SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, now let's say we have 100 children and we, because of whatever circumstances, can only preserve the welfare of 10 of them, should we say that because 90 may die we should allow all 100 to die and not save the 10 that perhaps we can?

SENATOR HABERMAN: Well, there is only one answer to that, Senator Chambers, and the answer to that is we should save as many as we can.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you think that if this child restraint bill were enacted and proper restraints could be put in place that would protect a child, that would be a worthwhile thing?

SENATOR HABERMAN: Proper restraints are a worthwhile thing, yes, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is it your feeling then that no such thing as a worthwhile restraint can be built? Is that your opposition?

SENATOR HABERMAN: I am sorry, you are going to have to restate...(interruption).

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is it your feeling that it is impossible to construct a restraint that will protect a child?

SENATOR HABERMAN: No, it is not impossible to construct a restraint that will protect a child.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then if restraints can be constructed that will protect children, and once put in place children will be protected, why will you oppose the bill simply because children in a different vehicle will not be protected? You don't want to protect those who can be protected. Is that what you are saying?

SENATOR HABERMAN: I used that illustration, Senator Chambers, merely to show the seriousness of the situation that we have a bill before us and we are standing here and saying we have to protect the lives of the children, yet this body will go on record and exclude motor vehicles that many, many, many children will ride in and they do not have to conform to having the restraints.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: We are being hypocritical, Senator Chambers.