

*PHOTOGRAPHING PRISONERS IN ENGLAND.*

In a case before Mr. Lane on February 3, counsel for a prisoner stated to the magistrate that while his client had been in custody on remand in Holloway Gaol, four photographs of him had been taken against his will, and submitted to the magistrate that this proceeding was illegal. Mr. Lane declined to interfere, and, we presume, left the defendant to his remedy, if any, by civil action. But we believe the objection is untenable. By section 6 (6) of the Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict., c. 112), "a Secretary of State may make regulations as to the photographing of all prisoners convicted of crime who may for the time being be confined in any prison." This enactment was, we believe, for a time regarded as authorising the photographing of every prisoner. But the word "crime" as defined in section 20 of the Act is restricted to a series of offences there specified. This appears to have been drawn to the attention of the authorities, and by section 8 of the Penal Servitude Act, 1891 (54 & 55 Vict. c. 69), the powers of the Secretary of State are extended so as to include the *measuring and* photographing of *all* prisoners who may for the time being be confined in any prison. This extended provision is wide enough to include untried prisoners; and its effect appears to be to legalise the photographing of any person detained in a prison, whether on remand or after conviction; and it is wide enough to include debtors and persons committed for contempt.—*Law Journal*.

*THE OFFENCE OF REFUSING TO WORK.*

Alice King was prosecuted before Mr. Denman, by the guardians of the Wandsworth and Clapham Union, for becoming chargeable to the union by neglecting wholly or in part to maintain herself, though able to do so, which is an offence against section 3 of the Vagrancy Act, 1824 (5 Geo. IV. c. 83). She had absolutely refused to do any work or to take two situations when found for her, and the only energy she ever showed was in breaking the workhouse windows. The facts really raised the question whether idleness is criminal, and Mr. Denman, after consideration, decided that where a person becomes a pauper by his own conduct—*e.g.* by deliberately refusing to earn his living—he is guilty of a criminal offence. And though this may seem strange, we have