

On appeal, the Divisional Court (Lord Alverstone, C.J., and Bigham and Walton, JJ.), held that the justices were right, and dismissed the appeal holding that the words "ill-treat," "abuse" and "torture" in the Act created three separate offences, and therefore a conviction for "ill-treating, abusing and torturing" would be bad.

PRACTICE—RECEIVER—EQUITABLE EXECUTION—MARRIED WOMAN
DEBTOR—MONEYS PAYABLE FOR MAINTENANCE.

In *Paguine v. Snary* (1909) 1 K.B. 688 an unsuccessful attempt was made to obtain the appointment of a receiver by way of equitable execution of a weekly sum ordered to be paid to the execution debtor, a married woman, by her husband, for her maintenance; but the Court of Appeal (Williams, Farwell and Kennedy, L.JJ.), overruling Phillimore, held that such payments were inalienable and therefore not liable to equitable execution.

CRIMINAL LAW—EVIDENCE—ADMISSION BY PRISONER IN CUSTODY
—STATEMENT IN REPLY TO CONSTABLE.

In *King v. Best* (1909) 1 K.B. 692 the prisoner after he was in custody was questioned by a police constable, and his answer was given in evidence against him. He had been previously warned that anything he said might be given in evidence against him. It was contended on behalf of the prisoner that the evidence was inadmissible, but the Divisional Court (Lord Alverstone, C.J., and Channell and Walton, JJ.), overruled the objection and *Rex v. Garvin*, 15 Cox C.C. 656, was overruled.