

large a part of the current literature of the day. The great object of a public library is to bring within the reach of the reader and student works which private collections do not and can not contain, and which in no other way could be accessible to the public. Its excellence will depend, not upon the number of its volumes, but upon their intrinsic value; and I wish this principle to be carried out by the managers, who, I hope, will never be influenced by the too common ambition for mere numerical superiority."

The plaintiffs contend that the will and codicils of Dr. Rush contain a foundation for atheism and infidelity; that the law, while tolerating the freest discussion, will never lend its hand for the protection and support of immorality; that in a land where religion and sound morals are recognized as the foundation stones of government no trust can exist for the protection of that which destroys the State.

No fault is found with this statement of the law. It may be regarded as settled in Pennsylvania, that a court of equity will not enforce a trust where its object is the propagation of atheism, infidelity, immorality or hostility to the existing form of government. A man may do many things while living which the law will not do for him after he is dead. He may deny the existence of a God, and employ his fortune in the dissemination of infidel views, but should he leave his fortune in trust for such purposes, the law will strike down the trust as *contra bonos mores*. We need not elaborate this question, nor extend the illustrations. The whole subject is thoroughly discussed in a number of cases which fully sustain the principle above stated. See *Updegraph vs. The Commonwealth*, 11 Serg. & Rawle, 394; *Vidal vs. Girard's Executors*, 2 Howard, 127; *Zeisweiss vs. James*, 13 P. F. Smith, 465. In the case last cited the testator devised all his property to his grand-nieces, for their lives and the life of the survivor, re-