

On page 55 of the SEQUEL, when speaking of Hezekiah Bunker, I am criticised in my use of the word "trace." I reply that I do so not so much with reference to *instruments* in which his name occurs, as with regard to his personal history, and this is evident from the context. The only trace that I could find of the man was his name: has the author of the SEQUEL discovered more?

On page 61, it is declared that Mr. Campbell had "no proper warrant for saying that there were one hundred and forty pleasure carriages in Yarmouth in 1831." I *had* a "proper warrant" in the form of a written memorandum of the late Mrs. H. G. Farish. I ask no better warrant. The warrant is unimpeachable. Nothing has been set down by me anywhere without warrant, and without, where possible, having been verified by many witnesses.

My statements as to the foreign trade of Yarmouth, adverted to on page 62, will stand the test of examination. I admit they will bear amplification. From this point of view—and apart from the animus of the writer—the additional information given in the SEQUEL is excellent; but in no case, throughout my whole work, have I intentionally depreciated any citizen whose memory ought to be honorably preserved.

Upon page 67, I am controverted as to the naming of More-Rum Brook. I question no statement of the author of the SEQUEL with regard to rum; but, as regards the naming of the Brook, I entirely prefer the traditional account handed down from the time of the late Colonel Joseph Norman Bond, as well as the information derived from personal intercourse with Captain J. V. N. Hatfield, Colonel James Lent, and many others.

I am charged, on page 68, with deliberate misrepresentation in my account of Confederation. I made *no* misrepresentation, deliberate or otherwise, and I require no excuse. To all those who are acquainted, first, with the facts, and then with myself, no further defence will be required. I felt the delicacy of the whole matter, and I spoke both carefully