



September 12, 2012

FACT CHECK:

EU and U.S. Sugar Reform Efforts Do Not Compare

The U.S. sugar-growing and processing lobby claims that 2006 reforms to the European Union's (EU) sugar policy helped create shortages and increased prices there, and charges the same would happen if Congress were to reform the U.S. sugar program. This is nonsense. Here are the facts:

FACT: Tight sugar supplies in the EU are actually due primarily to the same reason as in the United States – the EU still has tariffs, import quotas and domestic production quotas that limit supply instead of real policy reform.

FACT: U.S. consumers and businesses are already being forced to pay more than consumers in Europe for sugar. U.S. consumers pay as much as \$3.5 billion more than they would if U.S. sugar policy didn't severely restrict domestic production and much-needed imports.

FACT: U.S. sugar growers and processors ignore the fact that largely as a result of the failed U.S. sugar policy, 125,000 U.S. sugar-using industry jobs were lost between 1997 and 2010. An Iowa State University study shows that sugar reform could add up to 20,000 jobs in the U.S. food industry each year.

FACT: We agree – U.S. sugar growers ARE internationally competitive! This means that U.S. sugar production should not decline in a more market-oriented environment. The EU situation is different from that of the United States, as the EU is a high-cost producer of sugar. Therefore, it is not surprising that production declined in the EU when subsidies were cut.

To learn more about why the sugar lobby's EU comparison is so misleading, please click [here](#).

Congress – Reform Outdated Sugar Policies in the 2012 Farm Bill!

Learn more about the need to reform U.S. sugar policy in the 2012 Farm Bill at www.sugarreform.org.

Connect with us on

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Youtube](#) | [Flickr](#)

###

The Coalition for Sugar Reform is an alliance of consumers, food and beverage manufacturers, trade advocates, environmental groups, taxpayer watchdog organizations, responsible government advocates, think tanks and other interests. Our objective is to reform the federal government's intrusive, inefficient, restrictive and outdated sugar program – a decades-old subsidy that has repeatedly failed to provide adequate supplies of sugar to the U.S. market.