of his Sovereign's regret and approbation; and the scenes in which he had been so conspicuous an actor, had ceased to be a matter of general interest. Under these circumstances, the relatives of Sir George Prevost would confidently have entrusted his reputation to the unprejudiced judgment of posterity, had they not seen, with equal regret and indignation, a late attempt to revive the almost exploded calumnies and misrepresentations of which he had been the victim. That the Quarterly Review\* should have lent its pages to an attack like this, will, upon the perusal of the present volume, excite the surprise of every candid person; and it is chiefly for the purpose of correcting the misstatements into which the Reviewer has been led, that the following pages are presented to the public.

Before entering more particularly upon the subject of Sir George Prevost's conduct, so wantonly attacked in the article above alluded to, it may not be thought improper briefly to advert to his father's services and to his own early history. From his military career, previous to his appointment to the chief command in British North America, it will clearly appear that he was not without reason selected by his

<sup>\*</sup> Vide the Quarterly Review for October, 1822, p. 405.