shipped in such large totals as to disrupt our support programs and undermine domestically produced brands.

Consider cheese. During 1967 the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 180.5 million pounds of Cheddar or American cheese under section 22 authorizations so as to prevent excess production depressing the domestic market in cheese and cheese products. Yet, during the same calendar year we imported 152 million pounds of cheese—approximately 8 percent of all our production. The major proportion of this cheese was of the Cheddar or American cheese type. Of the latter type, 60.3 million pounds consisted of Colby cheese—a substitute for plain American cheese. It comes in under the designation "other" cheese in our tariff structure. It was only after repeated representations were made in 1967 that the President allowed a quota of 6,096,600 pounds be set for imports of Colby cheese. This is now in addition to the regular importation of Cheddar and American cheese.

Why, we must ask, should any quota be given to a cheese type that is plainly a substitute deliberately designed to substitute for an American product covered under our section 22 support price programs? Why should we have to allow this type of substitute to displace American cheese production? Should we be buying up excess domestic production and thus creating a sales vacuum so as to allow a foreign competing substitute an entrance into our market? What is reprehensible in the whole action is that fact that an illegal product evasion under section 22 programs has been allowed a valid quota after invading our home market.

Consider butter. In 1953 an import quota of 707,000 pounds was set for butter. Soon this category of our section 22 program was upset by the importation of butter oil and cream. By 1956, 1.8 million pounds of butter oil were imported—equal to 2.2 million pounds of butter. To offset further encroachments of our market a quota of 1.2 million pounds of butter oil was set in 1957—the equivalent of 1.5 million pounds of butter. Again an evasion of a section 22 commodity resulted in an extra import quota being given to foreign exporters.

Similarly frozen cream was given an import quota of 12,540,000 pounds on July 1, 1967. Again an addition of a new item under our section 22 support program has resulted in an addition to our butter import quota.

Another type of item that is upsetting our butter quota is the butter-fat-sugar mixture or "crumb." In 1961 nothing was imported, yet the totals for 1966 and 1967 were 105,026,000 and 100,548,000 pounds respectively. We have no quota on this. Consider the new product called "chocolate crumb" used for icing and ice cream mixtures and coverings. In 1960 we imported 54,000 pounds. This total rose to 21,500,000 pounds in 1967 and the prospects are already for a 40 percent higher import rate in 1968. Yet there is no prohibition against it. In 1967 the Department of Agriculture ruled that if the mixture contained a sugar content of 25 percent or over, then the sugar would have to be charged against our sugar import quota. So what is the result? Now the mixture contains 24 percent sugar—without a charge to the sugar quota and without charge to our butter or butter oil quota. Again a new item is being used to evade a specific commodity quota.

Consider procesed milk imports. In 1962 we imported 4,000 pounds of evaporated milk. The total rose to 1,311,000 pounds in 1967. The