

mandated bill, I rise to oppose something that I again concur with. The Department of Public Welfare tells us they believe that this language will put us out of compliance with the federal requirements and we would again risk losing the 400 and some thousand dollars in this area. So I concur with Senator Chambers that we should use...that his definition is the best one, but it I think creates a significant risk that we would be out of compliance with federal regulations, and I urge you to reject Senator Chambers' amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I rise to support Senator Chambers' amendment. When Senator Chambers offered the amendment yesterday, I recognized fairly quickly that what he was doing was something we ought to consider doing and that simply is to try to define with a certain degree of specificity what is a strike or what is not a strike, because as I had looked at the federal statute in the area, the word that was used was "strike". That's all that was said that it was just a strike, and it certainly seemed well within the prerogative of the state that has to live with that federal "U" case to ascertain precisely what is a strike the participation in which will cause a family to lose ADC benefits. I happen to realize that the Nebraska Unemployment Compensation law has defined for purposes of unemployment compensation when men and women will be disqualified from benefits by virtue of their participating in...and the language there is "labor dispute", when they participate in the labor dispute. And inasmuch as we have had that on our books for a long period of time, it seems to me that and obviously there has been case law developed around that kind of a language and those kinds of interpretations that would be very beneficial for our state to in effect borrow from our unemployment compensation statute and just put them right on our ADC statutes so that we in effect are working under the same language. Now there is one language change which I think is a beneficial change. As I said, the unemployment compensation statutes use the words "labor dispute" which results in a work stoppage. We have substituted the word "strike" for labor dispute. If you think about it, a labor dispute is broader than a strike because you can be locked out. The employer can decide to force the hand of the employees by effecting a lockout. And a lockout is something different from a strike. It genuinely is. And a lockout would not be a protected activity under the employment compensation act. But Congress only dealt with the word "strike" in the ADC program. So