

Mr. POAGE. Representatives of both employees and employers.

Mr. FORD. Right, now isn't the most likely way to achieve this to have a board that doesn't attempt to have anyone who is a representative of either management or labor? Don't we really ask these people to take an oath under the Constitution to follow the law and exercise their judgment as good American citizens without regard to prejudices and preferences?

Mr. POAGE. I would have to say, as I said to Mr. O'Hara earlier, I think theoretically it is an excellent idea, but as a practical matter I know that our Government doesn't run that way and I know that people are not appointed that way. You are contemplating an appointive board, I suppose. I would assume, of course, that is the only way to handle it. And I know that boards are appointed for the purpose of appeasing or satisfying or pleasing certain groups, and I think we all know that.

Mr. FORD. Just one final point. The burden of the resolution as it is expressed in its resolving clause is that this committee, in the interest of agriculture as well as the national interest, delete all reference to agriculture from the legislation which it is considering.

Now, that goes back to this whole question that Mr. Thompson, our chairman, discussed with you, of the jurisdictional point being raised here.

How would you as chairman of the Agriculture Committee take to a resolution which I would be most pleased to introduce and haven't because other older and wiser heads have indicated to me that it would be in all ways a very bad thing to do, to have you turn the school lunch program over to us because we spend all of our time working on the problems of education?

Mr. POAGE. I think it is perfectly proper for you to suggest that you would like to have jurisdiction over the school lunch program and, as a matter of fact, I understand that your committee and another subcommittee of this committee has actually assumed jurisdiction over the school lunch program and is at present considering it.

Mr. FORD. I have been corrected very quickly. We have a semantics problem. We do have a part of the school lunch program. We have what has been traditionally called the "school lunch program," not the milk program, not the new program contemplated in your legislation, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

Mr. POAGE. Possibly we have not been as devoted to jurisdiction as we should have been in our committee. Possibly we should have complained more about other people taking jurisdiction where we had a technical and possibly a practical case.

That is an amendment to a bill from the Agriculture Committee just as this is an amendment to a bill from this committee, and I think under the rules of the House the origin of the program clearly establishes the jurisdiction of amendments. But we have not felt disposed to have any ill-feeling with our colleagues because they have taken jurisdiction over something where we thought we had jurisdiction, nor have we claimed any jurisdiction at all in connection with this bill.

I want to—again I know it is repetitious, Mr. Chairman—but it seems there is a misunderstanding that our committee is claiming some jurisdiction here. We are claiming no jurisdiction whatsoever, I would, as chairman of the committee, tell you right now that our committee claims no jurisdiction over this bill.