becomes out of conformance because of zoning or new types of zoning that we are going to have to reward that person because we have placed that business in some way, shape or form out of conformance and I don't believe this is a good piece of legislation, even though supposedly it refers to Lincoln. I think it has statewide impact. I have got a copy of the Lincoln ordinance here and they give those people seven years to fourteen years to remove or modify the sign. I think that is ample. I don't know how some of you people feel that served in city governments but you ought to go back and look at your ordinances to see how your city handles this kind of a problem and I think for us to act favorably on LB 241, we place the municipalities in this state in a position that is very tenuous and very difficult because it isn't only just signs we could be talking about. we could be talking about a lot of other kinds of facilities. And until such time as we want to talk about the total issue, other than just the sign, I cannot support LB 241 and I hope most of you will not either.

SENATOR KAHLE: There are no other lights on. Pardon me, Howard Peterson, would you like to speak again.

SENATOR H. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise to support the committee amendments and to support the bill in its entirety. I think Senator Koch is entirely wrong. Whenever we take property from someone we need to repay that person for the property regardless of whether it is a sign or whether it is a house or whatever it may be that we condemn, whether we do it by zoning or whatever it may be. Property is property and it seems to me that it is only reasonable for us to say to a city, if you are going to condemn a sign, if you are going to condemn property, you need to repay that person for that property. Therefore, I would rise to support the committee amendments and the bill.

SENATOR KAHLE: Senator Newell, your light has been on. Do you wish to speak on this issue? Who will close? Senator Wesely. Senator Landis. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR LANDIS: Well, since I think Senator Wesely has some of his own amendments, let me just conclude by indicating that the committee amendments were adopted unanimously, and also indicate to you that there will be an amendment offered I believe by Senator Wesely which lays out the terms of the grandfather clause very explicitly. Now we had done this we thought by deleting some of the existing language but, in fact, there is a more explicit grandfather clause which will be offered later on. But