. A minister of the Gospel might indulge in it without the slightest impropriety.

One afternoon a wagon and wain to Carmel by the usual road, and returned by a mountain road, which skirts the shore of Lake Malopac, a beautiful view of the lake, and the surrounding scenery. Carmel is the country town of Putnam county, and is an important place in this region of lakes and mountains, in consequence. About this season the country is very beautiful. It is a great curiosity to see a man who is so well educated by the barometry of the surrounding scenery.

It is a great curiosity to see a man who is so well educated by the barometry of the surrounding scenery. It is as if he were a philosopher in a cipher to establish an empire. Now, if a party of two or three, or half a dozen, with rods and tackle, go to a lake, and sit on the bank, and fish, and catch the fish, one at a time, it is a game of the most interesting kind.

It is a great curiosity to see a man who is so well educated by the barometry of the surrounding scenery. It is as if he were a philosopher in a cipher to establish an empire. Now, if a party of two or three, or half a dozen, with rods and tackle, go to a lake, and sit on the bank, and fish, and catch the fish, one at a time, it is a game of the most interesting kind.

It is a great curiosity to see a man who is so well educated by the barometry of the surrounding scenery. It is as if he were a philosopher in a cipher to establish an empire. Now, if a party of two or three, or half a dozen, with rods and tackle, go to a lake, and sit on the bank, and fish, and catch the fish, one at a time, it is a game of the most interesting kind.

It is a great curiosity to see a man who is so well educated by the barometry of the surrounding scenery. It is as if he were a philosopher in a cipher to establish an empire. Now, if a party of two or three, or half a dozen, with rods and tackle, go to a lake, and sit on the bank, and fish, and catch the fish, one at a time, it is a game of the most interesting kind.

It is a great curiosity to see a man who is so well educated by the barometry of the surrounding scenery. It is as if he were a philosopher in a cipher to establish an empire. Now, if a party of two or three, or half a dozen, with rods and tackle, go to a lake, and sit on the bank, and fish, and catch the fish, one at a time, it is a game of the most interesting kind.

It is a great curiosity to see a man who is so well educated by the barometry of the surrounding scenery. It is as if he were a philosopher in a cipher to establish an empire. Now, if a party of two or three, or half a dozen, with rods and tackle, go to a lake, and sit on the bank, and fish, and catch the fish, one at a time, it is a game of the most interesting kind.

It is a great curiosity to see a man who is so well educated by the barometry of the surrounding scenery. It is as if he were a philosopher in a cipher to establish an empire. Now, if a party of two or three, or half a dozen, with rods and tackle, go to a lake, and sit on the bank, and fish, and catch the fish, one at a time, it is a game of the most interesting kind.

Successor of the Deceased.

Before Hon. Judge C. Thompson, on the 29th of May, 1855. THE THOMPSON WILL CASE.—CHANCERY DIVISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

2189.—Edward G. Thompson, an infant, by James M. B. B. vs. his next next of kin, David Thompson, George W. Thompson and others.—This was an appeal from the decree of the Surrogate, in the matter of proving the last will and testament of Abraham G. Thompson, who died in New York on the 29th of October, 1851. The appellants, by their counsel, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

Successor of the Deceased.

Before Hon. Judge C. Thompson, on the 29th of May, 1855. THE THOMPSON WILL CASE.—CHANCERY DIVISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

2189.—Edward G. Thompson, an infant, by James M. B. B. vs. his next next of kin, David Thompson, George W. Thompson and others.—This was an appeal from the decree of the Surrogate, in the matter of proving the last will and testament of Abraham G. Thompson, who died in New York on the 29th of October, 1851. The appellants, by their counsel, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

Successor of the Deceased.

Before Hon. Judge C. Thompson, on the 29th of May, 1855. THE THOMPSON WILL CASE.—CHANCERY DIVISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

2189.—Edward G. Thompson, an infant, by James M. B. B. vs. his next next of kin, David Thompson, George W. Thompson and others.—This was an appeal from the decree of the Surrogate, in the matter of proving the last will and testament of Abraham G. Thompson, who died in New York on the 29th of October, 1851. The appellants, by their counsel, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

Successor of the Deceased.

Before Hon. Judge C. Thompson, on the 29th of May, 1855. THE THOMPSON WILL CASE.—CHANCERY DIVISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

2189.—Edward G. Thompson, an infant, by James M. B. B. vs. his next next of kin, David Thompson, George W. Thompson and others.—This was an appeal from the decree of the Surrogate, in the matter of proving the last will and testament of Abraham G. Thompson, who died in New York on the 29th of October, 1851. The appellants, by their counsel, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

Successor of the Deceased.

Before Hon. Judge C. Thompson, on the 29th of May, 1855. THE THOMPSON WILL CASE.—CHANCERY DIVISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

2189.—Edward G. Thompson, an infant, by James M. B. B. vs. his next next of kin, David Thompson, George W. Thompson and others.—This was an appeal from the decree of the Surrogate, in the matter of proving the last will and testament of Abraham G. Thompson, who died in New York on the 29th of October, 1851. The appellants, by their counsel, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased. The respondents, Messrs. Fullerton and Newman, contend that the paper offered for probate is not the will of the deceased.

MARINE INTELLIGENCE. Movements of Ocean Steamers. Port of New York, May 30, 1855. Clearing. Steamship Baltic, Comstock, Liverpool, E. K. Collins. Ship Maria Green, Cape Town, C. G. Siffen & Innes. Ship Emigrant (Iron), Anderson, Baltimore, Ostrich & Co. Ship Hyperion, Griffen, Barbadoes, T. Dwight. Ship St. Lawrence, Griffen, Barbadoes, T. Dwight. Ship St. Lawrence, Griffen, Barbadoes, T. Dwight. Ship St. Lawrence, Griffen, Barbadoes, T. Dwight.