

Denise: Please use the following resubmitted version for the public record instead. Thank you. - Morgan

=====

Representative Sweaney, Chair, House Government
Operations Committee
cc: Committee members

Public comments of mine re: [H.225 Draft 1.1 \(2/27/2014\)](#)

Dear Representative Sweaney, et al:

It is well appreciated that you and two other members of the House Government Operations Committee were able to attend the Law Enforcement Advisory Board (LEAB) public hearing concerning "Electronic Control Devices" (ECDs: aka Stun Guns, aka Tasers). Thank you for doing so.

This morning I came
across the draft language
of H.225
that, to my knowledge,
the committee
had received from legislative council for its review for when it
next takes up consideration of the bill

.

Among other problems I have with this draft

version
of the bill, given about how "Electronic Control Devices"
(ECDs: aka Stun Guns, aka Tasers) have

in fact
proven to be lethal weapons (particularly when used on
certain populations

,

but
also when
these devices are
not used

in

accordance
to the manufacturer's
own
guidelines),
is that
I take
strong umbrage
and
have
major objections
to the draft language

essentially
adopting what is

in fact
nothing more than Taser International's current version of its
marketing language (i.e., "less lethal"
; previously having been "non-lethal" and afterwards, "less-
than-
lethal
"

) with which to describe the devices in question as being "less-
lethal alternatives to lethal force" and potentially having this
terminology be officially
enacted
within state policy and law.

While there are those who continue to believe and insist
otherwise, no matter how many persons have fallen as well as
continue to fall victim to major bodily injury or even death

after these devices are used upon them
, it is not true that these devices are "less-lethal alternatives
to lethal force".

Therefore, it
is

not advisable for the state to adopt this language within what
would
become

official
state policy as well as
law.

Rather, it is advisable

to drop

and strip out
that

language -- and anything along those lines -- altogether in
any and all instances;

and

, when describing or defining the devices,

either

retain

the word "lethal" or, if need be, use "potentially lethal"
instead.

Thank you in advance for any consideration that might be
given to these comments of mine.

Sincerely concerned,

Morgan W. Brown
Montpelier