

Outside the Gates.

WOMEN.



THE Rev. Dr. Parkhurst, of New York City, is evidently a gentleman of somewhat-out-spoken tendency; in speaking before the students of a young ladies' college, he recently made the following stern arraignment of the purposeless lines of some of their class. He is right to speak strongly, for in no country upon the face of the globe is labour held in greater contempt than in America, in spite of its boast of equality and liberty:—

"If it happens that I am speaking to any young woman whose property, actual or prospective, renders work unnecessary as a livelihood, and who, on that score, excuses herself from actual service of some kind in others' behalf, I am going to say to you, in kindly candour, three things: You are a dishonour to your sex; you are a traitor to your kind; you are a renegade from the cause of the Divine Master. Let me add, for your sake, and that of your father and mother, that an aimless life is property upon which the devil regularly holds the first mortgage. Aimlessness is certain to drift, and the drift is never up stream. What begins with aimlessness easily hardens into selfishness; and selfishness, with means to gratify it, is the prolific mother of a large and bad brood. This is a terrible picture of waste and failure. Surely we do not need to keep it before us to make us respect profoundly our girls' longing for work. Shall a child ask bread, and we give him a stone? . . . Would a father say to his son, 'My boy, your mother and I are lonely without you; you must stay at home, go out to afternoon teas and parties with us, and keep us company in the big, empty house; I have enough for us all, so there is no need of your bothering your head about supporting yourself?' Would he expect his son to be happy under such circumstances? Why, then, his daughter? 'It would distress you,' says the writer of a powerful article on 'The Waste of Women's Intellectual Force,' 'to have a group of idle sons, thirty or forty years of age, hanging around your home; you would not expect them to be contented, and you would probably blame yourself for having somehow erred in their training. But you like to have a group of idle daughters about you. You think it very strange if they are discontented, and you rarely feel that to them, as well as to their brothers, the real opportunities of life should have been widely opened. . . . On this high vantage ground, how clearly marked out is the path before us! Our daughters must bring their womanhood, as our sons their manhood, to help the world, *because* there is a 'difference between them,' and their work, 'though parallel, is not identical.' Many things the one can do that the other cannot possibly do. And for the rest, the only question of 'right' is, Which can do

—Science Notes.—

CATS AND DOGS.

IT would be out of place in this column to dilate upon the respective merits of cats and dogs as pets and companions, and might, moreover, cause offence to some readers, as many persons are strong partisans of either one tribe or the other. It has even been asked why so many devotees of the dog always couple their expressions of admiration for him with those of contempt for the cat, and *vice versa*.

Let us, however, leave this dangerous ground, and consider what may be learnt by a very slight study of the anatomy and habits of these animals. The cats, as a family, are fiercer, and their teeth and heads generally, are more typically carnivorous than those of dogs. The methods of obtaining food, practised by the cat and dog respectively, when dependent on their own resources, differ, and, as a result of this, the habits of the two animals are also different, even when domesticated.

The wild cat lies concealed in the jungle, or in the underwood, or by a rock, and when his prey approaches springs upon it suddenly. By the education of the race and to the individual, the cat is practised in stealthy movements, and its velvety paws and retractile claws enable it to be quite silent. The ability to draw back its claws when they are not in use is also of value in keeping them sharp and ready for action.

The dog does not hide from its prey, but trusts to greater swiftness, and superior powers of endurance, to fairly run it down. He is not silent, but gives vent to his excitement in whining, howling and barking, while the only relief permitted to the cat is a lashing of the tail. Do not these facts render more intelligible the habits of the animals under domestication? A cat can walk on a table or shelf, crowded with china, without upsetting anything; she appears quite aware of the exact position of each of her four paws, and seldom disturbs or breaks anything, unless in her confusion when she recognises that she is discovered in some forbidden place. No one who has watched both kittens and puppies at play can have failed to notice the graceful and elegant movements of the former, and the somewhat clumsy and boisterous deportment of the latter. Moreover, the claws of the dog are not retractile, so that they soon become blunt, and the foot-fall of the dog on hard ground is distinctly audible.

A dog, like a human being, may, however, acquire habits of deception. Here is a true story of a dog who was guilty of both deceit and "tale-bearing." He was an inmate of a household which included also a cat that was in the habit of stealing. When the booty appeared desirable to the dog, he would share it with the thief, "well knowing it to have been stolen." The cat's taste, however, was more aristocratic than his (according to the definition of "aristocrats" given by the little street boy who said they were "folks wot would eat anythink"), and when the cat stole anything the dog did not appreciate, he promptly "told" of her.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)