

Academy Funds."* It provided for the districting of the County; the examinations and qualification of teachers; the election of Trustees for the employment of the teachers, and the general management and supervision of the schools; they were also empowered to levy Tuition Fees—if they deemed necessary. The teacher was required to keep a diary of the attendance of pupils, upon the presentation of which to the Orphans' Court, (who were still left custodians of the school funds) endorsed by the Trustees, to the effect that the 'diary was correct, and that the school had been in operation under the charge of a duly qualified teacher, for the previous six months; the school was entitled to draw its annual donation of \$200—or, if the attendance was large,—of \$300, such is a meagre outline of a law under which the chaotic condition of our schools was reduced to some degree of uniformity and order. This system was in 1860, superseded by one establishing 'Free Schools,' † and recognizing the principle, since adopted by the State, and engrafted on our own, that "*the privileges of the schools are alike the property of all the citizens, and that the property of all is equally bound for their support*;" in accordance with which it abolished Tuition Fees, and resorted—when the State funds failed—to general County taxation. These were its distinctive features; in minor details it resembled its predecessor,—a resemblance rendered still closer by the subsequent amendment of 1862, ‡—which, by requiring the exaction of Tuition Fees, and abolishing the power of general taxation, remanded the Schools to the system of 1854. Both systems (1854 and 1860,) were, it is but just to say, far in advance of all that had preceded them, and either, notwithstanding their theoretical difference, might, in the hands of agents as intelligent and zealous as their framers, have secured for our schools a higher degree of efficiency than they actually attained—a failure fairly attributable to defects for which no mere *statutory* provisions can provide an adequate remedy, viz: the indifference, or incompetence of those to whom the immediate supervision of the Schools was too often entrusted. Nevertheless the originators of both systems have the proud consciousness of having 'done the State some service in laying the foundations of our educational edifice so broad and deep, that after-builders may modify, but cannot wholly efface the impress of their labors. To have done *this* is enough to satisfy the most ambitious, for '*quid munus Republicæ majus, meliusve afferre possumus, quam si juventum docemus, et bene erudimus?*'"

Having thus endeavored to trace the rise and progress of our schools, from the earliest period, to the adoption of the

* Commonly called from its originator (Jas. A. Bond, Esq.,) 'Bond's Law'

† Called from its framer (James T. Briscoe, Esq.,) 'Briscoe's Law.'

‡ Amended by B. D. Bond, Esq.