Correspondence of the Montreal Morning Herald.

The Chief's letter to President Pierce—true cause of the hostility to the Allies—Curious interview between Lord Palmerston and the American Minister.

New York, Sat., 27th, 1855.

"Palmerston and his colleagues" and Col. Bonneville

[illegible]

M. Louis Blanc give for such a chance of proving the principles of Socialism!—what would a Birmingham political economist give for such an occasion of finally and clearly establishing the philosopher's stone in the shape of the little shilling? Our tables and our walls [illegible] under the weight of circulars and pamphlets, and instructions which the world will condescend to read.

[illegible] very humble which we intend to form, we gladly accept as a matter of duty to any one who may happen to occupy the pulpit of our parish church. It is not common among the clergy to undervalue the dignity of their sacred office, but we think that very few at this moment fairly obnoxious to the reproach levelled against them by Archdeacon Sinclair, of underestimating the vast opportunity for good which they enjoy, but fail frequently to employ, every Sunday morning and evening. Man is, after all, a thinking and reasoning and yet, in this case, is commonly so little inclined to respond to the hand that touches the chords of that wonderfully attuned instrument, reason. If the clergyman to sanctuary, if people leave the church with little notice of the discourse that has been addressed to them, if it has become fashionable to Sinclair complaints, to praise short sermons for their shortness, the fault, rely on it, is not in the audience, who are always willing to be interested and excited—the fault is in the speaker himself. Yet in the dear place the church needs administrative reform fully as much as any other department. Care is taken that our preachers should understand the dead language, but no trouble is ever taken to see that they are competent to stirring the feelings, convincing the reason, or awakening the dormant energies of living souls. Their own language, that in which they speak and read, is sure to be the last to the structure and literature of which their education has directed attention, and no Bishop, or authority of a diocese, ever seems to consider whether the possession of language and eloquence is a necessary qualification for a parish church. And yet for short sermons, principal ability depends upon the hold they can take of the ears of their audience, who are seeking a new generation and convincing, there is no qualification so important, indeed so absolutely necessary. Would the poorest sputter at a public meeting, and see how a man, ill-educated in general, and probably ill-informed on the subject on which he speaks, pleasing either humor nor correctness of language, can still, by adopting himself to the comprehension of his audience, stand up their feelings, and leading at anytime their judgment, they approve and their assent. Why cannot the clergy do this? There are many reasons, but one stands over each body—there is a great gulf between them and their audience, an imperfect sympathy, a totally dissimilar point of view.

The time is changed, and preaching is now shorter and less sensational; it deals too much with generalities, and therefore fails to reach those details in which the minds of the audience are wrapped up. The preacher speaks to a [illegible] of Lord Palmerston in which the name of the Premier is not once mentioned from Sunday to Sunday; remarks the [illegible] of Lord Palmerston, and the