Mr. Roth. I think we are using different years. Senator Miller. I am talking about 1966. Mr. Roth. We are using 1964. Senator Miller. I could take 1964 if you like. Mr. Roth. I think you make your point. (The following table was later supplied:)

KENNEDY ROUND CONCESSIONS—UNITED STATES AND EEC TRADE
[1964, millions of dollars, c.i.f.]

	Dutiable imports (except grains)		Average cut,	Free, bound in	Grains (trade
	Total	Conces- sions	dutiable	Kennedy Round	coverage)
Total: (a) U.S. imports from EEC (b) EEC imports from United States Agricultural:	2,656 3,065	2, 136 2, 627	Percent 34 29	4 289	3 452
(a) U.S. imports from EEC(b) EEC imports from United States Nonagricultural:	202 445	117 223	13 13	1 19	3 452
(a) U.S. imports from EEC(b) EEC imports from United States	2, 454 2, 620	2, 019 2, 404	36 32	3 270	

Senator MILLER. And the point is that when it comes to working out an agreement with the EEC, we tabled about 60 percent of the industrial volumes. But when it came to agriculture we only tabled about 7 percent.

Mr. Roтн. If you are talking in terms of U.S. offers—

Senator Miller. I am sorry, about 15 percent.

So when it came to getting down to negotiations on agricultural items, we only got together on about 15 percent of our trade items. And on industrial items we got together on about 60 percent. And my point is that it doesn't look like we came out very well on agriculture overall, certainly not compared to industry, to the other industrial items. And I say this just to make the record straight. I understand and appreciate the difficulties you people face. But I come back to that basic policy that there weren't going to be any trade agreements with the EEC until they made meaningful concessions on agriculture. Now, what is meaningful is something that you get into semantics on; \$200 million offhand sounds meaningful. But the ratio that I point out, amounting to only 15 percent of our agricultural trade, I suggest to you is weefully weak compared to the industrial items of 60 percent.

Mr. Roth. Senator, I feel that your point is well taken. Certainly more was done in the industry, and we expected to do more, than in agriculture. I think we did get offers of real substance in agriculture from the EFC. And secondly, we only reid for what we get

from the EEC. And, secondly, we only paid for what we got.

But there are many areas in agriculture unlike in industry, or more so than in industry, which are very difficult to negotiate in. Take dairy products: they wanted to negotiate in dairy products more than anything else, but we couldn't, because, except for Roquefort, and certain other cheeses, everything was under section 22. And most recently; namely, a week ago, the President and the Secretary of Agriculture