

of stick built housing. If you are familiar with city elections, you will find the money behind them, the engine behind most city elections is the growth or development of the city. You can see by the kinds of contributions that are made to city council races and the like, the heavy money, the special interests that are involved are growth related interests, and how would they come down on the issue of mobile homes? Well, if you were a developer and you wanted to build homes, you wanted to sell a product of \$80,000 a unit, you would be threatened by something that was premade, that would roll in and be set down from some other manufacturer. You wouldn't want to see that that kind of housing was available at all. If you were a land developer that wanted to set their own units up on the outskirts of town in a nice fresh suburb, you wouldn't want to populate that with a type of housing that you did not control, you did not put on the land, in fact then make the whole project so very valuable and enriching. At the same time you have the handholding connection between that power base and city councils who have in the past been afraid of mobile homes because mobile homes have been treated as personal property, not real property, not taxed as real property, that the tax base was dwindling or shrinking or not rising at a very large rate, but at the same time, those mobile home units had a heavy burden on city services. So there is the linkage. The city councils who didn't want to have an adverse burden on their tax base and developers who didn't want competition, and from there we arrive at exclusionary rules and regulations in cities designed essentially to do one thing, make sure that there were no mobile homes either in the city or if they were that they were on mobile home lots owned by developers who were paying a healthy real estate tax. And that is what this bill is all about. This bill seeks to tell cities that they may not exclude across the board one type of housing no matter if that housing meets any reasonable standard, no matter how it stacks up to the construction standards of that community, no matter how it compares to existing facilities. Cities have a very selfish interest in keeping out mobile homes in the past. Because of recent Supreme Court decisions, I don't think that is the case any longer. I think you will have a healthy tax base. These will be taxed as real estate, real property and the tax base will not shrink. Yes, the developers will have to put up with the fact that we have competition but in this body I have heard the name "free enterprise" bandied about so often that we shouldn't at this point stand in the way of healthy competition in the housing market, particularly with the kinds of situations that we have made