

INTERNATIONAL LAW—FOREIGN MARRIAGE—DOMICIL OF MARRIAGE—
CHANGE OF DOMICIL—MOVABLE GOODS—AFTER ACQUIRED PROPERTY—FRENCH
LAW—COMMUNITY OF GOODS.

In re De Nicols, De Nicols v. Curlier (1898) 1 Ch. 403, though dealing with a prosaic question of law, reads a little like a romance. The case concerns the estate of a Frenchman who began business in London as the keeper of a restaurant near Regent street with a capital of £400, in the year 1863, and died in 1897, having accumulated a fortune of £600,000. The action was brought to determine what were the rights of his widow in his "movable goods." The deceased was married in 1854 in France, his wife and himself both being poor and having their domicile in France. There was no marriage settlement or contract as to property. Subsequently they took up their residence in England, where they acquired an English domicile. The deceased left a will whereby he left all his property to trustees (except certain legacies) to hold the proceeds in trust for his wife for life, and after her death upon trust for his daughter and her husband and children. The question submitted to the Court (Kekewich, J.) was this: Did the change of domicile alter the legal position of the parties to the marriage in reference to the movable goods? And this question the learned judge answered in the negative; and as, by the law of France, in the absence of any agreement to the contrary, there is a community of goods between husband and wife, he held that the widow was entitled absolutely to one-half of the movable goods.

ARBITRATION—PARTNERSHIP—AGREEMENT TO REFER—POWER TO EXPEL PART-
NER—VALIDITY OF NOTICE—STAYING PROCEEDINGS—ARBITRATION ACT, 1889,
(52 & 53 VICT., c. 49) s. 4—(R.S.O. c. 62, s. 6.)

In Barnes v. Youngs (1898) 1 Ch. 414, an application was made to stay the proceedings under the Arbitration Act on the ground that the parties had agreed to refer the matters in dispute to arbitration. The plaintiff and defendants were partners, and by the articles of partnership it was provided that a partner might be expelled for the commission of certain acts therein specified, and that if any question should arise whether a case had happened to justify the exercise of