

Opinion Leaders Across America Agree: Reform U.S. Sugar Policy

“The U.S. sugar industry has benefited from subsidies, price-supports, and import restrictions for decades. There is no good reason for this. ... It’s no great mystery why these subsidies persist. It’s pure special interest politics. The benefits are concentrated in a handful of companies, while the costs are widely distributed.”

—**“A Sweet (and Secretive) Bailout for Big Sugar,”** Opinion Column by John Carney, *CNBC*, March 13, 2013

“Right here in America, under our collective nose, there is an industry that survives on political patronage and government subsidies, that regularly receives mysterious and untraceable bailouts funded by taxpayers, that is disproportionately influential in Washington as a result of its massive lobbying efforts, and that is making huge profits at the expense of ordinary consumers. ... I’m talking about the American sugar industry, which for years has been a perfect case study for the corrupting influence of money in politics.”

—**“Occupy Sugar: A Movement Whose Time Has Come,”** Opinion Column by Kevin Roose, *New York Magazine*, March 13, 2013

“Without the Army Corps of Engineers’ dredging and building, the cane growers wouldn’t have the soil or the irrigation they need. Without Washington’s decades of rigging the labor market, the companies wouldn’t have had the workers they needed before mechanization. Now the industry says it deserves to be protected from foreign competition. ... Florida sugar cane is an industry literally built on big government.”

—**“Sugar Industry Would Wither Without Big Government,”** Opinion Column by Timothy Carney, *Washington Examiner*, February 3, 2013

“We no longer have the luxury — as we did for decades — of carrying marginal, ineffectual or wasteful programs. ... If we can’t eliminate the least valuable spending, then we will be condemned to perpetually large deficits, huge tax increases or indiscriminate cuts in many federal programs, the good as well as the bad.”

—**“If We Can’t Kill Farm Subsidies, What Can We Kill?,”** Opinion Column by Robert Samuelson, *Washington Post*, January 6, 2013

“Thanks to a web of tariffs, quotas and other perks that have been protecting domestic sugar-cane and sugar-beet growers since the Depression, American consumers — from big users such as Spangler [Candy Co.] to folks like you and me who like our coffee sweet — are often paying more than twice the global market price. By some estimates, the overage comes to more than \$3.5 billion a year.”

—**“Candymakers are Sour on Protectionism that Drives Up the Price of Sugar,”** Opinion Column by Joe Frolik, *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, June 19, 2012

“The Heritage Foundation has called for sugar subsidies to be totally abolished. They say the U.S. sugar program is bad for consumers, bad for agriculture, bad for America. ... The program that we’re talking about has been in effect for the past 72 years. But now I think things have got to change. Democrats should not support this program under these circumstances. I’m calling on Democrats to go along with the Heritage Foundation, gut the program.”

—**Ed Schultz, host of MSNBC’s “The Ed Show,”** April 20, 2012

“As George F. Will wrote in a column in Sunday’s Washington Post, as government grows, interest groups accumulate, seeking to capture its power and money. Some of these rent-seeking groups are corporate types. Will notes that the federal government delivers sugar subsidies that benefit a few rich providers while imposing costs on millions of consumers.”

—**“Where Are the Liberals?”** Opinion Column by David Brooks, *New York Times*, January 9, 2012

“Sugar import quotas confer substantial wealth on a small cohort of producers already wealthy enough to work the political levers of redistributive government. The increased cost of sugar substantially penalizes consumers as a group but not so noticeably that individuals protest.”

—**“Government: The Redistributionist Behemoth,”** Opinion Column by George Will, *Washington Post*, January 6, 2012