

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Johnson, why would you consider it worse for somebody 18-years old to give drugs to somebody 17 years, 364 days but it is not as bad if the one 17-years old, 364 days gives it to the one who is 18? Why is one so much worse than the other?

SENATOR L. JOHNSON: There is no difference provided for now in existing state statutes about the (interruption) difference in age.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, and your bill would make that difference. And your bill would make that difference, right?

SENATOR L. JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, let's say that we have somebody, and believe it or not, there are some people who don't use drugs by the time they are 18 and even beyond, even some old geezers and codgers, and geezeresses and codgeresses, and I think they are well beyond 18. Let's say that you have an individual who, for whatever reason, has been involved in the drug culture, as it is called, for a number of years, at least two years, since he or she was 15-years old, streetwise, has been homeless, may have been victimized and abused, and is a pretty hardened person at this point. So he or she reaches the age of 17 years, 364 days, and comes across some person who is naive but 18-years old. And this 17-year older plus gives drugs to the one 18, that would not come under your bill. That transaction would not be covered by your bill. But if we turn it around and that person who is relatively naive, as far as the drug culture is concerned, has some pills or counterfeit substance and this streetwise, hardened person who has been a part of the drug culture says, give me this, and the 18-year older gives it to the streetwise, hardened one. The 18-year older who is naive runs the risk of the punishments under your bill, isn't that correct?

SENATOR L. JOHNSON: That is true.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is that what you are after? I know that is what happens, but is that what you have in mind? Is that the kind of situation you have in mind? I will answer for you. No. If I had this bill, that wouldn't be what I'd have in mind. What we are all thinking about, based on the discussions, are the situations where somebody who at the upper level is really