

they don't like but which conduct is not criminal can be involuntarily locked away, you are doing in one sense what I am always hearing Russia and other totalitarian countries condemned for. The major difference though is that the Legislature is doing it in Nebraska so it will have the appearance of following legal procedures and because it followed legal procedures most people will conclude that it is a valid and worthwhile policy for the state to adopt. I don't like to see drugs sold. I don't like to see them abused, but as with all these types of laws, there are certain categories of persons whose liberty will involuntarily be taken from them. I doubt that there are many doctors or lawyers who will be involuntarily committed as alcoholics unless they have become so derelict and such derelicts that they are an embarrassment to their family and friends in the profession. But if you find other people who might have political attitudes or engage in political activity which is not desirable, these kind of laws give a pretense for locking those people away. Those who don't face the prospect of this will never understand it as a threat to liberty or freedom. The problem that I experience is that these groups who are impacted upon in a negative fashion by legislation will come to me for assistance because I am the one who will have tried to oppose it. But I tried to explain that I am not the one they ought to talk to. They ought to talk to all these senators who put these kind of laws in force and try to make them understand that it is not the best thing. The mere fact that the Department of Institutions asks for this does not make it acceptable to me. They started with mentally ill and dangerous persons and they could set up whatever definition should fit that situation. Then they added the alcoholic and dangerous person. Now that a lot of people's children are using drugs, they add the drug abusing person who is dangerous and all of these are subjective terms. If you are going to make it against the law to sell a certain substance, you have at least some objective elements to deal with. When the whole issue of whether a person is going to be involuntarily deprived of freedom is subjective and left to people who can adopt any standards that they want to or declare no standard that is being followed, I think it is not a wise proposition. I am opposed to expanding the categories of persons who can have their freedom taken away involuntarily. There are times when society goes too far in trying to determine that they are going to "protect someone from his or herself". You can tell some people you are going to have