

35,000 Jews have arrived in the city of New York! After all, what are we doing? In order that this work may be pushed—I am addressing myself not to you Philadelphians, but to the delegates from out of the city, away from the seaboard—in order that this work may be effective, it requires your co-operation in every way; that means not only that you will be willing to receive the immigrants who are sent, it means you must be willing to receive them in the spirit in which they should be received, so that they may willingly go to the places to which they are sent. Let us never forget that there would be no need for this immigration, there would be no need for the men to leave their families back in that hell of Russia, and no need to make a new home for them here were it not for their fidelity to their religion. Remember in helping make a new home for them, to make it as far as may be in such a way that they may be true to their religion, as they conceive it. It does not make any difference what we think about whether they want to keep the dietary laws, or this, that or the other thing. It is not for us to pass on their religious convictions. It is for us to open our doors and hearts to them on the terms in which they read Judaism, not on the terms in which we would read it for them. And unless we open our hearts to them on those terms, make no mistake, unless we open our hearts to them on those terms we don't open them at all.

MERCANTILE CLUB, 10 A. M., MAY 7, 1906.

THE PRESIDENT:

In the absence of Dr. Lee K. Frankel, Chairman of the Committee on Desertion, who is at present *en route* to San Francisco on behalf of this Conference, his report will be read by Mr. Charles Zunsner, Agent of the United Hebrew Charities of New York in charge of Desertion Cases.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON DESERTION.

DR. LEE K. FRANKEL, *Manager* of the United Hebrew Charities of the City of New York, Chairman.

The problem of deserted wives and children is neither new nor novel to the Conference of Jewish Charities. At the first meeting

of the Conference, held in Chicago in 1900, the Committee on Desertions presented an admirable report, in which was outlined the status of the desertion situation at that time, and a resumé of the legislation in various States directed toward punishment of deserters. Several suggestions were made by the Committee in the hope of eradicating desertion. In view of their timeliness, they are repeated here. The Committee summarized these questions as follows:

1.—That all our charitable institutions should endeavor, through the means of friendly visiting, the pulpit, the press, and at public meetings, to elevate the general tone of our poorer co-religionists and to impress upon them the honorable duty of providing for their families under all circumstances.

2.—In connection with this work, it would be well if our institutions for out-door relief could pursue a policy of endeavoring to afford sufficient assistance in proper cases to make the applicant self-supporting, thus removing the temptation to desertion.

3.—The several charities should report to each other monthly the details of all cases of desertion which come to their knowledge. This should be supplemented by the endeavor of each organization to ferret out the whereabouts of the offender, and to take immediate legal steps toward his arrest and rendition to his residence for punishment. The expense of each such proceeding, it would appear fair, should be borne by the organization at his residence, but it is quite possible that the actual expense of the arrest and return of the fugitive to the country wherein he has been indicted or charged with the crime will be paid by the authorities of the State or county of his residence.

4.—This Conference and the individual charities should urge upon the Legislature of at least those States in which are situated the larger centers of population, the passage of a statute similar to that now existing in the State of New York.

5.—This Conference and its several constituent organizations should also endeavor to secure from the governors of the various States concerned, the rendition of every fugitive wanted for the crime of desertion in any other State, together with the adoption of such rules covering extradition as would include the crime

of desertion unequivocally among those in which extradition should be compulsory.

As a result of the recommendations of the Committee, the subject of wife and child abandonment was eventually brought to the notice of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, giving a decided impetus to the entire question and bringing it prominently before Legislatures and charitable societies throughout the United States.

Largely as a result of this agitation, the State of New York has recently changed its form of punishment for desertion by declaring it to be a felony instead of a misdemeanor, as heretofore. The subject of desertion has not come up again before this Conference since the report made in Chicago. The question itself, however, has unquestionably been most prominently before all the societies connected with the Conference, and may be classified as one of the most important causes leading to the destitution brought to the notice of organizations which give relief.

Various studies of the desertion question have been made in recent years to determine causes of desertion and to devise methods of bringing the deserters to justice. At various times, papers dealing with this subject have been published in the columns of "Jewish Charity." In the number for December, 1905, there appeared a paper by Mr. Morris Waldman, showing the results of such a study made by the United Hebrew Charities of New York in the year 1902-1903. This study brought out some interesting and unknown facts with reference to the causes that led men to desert their wives and families. Of particular importance in this connection was the statistical information obtained, showing that a large percentage of desertion was not due, as had been supposed, to lack of work or to inability to earn a living, but to various forms of immorality.

A similar study made in the city of Boston in 1901, also showed that desertion could hardly be ascribed to purely economic causes. Thirty-three per cent. of the desertions in the city of Boston were due to drunkenness and a large percentage of the remainder due to general instability of character on the part of the husband or the wife.

The facts brought out in the study made by Mr. Waldman show

that Jews, in this respect, did not differ from other human beings. They demonstrate equally with the Boston figures that desertion is an evil, due to lack of willingness on the part of the husband to assume the responsibilities of married life and a desire on his part to get away from the cares and the trials which married life entails.

It is true that there are certain underlying facts connected with Jewish desertion which, to some extent, modify the above statement. Of particular interest should be mentioned the fact that owing to a forced immigration from European countries, a husband frequently comes to the United States in advance of his family, contracts new ties when he arrives here and is unwilling, for this reason, to maintain responsibilities originally contracted before he left his native place. This side of the question has been so carefully and thoroughly gone into that there is very little that can be added. It is well recognized to-day that desertion exists—that if anything it is on the increase—and that the efforts of societies should be directed rather to the consideration of breaking up desertion, even if stringent and severe methods must be resorted to, than to any academic or theoretical discussion as to the causes of desertion.

The desertion law in the State of New York, which went into effect on September 1, 1905, places abandonment of children on an entirely different plane from heretofore. Under the former law, desertion was a misdemeanor, punishable by fine and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months. Under this law, it was practically impossible to prosecute an offender who had left the jurisdiction of the commonwealth, for the reason that the governor of the State was not inclined to issue extradition papers for a misdemeanor. The charitable societies of the city and State, realizing the shortcomings of existing legislation, appointed a committee to draft a new law, declaring desertion to be a felony, which, after considerable pressure being brought to bear on the Legislature by the charitable activities of the State, eventually became a law.

After most careful consideration, it was deemed inadvisable to make the law apply to wife desertion, since it was felt that no Legislature would be willing to punish a man very severely for

desertion of wife alone. In fact, it was felt that juries, before whom such cases might be brought, would be apt to exercise considerable leniency where it was discovered that no hardship was involved through the desertion of the wife, particularly in cases where there were no children. The New York law, for this reason, is novel in that wife desertion is not mentioned. The law as it reads has reference only to the abandonment of children. The law reads as follows:

CHAPTER 168.

An Act to amend the penal code in relation to the abandonment of children.

Became a law April 8th, 1905, with the approval of the governor. Passed, three-fifths being present.

The people of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Chapter three of title ten of the penal code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section, to be section two hundred and eighty seven, a.

287 A. ABANDONMENT OF CHILDREN. A parent or other person charged with the care or custody for nurture or education of a child under the age of sixteen years, who abandons the child in destitute circumstances and willfully omits to furnish necessary and proper food, clothing or shelter for such a child is guilty of felony, punishable by imprisonment for not more than two years or by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars, or by both. In case a fine is imposed, the same may be applied in the discretion of the court to the support of such child. Proof of the abandonment of such child in destitute circumstances and omission to furnish necessary and proper food, clothing or shelter is prima facie evidence that such omission is willful. The provisions of section seven hundred and fifteen of this code prohibiting the disclosure of confidential communications between husband and wife shall not apply to prosecutions for the offense here defined. A previous conviction or convictions of felony or misdemeanor shall not prevent the court from suspending sentence upon a conviction under this section, or from arbitrarily fixing

the limit of imprisonment or fine, in case imprisonment or fine is imposed upon conviction herein.

2. Nothing in this act contained shall be deemed or construed to repeal, amend, impair or in any manner affect the provisions of sections two hundred and eighty-seven, two hundred and eighty-eight, or two hundred and eighty-nine of the penal code or any other existing provisions of law, relating to abandonment or other acts of cruelty to children.

3. This act shall take effect September 1st, 1905.

Immediately after the law went into effect, the United Hebrew Charities of the city of New York determined to make a very active campaign for the prosecution of deserters under the new law. In this movement, it was aided by the agitation that had been carried on for some time in the columns of the *Jewish Daily News* of New York, which paper had been making an active campaign through its columns towards finding deserting husbands. So that the work could be made as general as possible, a Special Committee was organized, known as the Committee for the Protection of Deserted Wives and Children, under whose auspices the results that are hereafter mentioned have been accomplished. The active propaganda of the work and the funds necessary for its maintenance have been supplied by the United Hebrew Charities. At the outset the committee decided on certain fundamental principles to guide its work. It was felt that the main object of the committee was not so much to punish deserters as to reunite them with their families and prevent the latter from becoming burdens on the community. At the same time it was recognized that there would be instances in which no other means would be effective, and in which it would be necessary to apply the law to its full effect.

Of paramount importance, however, was the recognition of the fact that the best way to overcome desertion was to give as much publicity as possible to the offender and to compel him either through fear of punishment or through fear of social ostracism to return voluntarily and assume the responsibility which he had neglected. It was conceded at the outset that only through a systematic propaganda would the work of the committee become effective.

The matter is brought to the attention of the Conference here to show what can be accomplished with deserters under a plan such as has been outlined above. At the beginning it was recognized that to do the work effectively, some one thoroughly conversant with the legal situation should be employed, who would give his entire time and attention to the work. It is only fitting that some recognition should be given to Mr. Charles Zunser, the special desertion agent, who has been employed by the committee, for the intelligence and the care with which he has carried on the committee's work. No less praise should be accorded to the Jewish press, and in particular the *Jewish Daily News*, for the co-operation which it has tendered in giving the work of the committee the proper publicity. In fact, it can safely be said that without the help of the press, it is impossible to obtain the means of getting that publicity which is so desirable not only in finding offenders, but in inducing them to return.

In detail, the work of the committee has been as follows: Notice was given in all papers to all deserted wives, advising them to appear before the committee and bring with them all the facts in their possession, through which the deserting husbands might possibly be traced. These facts included, in particular, photographs of the husband, place of his last occupation, and the name of his employer. After the wife's statement was taken, a special investigator at once visited the home, employer, relatives and friends, in order to obtain information regarding the present whereabouts of the deserter. An active campaign was at once started in the newspapers, calling attention to the formation of the committee, citing the law, and making a statement that it was the intention of the committee to organize each community in the United States in such a manner that information of the deserter was to be spread broadcast throughout the country and the respective communities asked to co-operate in ascertaining his whereabouts. The deserters were further given to understand that if they returned and resumed their responsibilities, there was no question of subsequent punishment. If they did not do so, the committee held itself ready to make all necessary expenditures in finding the husband, engaging the necessary legal counsel, prosecuting him, and where it was not possible to prose-

cute in New York city, to send the wife and the family to the residence of the husband to prosecute him in the city or State in which he lived. The effect of this propaganda was immediately apparent. The matter was taken up by the readers of the Jewish press throughout the United States, many of them at once offering assistance in organizing similar committees in other communities. It was not uncommon for a deserter, whose whereabouts had been unknown for years, to write to his wife, asking for forgiveness, and promising to return if he would be guaranteed against punishment. In all of these instances the wife was told to advise the husband that the committee would take no action, if he would only support his family. In other instances, the whereabouts of the husband were discovered either through friends or acquaintances, who read the description of the men in the newspapers, with the result that correspondence was opened at once with the societies in the respective cities. If the man was located, the committee did not hesitate, if they could not prosecute under the New York State law, to forward at once the wife and children to the city in which the husband lived, at the same time guaranteeing the society of the city against any expense that might be involved either in the support of the family while in the city or in making the necessary prosecutions. This action was necessary in many instances, for the reason that the New York law was not retroactive and desertions taking place before September 1st, 1905, are still considered misdemeanors and cannot be classified as felonies.]

The results of the work that has been done by the committee since October 15th are best told in the accompanying statement:

*Ask Trumper to  
comment on above -  
have to see what  
been actually  
through today?*

## REPORT OF THE DESERTION AGENT.

For the period beginning October 15, 1905, and ending May 1, 1906.

## PLACE OF DESERTION.

In New York State before Sept. 1, 1905.....	292
In New York State after Sept. 1, 1905.....	195
In other States of the Union.....	36
In foreign countries .....	57
Desertion story found to be fictitious.....	11
	591

## TERMINATION OF CASES.—TABLE 1.

Number of cases settled in court.....	54
Of these, husbands now supporting families.....	33
Of these, husbands serving a term in prison.....	18
Of these, husbands released from prison at wife's request .....	2
Of these, husband arrested but could not be made to support his family, as he is without means....	1

## TABLE 2.

Number of cases settled outside of court and husbands now supporting families .....	63
Of these, husband wrote wife, mentioned Desertion Committee, and returned .....	2
Of these, husband requested wife to come to him...	6
Of these, families sent to husband and reunions effected .....	6
Of these, wife was deserted in another city, man came to New York, effected a reunion and took family with him .....	2
Of these, supporting families as direct result of committee's work .....	47

## TABLE 3.

Number of cases pending in court.....	48
Of these, warrants issued for.....	31
Of these, action for divorce was begun by woman...	5
Of these, pending in court outside of New York State .....	3
Of these, in hands of Corporation Counsel.....	1
Of these, awaiting trial, man released on bail.....	2
Of these, indictment found .....	3
Of these, in hands of attorneys.....	3
Of these, extradition proceedings pending.....	1

## TABLE 4.—MISCELLANEOUS.

Of these, numbers of cases in which the families were sent to prosecute or join husband, cases pending.	23
Of these, number of cases in which negotiations for settlement are pending .....	42
Wife refuses to prosecute as she received a "get" from husband .....	3
Desertion story fictitious .....	11
Awaiting further information and development..	349
	426

The results that have been thus far accomplished demonstrate one thing, namely, that if the system which has been followed in New York could be extended throughout the United States, it would be possible to discover many of the deserters, whose cases were quoted above as still pending investigation, and that the percentage of desertion occurring could be materially reduced.

The number of bank robberies that occur to-day in the United States is apparently limited. There can be no doubt that this is due to the knowledge on the part of most individuals that crime of this kind is not forgotten and that the criminal, even if he be a fugitive from justice, is followed up to any part of the United States or even to any part of the earth persistently and relentlessly by the officers of the government or of the detective bureau to whom the search for the criminal has been entrusted. It

seems to be almost axiomatic that bank forgers and bank robbers eventually are located and there can be no doubt that the fear of final detection, notwithstanding the best laid plans for escape, acts as a strong deterrent against this special form of theft.

The same principle must be applied to our deserters. [Deser- tion has become more frequent and more pronounced for the simple reason that it is possible for an offender to leave his family, go to another State, possibly to change his name and to live the rest of his life without any danger of being apprehended. It is only when charitable societies will work in unison and harmony, so that the description of every deserter can be sent to every other community to which he may possibly have gone, and that in each of these communities there shall be an active committee or agent, whose business it will be to find his whereabouts, that the fear of almost immediate capture will, to a large extent, determine the prospective deserter to remain at home and keep up his responsibilities, rather than to suffer the consequences if he is apprehended and prosecuted. Probably no other class of people is so fortunately circumstanced as are we. It is peculiar that the Jewish press circulates widely throughout the United States and reaches a class of readers who would be most apt to come in contact with deserters, and what is of equal importance, will be read by the deserter himself. If the prospective deserter knew that almost immediately after his departure from home, the relief organizations, or rather his wife, through the relief organization, were to publish through the papers, a full description of his appearance and of his photograph, if obtainable, and that there was every likelihood that his wife and family would be sent on to him or that extradition papers would immediately be issued for his apprehension, and if he realized that he would be apt to be immediately recognized in the other communities to which he intended to go, there can be little doubt that the percentage of desertion would be very materially reduced.

It is the hope of the writer that the presentation of these facts to the Conference and to the individual societies comprising the Conference will effect some joint action leading to the formation of a National Jewish Registration Bureau for Deserters. Such a bureau should, following out the recommendations made by the

Committee on Desertion in 1900, be able to forward at once to the various societies throughout the United States, a description of the deserter and a complete statement regarding his habits, character of employment in which he might be likely to engage, cause of his desertion, and the other prominent facts connected with the abandonment of his family. Such a bureau should furthermore distribute this information not only to the relief societies of the respective cities and towns, but should print leaflets describing the deserters, which might be distributed by the individual society among the people with whom the deserter would be apt either to take refuge or among whom he would be apt to live and seek employment. Such a permanent record, read by the many individuals, would have astonishing results. As stated above, the value of the press in giving proper publicity cannot be overestimated and the co-operation of the press is always to be relied upon.]

#### DISCUSSION.

MR. MICHEL HEYMAN, New Orleans: Why is the law of New York only for child desertion; why not for wife desertion?

THE PRESIDENT: I think you will find that there is difficulty in getting a jury to convict a man who leaves his wife and it is proven that she is not destitute, of a felony which is apt to mean a penitentiary offence. They won't send a man to the penitentiary; at least it is difficult to secure conviction in that kind of case. That is the reason Dr. Frankel assigned as covering the difference and which secured the enactment of that law.

MR. HEYMAN: In New Orleans we have only about 10,000 Jews, a great many Russian immigrants, but to my knowledge there is only one case of wife desertion in New Orleans. There might be some others, but they didn't come before us.

MISS MIRIAM KALISKY, Chicago: We have had over two hundred cases of wife desertion last year in Chicago. I understand from Dr. Frankel's paper that since the first of September, 1905, wife desertion is extraditable. We have located a great many deserters from New York in our city. I have them come to our office, and keep in touch with them weeks and weeks. I would like to ask the question: How many have been extradited?

MR. ZUNSER: I don't remember the number extradited from Chicago, but I know we have brought back a few. We find the greatest difficulty in inducing the women, after counsel had gone to the trouble and expense of bringing these men back, to continue the prosecution. We find the woman turns right about when she hears the man is going to get a few years imprisonment, and asks the judge to let her husband out. In this respect we have been rather unsuccessful.

THE PRESIDENT: I want to correct a misstatement of Miss Kalisky. The offence did not become extraditable previous to last October. As I stated last night, it is now generally recognized that misdemeanors are always extraditable as well as felonies as a matter of law. As a matter of actual practice, Governors in some States are extremely loath to grant extradition papers for what is considered a minor offence where they would grant it for what is considered a serious offence, the distinction between minor and serious offence being based upon whether it is a misdemeanor, punishable by sending a man to jail or to the house of correction, or felony, punishable by imprisonment or fine. In this State and other states where it is deemed necessary for a misdemeanor, extradition papers have been granted. The matter has been taken up very fully by the National Conference of Charities and Correction and the New York Charity Organization Society has published a most excellent pamphlet consisting of a study by Miss Brandt of some 450 odd cases of desertion, and a pamphlet by Mr. Baldwin, of Washington, collating all the desertion laws of the country and enforcing in a most excellent manner the doctrine that misdemeanors are extraditable. The trouble has been, as the last speaker just pointed out, that the wives naturally forgive. It is the easiest thing, and in the individual case doubtless the best thing. The District Attorneys naturally don't want to go to the trouble and don't want to put the State to the great expense of extradition when the result of the extradition will be that nothing is accomplished through the courts. That is the great hindrance to extradition proceedings that accounts for the most of the difficulty. Then in some states, as in Illinois, we have no public funds. We have to rely on private funds, and for the same reason it is hard to

get private funds. Our charity funds are, of course, limited.

[MR. SIMON WOLF, Washington:] It seems to me one of the first things to be taken up is to see that every State in the Union shall pass a law on the subject, the laws to be of uniform character. Last year I succeeded in inducing Congress to pass a law on the subject, which only affects the District of Columbia, and while we have had but very few cases of desertion, yet we have had about eleven inside of twelve months.

[The origin of desertion, to a very large extent, is in the place of birth, where, unfortunately, as in Russia and Oriental countries, they marry very, very young, and naturally, under the exodus that has been going on for some years owing to oppression, the husband coming first, leaving his wife and children over there, some of the women have aged and he comes here under new conditions and he goes astray. If something would be done to bring the families together when they emigrate, and not permit the one or the other to come separately, a great many deportations might be prevented, because the law is more lenient where the father and mother and children come together, than where the husband comes alone and the wife and children later. In that way great good might be accomplished—to try and see that families should come together and not separately, and to educate public sentiment to the point of having uniform legislation throughout the United States, and in that way a bureau, when formed, would of course, be of great assistance and of great help.]

MISS GERTRUDE BERG, Philadelphia: The paper presents as the reason for not extraditing the deserting man that the wife will not appear against him. Is there any other means of having him arrested and an organization appearing against the man, and if he does not go back, have him committed and making him thereby an example in the community? Is there no such law?

THE PRESIDENT: It is not a question of arrest at all. It is a question after the man is arrested and brought back to conduct the prosecution. It is extremely difficult to conduct the prosecution if the main prosecutor is not willing to come forward and give testimony. The wife cannot be compelled to tes-

tify against the husband, and most of the facts essential to prosecution cannot be proven unless she is willing to testify.

MR. MAX HERZBERG, Philadelphia: The law of Pennsylvania heretofore was that it never recognized wife desertion or family desertion as crime or misdemeanor. It was gotten around in a different way. The Board of Guardians of the Poor, at the instigation of the deserted wife, would have a man arrested, and he would then be brought into court and the judge presiding would make an order against him for the support of the wife and children. That, however, could only be done at the instigation of the wife and upon her testimony. If he refused to pay that order after it was made he could be sent to jail, not because he had committed a crime, but because he was in contempt of court; in other words that he had not obeyed the order of the judge and was therefore supposed to be in contempt of court. Of course, a proceeding of that kind was not such a one as the law recognized as extraditable, and we felt that some proceeding would have to be taken whereby the societies and others interested in seeing that deserting husbands were prosecuted and punished would have a right to appear. The difficulty we found, as all of you find in every one of the states, was that after we had gone to considerable expense and trouble in locating a man in the town where he was found, and had him arrested, threatening of course not to support the wife until she did take steps to prosecute the man, after he was arrested she refused to prosecute, and all the trouble and expense was of no avail. In order to get around that, we had a law passed not only by which the deserted wife prosecuted or testified, but also making it a misdemeanor. The Committee, of which I was a member, really wanted to make it a felony, but the Legislature thought felony was a pretty harsh term and made it a misdemeanor, and the Governors at first were rather loath to grant extradition papers. I may say that we have had two instances under the notice of the United Hebrew Charities Society, in which we brought the offenders from other States. The first under the law was one I myself instituted. I swore out the warrant myself for the man, and sent the warrant, together with the papers, up to the Governor of Pennsylvania with

a letter, and he immediately returned it honored. I sent it to Governor Higgins of New York and he returned it by next mail. I think within one week (the record time in Pennsylvania for extradition) we had the man back in Philadelphia. I'm sorry to say it didn't do much good. Inside of a month the woman, without my knowledge, went to court one morning and said she had her husband arrested and wanted to drop the prosecution, and the District Attorney merely submitted the bill and allowed the man to go, with the usual result; he stayed home three weeks, is again a fugitive from justice, has two children in the almshouse, and the other two in different places.

THE PRESIDENT: It may be possible to convict even where the wife refuses to prosecute and forgives, but it will be a very rare jury that will ever convict under those circumstances. Whatever the law may be, it does not make the wife an absolutely essential witness. A man may be prosecuted for any offence he commits, without regard to the person who happens to be injured by the offence to prosecute. If the party injured, particularly in the matter of desertion, refuses to prosecute, and tells the jury she does not want the man punished, no jury of twelve men is going to be unanimous in sending the man to the penitentiary or to jail, in my judgment.

DR. MAX LANDSBERG, Rochester: It seems to me that even if we have uniform laws in the United States, the possibility of extraditing the husband would not do away with the evil. The women always consent to live again with the men. Now I think every case, before action is taken, should be studied. There are actually a good many instances where it is a blessing if the husband is away from the wife. We have cases where desertion is a chronic matter; we have other cases where the women know where the husbands are and only want to be supported for a while; we have cases where there are no children, and where the husband will leave as soon as a child is expected in order to get rid of the expense of supporting his wife during that period. Now I do not know whether that is covered by our desertion law in the State of New York, because it refers only to child desertion. I do not know if the law refers to the desertion



of an unborn child. We had a case long before our law was passed—years ago—where a man had left, and we found it out. His wife could not read and our agent read the letter that came from Russia where the parents had lived. The man had two children and his wife. They tried to get him to come back to Russia because they had another wife for him who had a lot of money. We engaged detectives. We were very much interested in bringing the man to justice. We sent detectives with our agent in order to arrest the man, and also the rabbi, if possible, the moment the *ghet* was delivered. They had made arrangements so that the *ghet* would be valid in the absence of the wife and they would appoint an agent for the wife, which is generally not done among the Jews, but they did so. Our agent had the man arrested before the *ghet* was delivered. The man was taken back to Russia and put under bonds to support his wife, and since he could not pay, he was put in the penitentiary for years, and of course then they had to let him out. The man was very penitent. He said he was wrong and he wanted to live with his wife. We set him up in business and the whole result was, after a few weeks he deserted her again and went to Washington; so that instead of a wife and two children, we have had a wife and three children to support for the last six or seven years. The only remedy is that we investigate into the history of the man. If we find him a chronic deserter we let him go, but if he is a man that does it the first time and has never done it before, and you can induce the wife in advance to pledge herself to prosecute him, then have him arrested; otherwise don't go to the expense.

MRS. PISKO, Denver: It seems to me that one side of the question has not been touched upon at all, and it seems to me that that side has a great deal to do with the lack of desire on the part of the State and on the part of the woman to have the man prosecuted. Supposing that we had to bring a worthless fellow back from another State and put him in jail or the penitentiary for a year or two years; the woman is separated, and has to be supported by the charities. Now I have nothing new or original to offer, but I think this is something that the people who are thinking of having legislation in their States on this sub-

ject ought to consider. If they would take the man and put him into prison and make him work, and give the money which he earns in prison, to support his family, I think the States would be much more willing to bring the man back, and the wives would be much more willing to prosecute if they knew the men would support them. In the meantime, the woman always hopes he is going to support her. The State doesn't want to bring the man back. He is only a burden on the State. In making legislation, I think that is one of the things that ought to be considered.

MR. SOLOMON LOWENSTEIN, New York: Inasmuch as there were certain recommendations contained in the President's biennial report read last evening, and certain recommendations in the paper of Dr. Frankel, I move that a committee of three on Resolutions be appointed to consider resolutions on these subjects and such other subjects as may come before the Conference.

THE PRESIDENT: A motion is made to appoint a committee of three to consider and report on all resolutions that may be offered during this Conference or that have heretofore been suggested in this Conference or in Dr. Frankel's paper.

(Motion put and unanimously carried.)

The chair appoints Messrs. Senior, Landsberg and Mrs. Eckhouse as the Committee on Resolutions.

#### PERSISTENCY OF DEPENDENCE AS INDICATED BY RELIEF STATISTICS.

DR. BORIS D. BOGEN, Superintendent of the United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati, O.

Strange as it may seem, there is a prevailing opinion that the poor persist in living in poverty and that their station in life has become a second nature to them. Instead of studying the true conditions and the real underlying reasons of poverty, our attention is too often directed towards the necessity of improving or changing the tendencies of the poor, ignoring the fact that after all, poverty is not the choice of those afflicted by it, but is rather

*Presented at the Fourth Annual Session  
of the National Conference of Jewish Charities,  
Philadelphia, Pa., May 28, 1906*