

Submitter:

Allan Hunter

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

House Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

HB2467

Citizens' civil rights are universally endangered whenever a proposed law makes it easier to confine them, all the more so when it is justified NOT by something they're alleged to have done but instead by someone's opinion of what they MIGHT do.

Nobody — psychiatric professional definitely included — has shown themselves to be very good at predicting whether someone else will do something "dangerous".

The possibilities for unintentional abuse of this type of policy are wide-ranging and are THEMSELVES dangerous. Any individual who differs from the societal norm in any shape way fashion or form is at risk of being perceived as insufficiently capable of conducting themselves. This includes both factors that a person has some measure of choice in and factors that are completely beyond an individual's ability to control, and unfortunately includes a very wide scope of completely harmless ways of being different.

The intention may be benevolent but history has shown us that institutions created with good intent can do great harm when the populace has no right to decline their benevolence.

Meanwhile the possibilities for INTENTIONAL abuse of this type of policy aren't dismissible either. A politician or a corrupt public official could use a statute of this type to eliminate people whose presence they find intrusive or annoying. In our current political climate we see daily examples of how existing policies are subject to this type of misuse.

Err on the side of individual citizen autonomy and self-determination. We already have sufficient mechanisms for taking care of incapacitated people.