May 1st, and after argument was considered in elaborate judgments by at least two members of the Court. Their Lordships hold, reversing *Regina* v. *Plowman*, that these sections of the Code are clearly within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada.

Mr. Justice Gwynne says: "For my part I cannot entertain a doubt that the Parliament of Canada can pass an Act as effectual to affect Her Majesty's subjects, who being married and resident in Canada, go through a form of marriage out of Canada, having left Canada with the intent of going through such form of marriage, fully to the same extent as an Act in like terms passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom could affect her Majesty's subjects resident in the United Kingdom, who, being married, should go through a form of marriage outside of the United Kingdom, having left any part thereof for the purpose of so doing."

Mr. Justice Girouard upholds the validity of these sections for the reasons given by the Chancellor in his judgment in *Regina* v. *Brierly*, and distinguishes the case of *Macleod* v. *Attorney-General of New South Wales*, on the ground that the provision (s. 275 (4)), which restricts the extra territorial application of our Act to persons who leave Canada with intent to go through the bigamous marriage, is wanting in the New South Wales statute which was under consideration in that case.

Chief Justice Strong, however, dissents entirely from this view, holding that the judgment in *Macleod* v. *Attorney-General of New South Wales* shows clearly that in the opinion of the Privy Council all such extra-territorial jurisdiction is denied to Colonial Legislatures.