

to wear a safety seat belt system be admissible as evidence in the trial of any other civil action. Now I want you to stop to think for a minute, we passed the child restraint seat bill so here is a couple going down the highway and the baby starts to gag on a piece of food. The mother has to unstrap her seat belt, lean over the back seat and take care of that baby. Bingo, she is in trouble. The baby needs a bottle, it needs its diapers changed, bingo, they are in trouble and we are forcing these people to do these things under the seat belt law. So we are saying, you are doing what is right, you have got to save the baby's life. I am sure Senator Marsh will agree with that and Senator Morehead. You have got to take care of that two year old or three year old that is going to choke, and while you are doing that, you can be in an accident and get sued. Well, now that is not right. That is not fair. That isn't even reasonable. So think about that. You are driving down the highway and you ask your wife or your girl friend or whatever to reach in the back and get the thermos bottle so you can have a cup of coffee. They unfasten the seat belt, turn around to reach to get the thermos, bingo, you have an accident and you have had it in a court of law. That is not right. That is not fair. I don't think the bill was intended to do these things. As we get on further with the debate, I will show you a United States Supreme Court decision that this is wrong, that we can't do this, but I will save that for later. So I would ask, okay, what happens if you buckle your seat belt and it is defective or what happens if it isn't clear closed? Bango, you are in trouble. So I say for these reasons adopt the amendment and then let's move on. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Senator Morehead, do you wish to speak on the Haberman amendment?

SENATOR MOREHEAD: Yes, Madam Speaker. I would point out to Senator Haberman that he is telling you that New Jersey adopted this language. I would point out to Senator Haberman that was proposed in New Jersey but that language was never adopted in New Jersey. So that is like taking one of our bills that comes out first in the green copy and then never following the amendments or whatever happens as we go on down the line. So if Senator Haberman is selling you this amendment because it was adopted in New Jersey, it was not and I want to tell you that very clearly. I would ask you to defeat Senator Haberman's amendment because the way