

Mr. HARSHA. Would you yield? I have here a pipe tool that you tamp a pipe with. It has a reamer and this thin blade. I submit that I can do as much damage with this as I can with a 3-inch knife.

Mr. BRESS. That pointer on your pipe cleaner is about the length of an ordinary pocketknife. I would say that would not be prohibited, forbidden.

Mr. HARSHA. You could do an awful lot of damage with that.

Mr. BRESS. If you had an ice pick carried around, my position might be a little different.

Mr. CRAMER. If any such instrument is actually used, however, it is covered in the next section, physical violence, is it not?

Mr. BRESS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. This is an all-inclusive definition?

Mr. BRESS. No.

Mr. CRAMER. It is to get at the more reprehensible weapon, the more dangerous weapon?

Mr. BRESS. Yes. The use by Congressman Harsha of that pipe cleaner as a weapon for the purpose of attack would constitute a felony in the District, assault with a dangerous weapon. The manner in which he used that would convert it into a dangerous weapon.

Mr. CRAMER. Physical violence would cover any weapon used for that purpose, whether defined in section 6(a) or not?

Mr. BRESS. Right.

Mr. CRAMER. In your opinion, will this definition of a dangerous weapon include a Molotov cocktail? It could be by definition under incendiary?

Mr. BRESS. I believe so.

Mr. CRAMER. I read it carefully two or three times, and I think it is, too. I wanted your concurring opinion.

Mr. BRESS. I think it could be not only explosive but I think it would constitute a dangerous weapon. Our courts have held that a shod foot when used for purposes of assault is a dangerous weapon.

Mr. CRAMER. There is in the present law nothing to protect us from Joe Blow, if he is a nut or a revolutionary, coming into the House and tossing a Molotov cocktail any time he wants to. This bill or bills of this nature are essential to prevent this or to provide a deterrent at least in the future; is that your opinion?

Mr. BRESS. That is correct, sir. It would not prevent it.

Mr. CRAMER. We have had marchers on the Capitol and we probably will have more. It seems to me the Congress has a duty to set the moral climate and to provide a deterrent so that those who might be inclined will be doing so at their own great peril.

We must, as Members of Congress, protect the people's government and see it continues to operate. That is the thought behind this bill, is it not?

Mr. BRESS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. They could clog up the workings of the Capitol so we could not function.

Mr. BRESS. This corrects a long needed bit of legislation.

Mr. CRAMER. There has been some discussion with regard to other buildings outside the Capitol needing protection. As I understand this, this bill provides for an increase in the penalties in section 2, on page 7, line 3, for all public buildings, from \$50 to \$500 and to 6 months in jail.

Mr. BRESS. In the District of Columbia for disorderly conduct. Yes, sir.