

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 3, 2004

LB 962

them, not every one maybe, but if I didn't I should have. Because usually it's some company or some strong outfit that can overreach the smaller. And people are not aware that when they get into that and it's over, they lose their right to go to court. And I don't think that's a right that ought to be easily and readily given up as a result of action by the Legislature. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schrock.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Mr. President, I'd yield my time to Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Schrock. And I'm trying to keep my promise. I'm not going to beat this to death. But it is something that is troubling to me, because it seems that we're doing two things where only one is necessary. That's what I'm...that's where I'm starting from. If mediation is what worked between A and B that you and I had discussed, and you said they're getting along famously now, how would that situation have come out differently had there been binding mediation?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I think when you have binding mediation, that's kind of a threat, where voluntary...for example, if I have a disagreement with my brother and I have a choice of going to court or having an independent party sit down with the two of us, if we're both reasonable and rational I think a trained mediator can probably solve a lot of problems. And...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Voluntary mediation, you mean now?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Voluntary mediation.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Well, between brothers that might be a good idea, because if it fails then...

SENATOR SCHROCK: I think...but I think it can be any parties