

or maybe their heating bill. It is just a little something extra to keep a small businessman going. So if you want to help put more small businessmen out of business, then kill this bill, but if you are for the small businessman as I am, and if you are for being fair to the sign companies, you will promote this bill. I think each and every Senator here has probably bought sign advertising when they ran for office and you have got to know if you have a sign that is seen every day by 10,000 cars going up and down main street it is worth a lot more than a sign sitting out in a pasture where maybe 10 cars a day see it. So you can't compensate these sign companies just for the cost of the sign. There is the actual value that they get for the price they get to charge because it has more advertising value to them the more people that see it. For the sake of the small businessman who does get income from these signs, I urge you to vote yes and advance LB 241. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR KAHLE: Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, members, you know this is a rather fun afternoon. Here we are again, special legislation. Senator Haberman says that is what we do all the time. This is a perfect example of it. I would say quite honestly that when I saw Senator Haberman and Senator Wesely both being introducers of this legislation, that was enough right there to make a red flag go up. That was a rather strange marriage to start with. But I wonder a little bit about some of the comments that Senator Haberman and Senator Higgins just made. Senator Haberman indicated, first of all, that it was all right to treat signs differently than we treat other...or that we allow the cities and the counties through their zoning regulations to treat other individuals, and yet he is the person that stands up on this floor, time and time again, and says he is for local control and gets up on his soapbox and yells and screams about local control. Well, Senator Haberman, I think we are taking local control away from those people. We are saying here is an exception. Signs have to be treated differently than everybody else. If you will read the existing language as Senator Johnson pointed out just ahead of the new language on page 3 and also at the bottom of page 4 of the bill. It says that "The municipal legislative body", or in the other instance, the county, "may in any zoning regulation, provide for the termination of nonconforming uses, either by specifying the period or periods in which nonconforming uses shall be required to cease,...", and somebody mentioned that they can't cause them to stop, they can't close down the apartment houses. Oh, yeah! It says there they can. It says there they can. If they are out of compliance, you can