

But, perhaps, the fullest definition is contained in *Jackson vs. Phillips*, 14 Allen, 556, wherein Mr. Justice Gray said, "A charity in a legal sense may be more fully defined as a gift, to be applied consistently with existing laws, for the benefit of an indefinite number of persons, either by bringing their hearts under the influence of education or religion; by relieving their bodies from disease, suffering or constraint; by assisting them to establish themselves for life, or by erecting or maintaining public buildings or works, *or otherwise lessening the burdens of government*. It is immaterial whether the purpose is called charitable in the gift itself, if it is so described as to show that it is charitable in its nature."

And hence it is that gifts to found institutions similar to the present have always been held to be gifts to charitable purposes.

Thus, of a gift to the British Museum; *Trustees vs. White*, 2 Sim. & Stu., 594.

"This is an institution established by the legislature for the collection and preservation of objects of science and art, partly supplied at the public expense and partly from individual liberality, intended for the public improvement," &c.—LEACH, V. C.

To establish a perpetual botanical garden for the public benefit; *Townley vs. Bedwell*, 6 Vesey, 194.

A gift to the United States of America, to found at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institute, "an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men;" President of the United States *vs. Drummond*, cited 7 House of Lords Cas., 141, 155.

This case is a remarkable illustration of the extent to which a bequest for charitable uses will be sustained,