the proceeds of a sale of his wife's separate property without ever accounting for it: *Briggs* v. *Willson*, 24 A.R. (Ont.) 521. And a resulting trust arises in favour of a married woman from the purchase by her husband in his own name of a house with her money, which had been deposited in bank in their joint names: *Mercier* v. *Mercier*, [1903] 2 Ch. 98 (C.A.).

Where a married man induces his wife to sell shares held in their joint names, on his promise to reinvest the proceeds in the same manner, but which he used without the knowledge of his wife, in part payment for land purchased in his own name, on his death his widow is entitled to a lien on the land for the proceeds of such sale: *Scales* v. *Baker*, 28 Beav. 91.

Where money bequeathed to a married woman's separate use, was lent during coverture on a mortgage payable to the husband and wife or the survivor of them, which was prepared by her husband's solicitor, and which untruly recited that the money lent belonged to the wife before marriage and was not comprised in any settlement, the wife executing the conveyance without it being read to her, or having independent advice, she may, on being deserted by her husband, have the deed declared void, and the mortgagor required to execute a new mortgage in favour of her alone: *Knight* v. *Knight*, 5 Giff. 26.

Under R.S.M. 1891, ch. 95, sec. 5, relative to the separate property of married women, there is no presumption from the receipt by a man of the corpus of his wife's separate estate that it was a gift; and she may recover it without evidence either of a bargain or agreement for a loan: *Thompson* v. *Didion*, 10 Man. L.R. 246. And a man who receives money belonging to his wife will be a trustee for her in respect thereto unless he can shew clearly and conclusively that there was a gift of it to him: *Ellis* v. *Ellis*, (Ont.) 12 D.L.R. 219.

A woman, whose claim that her husband permitted her to carry on a farming business on a farm owned by him, and to treat the proceeds as her separate property, is uncorroborated, is not entitled to the proceeds of the business which her husband invested in his own name: *Whittaker* v. *Whittaker*, [1882] 21 Ch.D. 657.

Where the trustee of a fund, the income from which was payable to a married woman for life, permits her husband to use a portion of the fund for a number of years, the wife, on separating from her husband, cannot recover interest on such sum, where she admitted that she allowed her husband to receive her income as long as he behaved as a husband should, and she did not claim interest until after his desertion: *Rowley* v. *Unwin*, 2 Kay & J. 138.

A wife's assent to the mere receipt by her husband of a legacy bequeathed to her separate use will not raise a presumption of a gift to him: *Alexander* v. *Barnhill* (1888), 21 L.J. Ir. 511; *Rowe* v. *Rowe*, 2 DeG. & Sm. 294. And a bequest to a wife by husband of a large sum will not be considered as a satisfaction of her claim against his estate in respect to the legacy so received by him: *Rowe* v. *Rowe*, 2 DeG. & Sm. 294. So the delivery by a woman to her husband of a cheque for a legacy