Johnson, you remark that Haul Johnson on account of immoral cos duct "has as much right to lose his interest money as has the "woman he was married to", but the point you appear to overlook is that the wife laid herself open under the law, by her action in descrting her husband and living immorally with another man. (see Section 92, sub-section C of the Indian Act), whereas the husband would not appear to have brought himself under operation of the law:

m. 2.00

It occurs, however, to point out that Mrs. Wesley appears to have become by marraige a member of the Saugeen Bana and the question suggests itself as to whether in the event of her misbehaving herself with Johnson, she should not be expelled from the reserve:

As to the case of Solomon Jones, if he has been deprived of his annuity, and it is paid to the deserted wife, it i not apparent that the Department's jurisdiction extends to any further action;

The same remarks apply to the esse of Mrsdhouls .Nadjiwan and her husband, and as to Anderson Tomab, unless it can be shown that he does not do his share toward supporting his boy, it is not apparent what punishment could be inflicted upon him, however deserving thereof he may be.

Relative to Robert Nadjiwan and his wife, also John Akewenze and his wife, it is not apparent that any action can taken.

Your obedient servant.

Secretary

71

