

over to another either gratuitously or onerously his right to compensation which has not yet been paid. This is possibly liable to an exception in the case of alienation to a person to whom the workman owes the duty of maintenance. This would be upon the principle, to be explained immediately, that provisions, although declared unseizable, are subject to seizure for a debt of this kind. (1)

The difficulty is in regard to the provision that the compensation is to be exempt from seizure. In France it is contended that this exemption cannot be meant to be absolute. Funds which are declared to be unseizable are of two kinds (a), salaries and wages, and (b), alimentary allowances granted by a court, and sums of money or pensions given as alimony. It is urged that the intention of the present enactment is to assimilate the compensation payable under this Act to one or other of these two classes of unseizable funds. If this be so, it is necessary first to decide to which class they are to be assimilated, as the rules of law applicable are not quite the same for both. (2) Salaries and wages are not unseizable as to their whole amount, but only as to a certain proportion.

Persons whose wages exceed a thousand dollars are altogether excluded from the benefits of this Act, so that it is unnecessary to consider any case except that of a workman whose wages do not exceed three dollars per day. By our law such wages are exempt from seizure to the extent of four-fifths, and to avoid the necessity of repeated seizures the proportion seizable may be deposited in the manner prescribed by the *loi Lacombe*. (3) Upon one view the compensation payable under this Act, being a kind of reduced wages, should be governed by the rules as to exemption from seizure which apply to wages in general.

---

(1) Sachet, v. 1, n. 669.

(2) Trib. Civ. de Pont-Audemer, 5 mars, 1902, D., 1902, 2, 300.

(3) C. C. P., art. 599, n. 11; 3 Edw. VII, c. 57 (Que).