

what I was talking about. Based on the definition, any drug addict falls within the operation of this bill.

SENATOR WESELY: It is a very broad definition.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So there are some drug addicts, they might be...and I mention doctors who use their amphetamines or valium or whatever. There could be lawyers. There could be all of these other people. And when you look at what it is you are talking about, you have to talk about the definition of that category you are dealing with. So tell me how I am wrong in what I am saying.

SENATOR WESELY: You are not wrong in what you are saying. It is a very broad definition of drug user, but no matter what your definition of drug user, they still have to go back up to Section 2 and be a threat to themselves or to others before they can be committed. So that is the key, not the definition so much.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If a doctor uses drugs and also is a surgeon, couldn't he be a threat to others? If a lawyer uses drugs and represents people and doesn't do a good job because of his drug addiction, couldn't he be a threat to others? Or are you talking only about physical damage?

SENATOR WESELY: If you look at the definition, Senator Chambers, it says, a substantial risk of serious harm to another person or persons within the near future as manifested by evidence of recent violent acts or threats of violence or by placing others in a reasonable fear of such harm. It looks to me as though that would indicate not so much the lawyer or the doctor being a threat as an individual with violent tendencies being a threat.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So then the damage that a doctor could do, although it might partake of violence because it is a physical act which damages a person, since a doctor is doing it, even though he is doing it incompetently and not according to medical standards, it would not be considered violence, so a doctor is exempted even though the harm he causes might be far greater than some drug addict out on the street who says, if I could get my hands on your throat, I would strangle you. He gets involuntarily committed. The doctor who buries his mistakes does not. So aren't we establishing a policy really of what we are going to do?