Statements of School and other taxes and copy of letter sent to Board of Education upon the subject of tuition fees charged me.
Duplicate of letter signed and
sent addressed to J. E. Hottle, Esq.,
Chairman
Febry. 25, 1897.

To the Board of Education,
Salt Lake City.

Gentlemen:

I have received a bill "for the first and second half years' tuition" of my children from A. S. Martin, Esq., Principal of the Grant district school of this City, amounting to $144.00, and I am told that this sum must be paid at once to the Board of Education.

Coming as this does from you, through the Principal of your school, I deem it but simple justice to myself and to you that I should give you reasons why I should not be asked to pay this amount.

My property lies in the southwestern part of the city, and a portion of it extends across 10th South Street and lies outside of the city boundary; but the greater part of my land is within the city limits. I am remote from any district school. The nearest school in the county is about a mile and a half distant from where we live. It is practically impossible for my children to attend that school. For upwards of half of the year the road to it is almost impassable; it is unfrequented and rarely traveled, and there is not a house on the whole distance between my residence and the schoolhouse. An attempt of my children, therefore, to go to that school would be at the risk of their health and lives. Under these circumstances it is out of the question for me to send my
children to the county district school. They must either go without education or I must send them to a city school.

I understand that you have adopted the rule of collecting tuition fees from children who live outside of the city, because it is not just that the city should bear the burden of the tuition of the children of parents whose property is in the county, and from which the county receives the benefit of taxes.

I shall not question the propriety of this rule. But it appears to me that it should not be applied to me. I belong to a different class. I am, to almost all intents and purposes, a resident of Salt Lake City. It is my postoffice address; it is where I spend the greater portion of my time; all my business interests are there; and I am looked upon, and always have so regarded myself, as a resident of the city. My personal city school tax during the past three years amounts to $615.85. I am interested also in corporations which pay large school taxes. I have written to the treasurers and cashiers of these institutions, and they have made statements to me in writing, over their own signatures, which show that my portion of the city school tax paid by these institutions for the year 1886 alone amounts to about $883.00. This amount is smaller than that which I really pay, because I have only taken the larger institutions in which I am interested. So
that I pay in the aggregate at least $1215.00 annually as a city school tax.

Now, I appeal to you and to your sense of justice if it is right, or if it can be defended upon any principle of equity, to collect school tuition from one who pays this amount of school taxes to the city. It seems to me that, however necessary and proper it may appear to collect tuition fees from those who pay no taxes in Salt Lake City, but who send their children to the district schools of the city, my case (and perhaps that of others similarly situated) does not belong to this class, or come under this rule.

It has come to my knowledge — and I have made no inquiries upon this subject — that there is one transient at least (and how many more I do not know, but I am assured that there are many) who has sent children to one of the district schools for months and has not been required to pay a dollar.

In conclusion, permit me to say, if you enforce this bill for tuition fees against me, I shall feel that I have been deeply wronged and have just cause to complain. If there were a county district school convenient or accessible to my children, you might say to me: "Send your children there"; but as my children cannot reach any county school and I pay this large amount of city school tax, I appeal to you to remit these
tuition fees, and not subject me to the injustice which their enforce-
ment and the attempt to collect them would inflict upon me.

I am,

Very respectfully,
John Savings Bank

Taxation 1876

Grace Tax Paid $6762.90

City School Tax proportion of farm $4479.35

1876

On Nov 1st Geo. S. Cannon held $7500 of Capital

$20,000

Hence 2.5% proportion of Capital

City School Tax 1876 would be $353.56
Pres. George Q. Cannon,

City,

Dear Father:

The total amount of taxes paid by George Q. Cannon & Sons Co. for 1896, was $615.96.

Of this amount the school tax was $144.82, and of this latter amount you pay personally, through your investment, $97.22, and of the $144.82 only 72 cents would be paid by stockholders outside of your own family.

You and your family, therefore, have paid through George Q. Cannon & Sons Co., school taxes to the amount of $144.10 for the year 1896.

Yours truly,

Hugh J. Cannon
President George G. Leavitt, D.D.

Salt Lake City, Utah,

July 26, 1897.

Dear Brother Leavitt:

In the year 1896 we paid the city school tax amounting to $3,250.52. Your stock, together with that of your family, amounts to $72,600.00, or 1/15 of our capital. Therefore, 1/15 of $3,250.52 equals $216.70, or the amount of city school tax for 1896 paid by your investment in Z. C. M. I.

 Truly Yours,

T. G. Webber
Pres. Geo. Q. Cannon,

City,

Dear Brother:--

The total amount of taxes paid by the Brigham Young Trust Co. for 1896 was $8848.90, perportion of school taxes was $ 6/10 mills amounting to $2628.12 as you are an owner of 12% of the stock of the Company your share of the school tax would amount to $315.37.

These figures are approximate as the books of the Company are in the Secretary's office and are not available at the present moment.

Yours truly

[Signature]

Brigham Young Trust Co.