

is not denounced by one of the rightful heirs, the land is continued to be held in common by all heirs. Not all heirs happened to have equal number of children; so, after the second generation, all their heirs had not the same right, many of them began to sell to strangers a part or all of their inheritance, and this unequal distribution of the rights amongst them is made more difficult to determine at the present time, when we consider that there are no precise genealogical trees, no records of the families and their offspring and no documents whatever to throw light on that, but only the word of the eldest among the living ones as to who has a right and how much of it or if none at all.

According to Mexican law, anyone having a right, however small, in a community, is entitled to fence in and use as much land as he desires from the unallotted, and that he holds in the name of the community but for his own exclusive benefit. This has brought into the communities a certain class of land grafters who, buying a small right, fence in a large tract and make exclusive use of it in various ways. The rest of the members cannot protest.

The communities cannot be divided under existing laws, for if a number of the members in one, for instance, decides to divide, only one of them might appeal to Federal courts alleging hurt to his private interests and thus all proceedings are indefinitely stopped. Nevertheless most of the members of the communities are earnestly hoping they will be divided some time, so they can get their rightful share of the inheritance. Accordingly every one of them makes only the absolutely necessary improvements on the land he has fenced in for fear some time or another land and improvements may fall to the lot of another.

Very few of these communities are defined as to their membership. Fewer still have a regulation of their own and an organization. Perhaps out of five hundred communities in Nuevo Leon, not half a dozen are duly organized. They were not instituted by law, but have grown out of the peculiar conditions of the region. Still every one of the right-holders defends his right by all means at his command when it is attacked in some way by others. This fills the courts of the land with the disputes of the communities and their shareholders. Lawyers have grown fat from them. Not only are these fights between one shareholder and his neighbor in the same community, but there are difficulties between one community and another, in many cases limits being undefined and land unsurveyed.

To survey the land and justly divide it among the shareholders would require the herculean labor of a just and wise government and a long retinue of the appropriate employes. It would not take less than ten or fifteen years, and to enforce its decisions it must have the strength of the whole nation back of it.

The actual local Government and its Agrarian Committee are grappling now with this situation and trying to solve the problem. They believe it better to apply revolutionary methods to it and do away with this vexing question once for ever in a quick and forcible way.

Can any Single Taxer suggest an effective and practical remedy for it?

E. S. WESTRUP.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

A HINT TO THE FARMERS

San Francisco, September 24.

Farmers in the Modesto and Oakdale irrigation districts were able, under the Home Rule provision of the irrigation law, to exempt their improvements and personal property from irrigation taxes. That exemption lowers the taxes of the farmers, and raises the taxes of the speculators. That's the reason the farmers in those irrigation districts are in favor of Home Rule in taxation.

A few weeks ago an irrigation district was formed in the southern part of Shasta County, and one of the main arguments used in favor of forming the district was that the farmers could exempt their improvements and personal property from taxation for irrigation purposes.

The Amendment for Home Rule in Taxation will give all farmers in California the same power that the irrigation law gives to farmers in irrigation district. It will give the farmers of any county the right to vote taxes off their improvements and personal property—if they want to do that. How does it help a farmer to pay more taxes on fifty acres of an improved farm than a speculator pays on fifty acres of unimproved land?

CALIFORNIA LEAGUE FOR HOME RULE IN TAXATION.



MONEY IN RECENT ELECTIONS

Washington, D. C., Sept. 24.

The Lorimer scandal shocked the nation. A Senate investigation showed that Senator Stephenson spent \$108,000 to secure his nomination at a primary election and we were again shocked. The nation is due for some more shocks. Penrose has been nominated in Pennsylvania and Roger Sullivan in Illinois.

Senator Norris has introduced a resolution demanding an immediate investigation by the Senate of the amounts spent in each of these primary elections. It is being strenuously opposed.

Vast sums but in lesser amounts are being spent all over the nation to defeat the people's candidates and to elect reactionaries. The Special Interests are determined to control the next Congress. They care nothing about a candidate's party politics so long as he is secretly or openly for them.

"But," you remind me, "we have a Federal law which prohibits corporations from contributing to campaign funds; another law which requires publicity of campaign contributions and expenditures and which prohibits a candidate for the House of Representatives from spending more than \$5,000 or a candidate for the United States Senate from spending more than \$10,000 to secure his election."

Of course we have. BUT—these laws are jokes. A "corporation" cannot contribute, but a "person" who may be connected with the corporation may spend any amount he chooses. Publicity is required of national party campaign committees operating in "two or more states," but none from state or local committees. A candidate must report the