

to his colleagues but to the numerous witnesses, who were mostly men of eminence, including H.R.H. the Commander-in-Chief. His questions to these gentlemen were searching, pointed, deftly aimed. They dealt at times with unpleasant facts or allegations, but they were put so pleasantly that they could not give offence.

It is not always the most important events of discussions, or even of a grave inquiry, that come back to one most vividly in after years. What I happen to remember best is what least admits of being put into words. On the one hand, there can be no doubt that Lord Dufferin took this Commission very seriously, and gave it his best powers. He was much in earnest in desiring to secure for our officers, in those days of purchase, the best possible education. At the same time, I used to fancy that I detected, now and then, a playful irony in his look and voice and in the adjustment of his eye-glass, as he planted some of his cleverly chosen questions, especially when they hinted at some frailty in respect of discipline on the part of the young cadets. Behind the conscientious zeal of the Commissioner, and at no very remote distance, there seemed to loom a genial *hinterland* of sobering Eton memories.

Quite apart from this, one feature in his Chairmanship struck me at the time with surprise. He had even then a high and highly-deserved character for eloquence. His speeches in Canada a few years later are models of a new order of oratory, a rare interweaving of playfulness and earnestness. But when he spoke at the meetings of the Commission he was the reverse of fluent. He spoke slowly, thoughtfully, sententiously, as if feeling his way, with something of a hesitation such as I have noticed in the utterances of Lord Palmerston and Count Cavour. Not that this hesitation detracted from the effect of his remarks; on the contrary, it seemed to concentrate attention upon them.