

I do not think that the gentleman would contend that those bills were as far reaching or contained nongermane amendments as does this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Do you want me to answer that, sir? I think on close examination, you will probably find all these titles concern civil rights and, therefore, are germane.

The question of Indian civil rights indicates germaneness. This is a civil rights bill. Indians are a part of the Nation and they are entitled to civil rights.

The question of rights—that originally was a bill that was put in a bundle in the House itself, and was held to be germane by the Parliamentarian. It was split up so that there was no question about the rights provision being germane. The question concerning housing certainly is a matter of civil rights. They involve the 14th amendment and not only that, as Mr. Rogers has reminded, we passed it before as a part of the civil rights bundle. There was no question about germaneness raised then.

The question of firearms, while I would say that the Senator Long amendment is not a distinctly firearms act, yet it is a matter that involves civil rights because it is weighted so as to prevent civil rights disturbances, riots, and so forth, that may grow out of civil rights. So, conceivably, there would be no difficulty in holding that germane. I would say all in all, whatever is hung on this by the Senate is proper as far as germaneness is concerned.

Mr. COLMER. Again, I would have to respectfully disagree. I do not think this question of Indians would be held germane upon the floor of the House. I think it would be subject to a point of order.

I think the firearms provision that was added over in the Senate would be subject to a point of order, and, I would think, although I would want to look into that a little further, that the House provision—H.R. 421—would be held nongermane.

But, I come back to, Why the haste?

Now, take the question that was brought up, the Indians. That is a bill that is now under consideration in a committee of the House, headed by the distinguished and able and splendid chairman of one of the committees of this House, a colleague and friend, Mr. Aspinall, who, by the way, has indicated that he would like to appear before this committee and object to this provision being in this bill.

Now, the gentleman would not condemn—or rather, would agree with me that the subject of Indians was not considered in his committee, either in this Congress or in a previous Congress.

Mr. CELLER. I certainly agree with that.

Mr. COLMER. Yes. Now, the housing provision of this bill—

Mr. CELLER. May I interject one thought.

You know this is not the first time this thing happened. I remember we had a very insignificant immigration bill and they tacked on a football proposal and I do not remember anybody in the committee or any other committee that made objection to it.

Mr. COLMER. Oh, yes.

Mr. CELLER. Then, we had another simple tax bill and they tacked onto that a congressional redistricting bill and nobody objected to that.