

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of THE REVIEW :

Sir, With regard to this question of returning goods, I am of the opinion that the wholesalers must bear with their own little troubles. We have enough of them, and they cannot shelve all their grievances on the poor retailer. The trouble is generally due to the great number of travellers and the intense competition among them. They must sell goods whether we want them or not. They tell us the whole truth about their goods, and a great deal more, and force us to buy, or at least put us in such a position and in such a frame of mind, that we are afraid not to buy, not physically, but morally afraid. You will find, sir, if you inquire, that the goods returned are not often staples. In fact, seldom will they be the usual and staple stock. But the parcels marked "returned" are parcels of novelties, fancy goods, new brands, new designs, etc., warranted by the traveller to sell at sight. But when they arrive and are opened up, the merchant thinks the matter carefully over, and he concludes they won't sell and he decides to send them back. This, I say, is a just privilege, due to the retailers who buy goods under the pressure of oily tongued travellers. With regard to the bad packing, of course, I must admit that to be a real grievance.

Yours truly,

COUNTER.

Montreal, Que., Nov. 3rd, 1892.

To the Editor of THE REVIEW :

Sir, With regard to the circular sent out by the Dry Goods Section of the Toronto Board of Trade, I must say that I think the wholesalers are making a mountain out of a mole hill. By sending out the circular they have sent, they imply that this is a general practice among the retailers. Now, sir, this is not true, as far as I can judge of the trade. The majority of retailers may send goods back, but this majority do not send goods back for the reasons nor in the manner set out in the circular. The wholesaler may have made a mistake in the quantity or pattern, or may have substituted one line for another; in any or all of these cases the dealer is justified in sending back goods if they are not suitable for his purposes. And he is also justified in doing this at the wholesaler's expense; because when the wholesaler does anything of this kind, he knows that he is incurring this risk, and consequently the retailer should not be accused of wrong doing when he is doing simply what is expected.

Moreover, I decidedly object to the imputation that goods are generally damaged when returned, due to slovenly, careless packing. If some wholesaler has a few such customers, he should not endeavor to reflect this bad light on the whole class of retailers, but settle this matter with his own customers. The retailers in the dry goods business in Canada are, in my opinion, as gentlemanly and upright a class of business men as exist anywhere, and it is discouraging to them to have such general charges laid at their doors.

Yours truly,

GEORGIAN BAY.

Nov. 10th, 1892.

DRY GOODS FOOTBALL.

The Toronto wholesale dry goods clerks have been much interested as to the result of the contest for the shield presented to the League by THE DRY GOODS REVIEW. Exciting matches were played all through the season, and finally the team of Caldecott, Burton & Spence won the shield for the second time. Once more, and it is theirs forever. The teams of W. R. Brock & Co., and of Wyld, Grasett & Darling were tied for second place. Many believe that Brock's team is the best in the League, but Caldecott's are the champions, winning it by careful management and strong play. The team of John Macdonald & Co. withdrew from the League early in the season, on account of an unfortunate disagreement between them and the executive committee. They had a strong team. If possible the readers of this journal will be favored with a picture of the champions and their trophy in next issue.

IN MONTREAL.

There has been considerably rivalry between the employees of the firms of McIntyre & Son and Lonsdale, Reid & Co., regarding their prowess in Association football. The matter was decided by two matches early in the month, but the matter resulted in a tie, each house winning a match. Since then the weather has not tempted them to decide the matter.

The first match was played on Saturday, the 22nd October, the Lonsdales winning by two goals to none, all made in the last half.

On the 11th of November the two houses met again in the Crystal Rink, when the McIntyres administered an overwhelming defeat to the Lonsdales, winning by a score of five goals

to two. Following were the teams on this occasion:—

McIntyre, Sons & Co.—J. Duhamel, F. J. Shaw, Jas. H. McKenzie, L. Clark, R. Park, D. Lynch, H. Shaw, P. Forster, W. McKenzie, C. Hostler, R. Blunling.

Lonsdale, Reid & Co.—M. Baker, W. J. Chidley, J. Hannah, A. Chiquette, A. Gibb, W. N. Ahern, E. A. Lapierre, C. W. McFarlane, R. B. Murray, N. Marchbanks, W. C. Murray.

Referee, John Dolg.

FURNISHINGS NOTES.

The Inverness overcoat will be in favor this winter with the best dressed county and town gentlemen, perhaps not so popular in the cities. The Chesterfield will be as popular as ever. But last year's fashions are not going to have much change, except perhaps a tendency to longer garments. The Clothier and Furnisher says:—"The overcoats of the winter will of course be longer—the long undercoats necessitate that—and then there is a tendency for greater length in topcoats, for cold weather wear, that has been fomenting in the fashions for several years past. They will be box in shape, rough and double breasted, with the lapel rolling lower than last year, save when the chill blast blows. There will be a minority of the long-tailed Newmarket-like overcoats; for they are tight-fitting and blind the undercoat, while they very noticeably vie in shape with the coachman's livery."

The fashionable hat is the Tourist, and it bids fair to conquer public fashion, taste and everything. The rush seems to be into all sorts of soft hats, lessening slightly the demand for stiff hats.

Everything indicates colored shirts for next summer's wear, both in negligence and ordinary.



WANT OF PERSPICUITY.

PARSHLEY (who has lunched at the same restaurant with GAYJER without seeing him)—Some infernal rascal stole my hat in there, just now!

GAYJER.—That's funny! I lost mine there, too! (And they part, resolving never to visit the place again.)