

That, in turn, means less tax revenue for city coffers. Not a smart move for a city that's already hundreds of millions in the hole.

It all shows that Alarcon's real scheme isn't to relieve working families, but to create a special interest group that will defend its privilege of paying below-market rents. Two-thirds of L.A.'s population pays rent, and 13 of the 15 city council members are Democrats.

That provides a nice setup for a way to get re-elected, even if your political popularity is waning fast.

The result will be less mobility and dynamism in a city that uniquely thrives on temporary dealmaking. The only place for this economically foolish plan is the cutting room floor.

Avg. Rating:	(11) Your Rating: 습습습습습
Email Print	Comment 🛛 🖸 BOOKMARK 📲 🎡 🧤 🛄 License

## « Previous Article in IBD Editorials

#### See Also

- Israel Or Terrorists 04/15/2010 06:54 PM ET
- Climate-Gate Gets A Whitewash 04/15/2010 06:54 PM ET
- Jobs On Aisle Three 04/15/2010 06:54 PM ET
- For CEOs, Reforms Turn Reprehensible 04/15/2010 05:43 PM ET
- Small Business Vs. Big Government 04/15/2010 05:43 PM ET

## Comments Showing 1-5 of 8Leave a comment

« « First | « Previous 1 2 Next » | Last » »

### Posted By: Serfdumb(1270) on 4/16/2010 | 10:50 AM ET

Amounts to confiscation of property - in name of 'fairness'. If the blood suckers keep getting their way, will lead to more & more loss of property rights; e.g. Pelosi's idea for Gov't confiscation of 401Ks and IRA accounts - in the name of 'fairness'. 'Fairness' to a politician means what's yours is mine to buy votes with and do as I please, cause I know best how YOU should live, work, breath, make & spend earnings, etc., it's called tyranny.

#### Posted By: acierno(1485) on 4/16/2010 | 10:46 AM ET

rent control is a crime it leads to; no new rental construction, decay of existing units, state control of once private property for political aims, loss of city and state revenue. also most of the people who own rental properities are not donald trump, they are mom and pop businesses that generally occupy the commerical area to secure their businesses. they rent out the rest of the building to make ends meet, if you drive these prople out you also lose on the commerical tax revenue ala the bx

## Posted By: InCincy(220) on 4/16/2010 | 8:53 AM ET

This will probably benefit the coastal enclaves. So, there will be wealthy communities on the ocean and in the hills overlooking favelas. It will be just like Rio or Mexico City (but with an ocean). Government does not recognize that it IS NOT A LACK OF REVENUES that is the problem. IT'S FUNDING RIDICULOUS PROMISES. Everything's free in America, everything's free in America.....

## Posted By: EbPaceNYC(165) on 4/16/2010 | 7:45 AM ET

Looking at the stats, 2/3 of the pop are renters, and 13 of 15 councilppl are dems. Maybe some of these pols want in on the Charlie Rangel special of multiple rent control apts for their personal and political uses. Anyway, you'll end up like NYC with ppl who can't normally afford rent in a neighborhood but bc grandma lived there when it became rent controlled, they end up paying way below market rates in some nice areas. And then some ppl will struggle to make ends meet bc they're paying non controlled rents in order to subsidize the others.

## Posted By: Osamas Pajamas(1870) on 4/15/2010 | 11:19 PM ET

Scorched earth is the best policy --- burn these buildings to the ground and tell the bloodsuckers --- "Seize this!"

« « First | « Previous 1 2 Next » | Last » »



# **Trading Center**

