

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Wesely, if I may, if we substituted the words "controlled substances" for "drugs", would that make any difference to you?

SENATOR WESELY: It would. It would be...I would not support that.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Why is that?

SENATOR WESELY: Because we specifically asked that at the hearing, Senator Beutler, and specifically it was reported back to us that there may be people that may be abusing drugs and then become dangerous, violently ill, dangerous to themselves or to others without having to use illegal drugs. And...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Are you talking about people who are using drugs on prescriptions?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes, or...yes, they could get high on I don't know what, look-alike drugs, who knows. But that is...the key is the definition is very broad but the catch and the check and balance is going to be the Section 2, the definition of who can actually be committed. Those people aren't going to be committed just because they use drugs, and they are going to have to be a threat to other people or themselves.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, why do we have a definition of, say, alcoholic person or mentally ill person, or abusive person at all? I mean, if the danger we seek to eliminate is the risk of serious harm to another, then perhaps we should just leave it be at that and commit anybody who is a risk of doing serious harm to another.

SENATOR WESELY: Well, I...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Does it matter what the cause of it is if it is a result that you are looking for as the test?

SENATOR WESELY: It may not be, but at the same time the funny thing about both Senator Chambers' and your comments is I know you want to restrict who this can apply to, but then comments come out that it sounds like, you know, broadening it. We want to try and restrict. We don't want