

Mr. CRAMER. That answers also the question, does it not, as to what an incendiary device might be under that section 6(a)? It is correct you define firearms in present law?

Mr. BRESS. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. You define dangerous weapons as defined in the present law plus some additions that appear on page 6; right?

Mr. BRESS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER (reading):

(3) The term "dangerous weapon" includes all articles enumerated in section 14(a) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 654, as amended; D.C. Code 22-33214(a)) and also daggers, dirks, stilettos, and knives having blades over three inches in length.

What is a stiletto?

Mr. BRESS. A form of dagger, I think.

Mr. CRAMER. Straight-bladed knife?

Mr. BRESS. I think it is just a very narrow bladed type of dagger.

A dirk is substantially the same.

Mr. CRAMER. The incendiary device is not defined; is that correct?

Mr. BRESS. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I think in our discussion yesterday you indicated an incendiary device, if that causes a problem, should be and would be defined by the regulations of the Capitol Police force; is that correct?

Mr. BRESS. It could be.

Mr. CRAMER. Or it could be defined in the bill?

Mr. BRESS. Yes, sir. I had suggested to the Senate Public Works Committee that the bill was deficient in failing to have a definition, a recommendation. I recommended that a definition be placed in the bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Could I have an example of that? Then I will yield.

Mr. BRESS. Yes, sir. I have tried my hand at it last night.

I have come up with several. I am not sure that I am completely satisfied with any of them but one is:

Any device designed for or capable of causing ignition of or fire which is ordinarily not possessed by a person for lawful personal use.

We have a decision in *Benton v. United States* decided in the U.S. court of appeals, which held unconstitutional our dangerous weapons statute in that it described a number of items as dangerous weapons, the possession of which was a crime, when some of those were items that could be innocently used. So, to overcome that, I put in the provision, "* * * not possessed by a person for lawful personal use."

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, you want to cover matches, cigarette lighters, and things such as that?

Mr. BRESS. That is right; "* * * any article ordinarily carried on or readily accessible by a person for his individual or private use * * *."

The third definition I have is language which goes into chemistry and engineering to describe what is incendiary in capability and then excludes at the end but does not include ordinary matches, flint and steel lighters, or gas lighters intended primarily for personal or household use. All three definitions, I think, a combination of them might be satisfactory.