

I do not think there is any foundation for this argument. The policy of the law exempting wages from seizure, except as to a small proportion of them, is to discourage the giving of credit to persons with small incomes. Wages are intended for the support of the workman and his family from day to day, and it is very undesirable that shopkeepers should allow the wage-earners to run into debt. If this applies to a workman in the receipt of full wages, it applies *a fortiori*, to one who receives a rent equal to only fifty per cent. of his wages, or a rent equal to half the sum by which his wages have been reduced in consequence of the accident. I do not think that it is permissible to qualify the provision of the Act, that compensation is to be exempt from seizure, by reading into it the words "in the proportion in which wages are so exempt" or any words to that effect. The second view suggested in France is that the compensation payable under this Act is to be assimilated to an alimentary allowance. If so, it would follow that, although exempt from seizure for ordinary debts, it might be seized for alimentary debts. (1)

But the term "alimentary debt" is itself ambiguous, it may mean either (a), a debt due to persons who have furnished the debtor with food and clothing and other things necessary for bare subsistence, or it may mean, (b) the obligation to which the debtor is by law subjected of affording support according to his means to consort, children and certain other relations who are in need. (2)

In regard to (a) the debts due to furnishers of necessaries, the same argument applies as in the case of wages, which has just been discussed, and I do not see how the term "exempt from seizure" can be qualified by interpolating "except for alimentary debts." In regard

(1) C. C. P., art. 599, n. 4. See Trib. Civ. de Pont-Audemer, 5 mars, 1902, D., 1902, 2, 300. Hamelin v. Les Commissaires du Havre, 1902, 21 S. C., 51 (Archibald, J.)

(2) C. C. arts. 165-172.