

cated mechanism that had been devised to obviate this inequality of consumption and to keep the two points continuously at the same distance was explained at length, and brought within the comprehension of all. The arc light was generally used for illuminating large spaces, while the incandescent lamps were chiefly devised for domestic uses. Electric motive power will form the subject of the next lecture.

From the Register

August 24th 1882.

CLASS DISTINCTION IN ROWING.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—I notice in this morning's issue a letter signed "Universities" on this subject, written from what the writer in his unparalleled assurance holds out as a gentleman's standpoint, but from the tone of which any one with any gentlemanly feeling would at once put down as the work of a *parvenu*. Not being a boating man myself, I do not intend to discuss the matter from a rower's point of view, but simply as between class and class; but before doing so must say that "Universities" must be a poor, weak, overworked student if training for a boatrace will overtax his sickly brain, and the sooner he gives up sapping and takes to manly sports the better for his success in after-life. I am sure that ninety-nine-hundredths of the *gentlemen* in the Association will hardly like to admit that the work they are likely to do on the river will injure their brains. Reasons Nos. 3, 4, and 5 in "Universities" letter are the great points on which exception is to be taken. The writer seems to be one of those persons whose veneer of good manners is so thin that he cannot afford to have the slightest friction with those who are accidentally placed in a lower social position than himself, lest the thin coating of polish rub off and show the barbarian beneath. What man with the slightest feeling of a gentleman would wantonly inflict ~~the gratuitous~~ insults that he has heaped on a respectable body of mechanics? A true gentleman has nothing to fear from familiarity, for he can always nip it in the bud if he likes; and I would ask him how it is there is no class distinction among rowing men at home, how men in professions do not suffer from being brought in contact with those of a lower class, and whether Lord Harris and the rest of the Gentlemen of England and English University men meet the professional players on the cricket field for amusement without encouraging familiarity on the part of their inferiors and losing caste? In short, I think the whole of "Universities" letter is snobbish to the extreme, and hope that when he grows older and sees a little more of society (for no one but a boy who is just feeling himself would write such a letter, unless, as Mark Twain says, "It is wrote sarcastic") he will understand that gentlemen are secure enough in their position to be able to know and show courtesy to those in a lower sphere, and will not *lose caste* because they are acquainted with those who do not set up to be such "large orders" as he does. To conclude, the whole of "Universities" letter seems to be that he is afraid to row, not with but against manual-labour men.

I am, Sir, &c., R. D. BERESFORD.
North Adelaide.

From the Register
August 24th 1882

CLASS DISTINCTION IN ROWING.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—The letter in your issue of Tuesday signed "Universities," and dated from North-terrace, leads readers to suppose that the University Boat Club, or some member of it, is responsible for the arguments and statements it contains. The majority of our members, though holding a similar opinion on the question of distinguishing classes in rowing, would never support it in a tone so injudicious and provocative of animosity. Great pains were taken at our meeting on Friday last by some speakers to show that no "snobbish" disrespect for the "dignity of labour" induced the desire for the distinction of classes, but simply an anxiety to see fair-play, encourage general rowing, and prevent it degenerating into what is at home termed "pot-hunting." One fact which, even if unsupported, would appear a sufficient reason for the change we have made is that if we ignore the distinction therein created we shall be acting in defiance of the opinion and experience of all other Rowing Associations, and disqualifying ourselves for competition with them in future. Secondly, those whose daily work exercises the brain, but tends to weaken the body, are the class for which such exercise as rowing is most essential, and to which most encouragement should be given. It was for their benefit that the limitation expressed by the word "amateur" was instituted. The difference in daily occupations constitutes a handicap so heavy that it leaves but a small chance to the amateur, and so he becomes discouraged and desists from the attempt. This has been the experience of the Melbourne and Sydney Associations, and as far as we have gone has been our experience too, and there seems no escape from the difficulty except by following the example of those Associations, and removing manual labour from competition among amateurs.

Thirdly, the principle involved in this distinction is acknowledged by the rule of our own Association, which excludes professional boatmen from our regattas. Why such exclusion if the object of our regattas is only to discover what crew or individual oarsman can pull a boat fastest? I am sincerely sorry that this has developed into a social class question. It might, I had hoped, have been amicably settled but for the letter referred to, with its unfortunate antithesis of "gentleman" and "mechanic." The claim to the title of gentleman is altogether beside the question; the name is often as inappropriate to one class as the other. That of amateur oarsman, however, the general consent of the rowing world has refused to manual labour, and for this refusal I believe I have above shown just reason. In one respect indeed the rule restricting the class would bear alteration. There is no valid reason why an amateur should be disqualified as such for merely rowing with or against those who do not satisfy the definition. This clause, I feel sure, will prove the most dangerous rock of offence, and I would suggest that steps be taken towards effecting this alteration by our Association, in combination with those of the other Australian Colonies. Mixed crews might then row without disqualifying any one, and I believe nearly all the members of our rowing clubs here would be satisfied. Till this is done, however, our Association cannot afford to isolate itself by refusing to recognise the opinion of the majority.

I am, Sir, &c., D. F. KELLY.
The University, North-terrace.