it in the future. And the problems which I find abroad, particularly as they affect Britain, make it essential in my judgment for the President to be able to negotiate a free trade area, for example, in the Atlantic, but subject to the congressional veto which may be required in order to protect fully participation by the Congress in any such eventuality.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your patience. I think the Chair knows that I have been very heavily involved in these matters for many years, and hence felt sure that at the opening of such a hearing as this that I would make this declaration.

Chairman BOGGS. I thank the Senator from New York. He has indeed been very closely associated with the action taken by Congress in the past on all of these subjects.

And I appreciate your statement, Senator. It is a very complimentary statement.

Do any other members of the subcommittee have statements?

Representative WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to congratulate Dr. Roth and his colleagues for the work that has been done over the years. It is an arduous task, and it seems to have been culminated very successfully. And I think in the next 2 or 3 years that the emphasis that Senator Javits has placed on keeping an eye on it is something that should be kept in mind.

Thank you.

Chairman BOGGS. Thank you very much, Mr. Widnall. Senator Miller?

Senator MILLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to join with my colleagues in thanking the chairman for arranging these hearings, and welcoming Ambassador Roth before the subcommittee.

As a member of the subcommittee I am naturally interested in all aspects of the GATT negotiations and the Kennedy Round in particular.

But I am also a representative of a great agricultural State quite concerned with what has happened from the standpoint of agricultural products and more particularly the access to the Common Market countries for our grain. I have heard all kinds of statements, ranging from a statement which appeared in the press attributed to Mr. Schnittker praising the results, to cries of "sellout" of American agriculture from some rather knowledgeable members of the agricultural industry.

It was pointed out that the United States gave up trying to get guaranteed access to the market of the European Economic Community because the Community's final order had "no value." I am going to be interested in knowing what this was, and what caused the evaluation that it had no value.

I went on to point out that the United Sates received a reasonable assurance that the total grain exports to the Common Market will be maintained, because production there may grow no faster than consumption, and because the Community will now have to export more grain on a new agreement between more countries.

I am naturally interested in the basis for that evaluation, and especially that production there may grow no faster than consumption.