

A. No person has a true impression of the degree of pain or pleasure of another being; there is no complete medium to convey the sensations; words will not do it. No person can tell what a man of probity and reflection, who wishes to judge without error, and to do his public duty in an arduous question, feels, when put upon the rack of opinion. No man in this place exactly knows how I feel, in my particular and relative situation, by being so long kept at this Bar, and called upon to answer every sort of question that can be imagined about all possible and probable things from such a variety of persons. Witnesses, by all the law I know in the world, are called every where only to speak to facts; to opinions, no where;—except in one court of religion, in the world.

Q. The gentleman then has, I find, some sort of idea of another man's suffering, although not an adequate and perfect one. Cannot he tell the House, supposing that I were to give the gentleman who sits below me a slap on the face, what he would suffer? [The Member who put the question being a very slightly made man, and the gentleman who sat beneath him a very stout man, and the latter turning round quick to look at him, it occasioned a loud laugh.] I mean, what would a person struck suffer when there are visible signs of a violent blow? Suppose that the blood gushes out of the nose?

A. The noses of some people bleed without pain. That gentleman might have a blow on the nose, and he might feel it. I should not. I mean, he would feel it if he were sober; if he were drunk he might not; he might take it all in good part; and as for the blood, swear it was all good claret.

A Member. Repeat the answer.

A. If he were inebriated he might not feel. Mr. Chairman, I hope my answers are not improper. I desire to be serious. I am in earnest. The answer, I take it, by the law of all evidence, ought to be of the same colour with the question, and pointed to it.

Chairman. Right, certainly.

Colonel Batre. I would not desire to distress the gentleman at the Bar. He is certainly under personal difficulties in his situation of office, and not being a Member. But I see he bears his examination with much patience and good humour. We were all going to be very dull, and he has enlivened us. He has been asked above an hundred questions, and has parried them all: not one decisive answer. I did not expect he would have kept his ground so stoutly against numbers. I will now beg leave to try him. I undertake, Sir, to ask him one very easy question, which I think he may and will answer. What does he think is the King of Prussia's religion?

A. I have read some of his works; if the writings I mean are really his; although some people have doubted the title, "*Oeuvres du Philosophe de Sans Souci*." His religion may be judged from them.

Q. I desire to know, Sir, what he judges the King of Prussia's religion to be?

A. From them? I believe his Majesty has no (formal) religion.

Q. If the province of Canada were to be ceded to his Prussian Majesty, what religion would he introduce into it?

A. A soldier's religion.

Q. What is a soldier's religion?

A. If I were a soldier, Sir, I would answer the words—my honour.