



January 16, 2014

UNWRAP THE FACTS



Sugar Lobby Should Stop Blaming Other Countries for Protectionist U.S. Subsidies

The sugar lobby and its allies continue to defend U.S. sugar subsidies, yet they are also pointing a finger at other countries, now India, for “ratcheting up their subsidies and artificially manipulating global prices.” They seem to overlook the fact that the U.S. sugar program is one of the most anti-free market policies in the world. **Let’s unwrap the facts.**

- **The U.S. sugar program tightly controls the sugar supply**, restricting imports and dictating the amount of the domestic production quota allocated among sugar processors. When the sugar supply is low in the United States, U.S. sugar prices skyrocket as a result of the restrictions on imports.
- **These higher prices mean U.S. consumers and businesses pay more.** In fact, consumers and businesses have paid \$3 billion annually over the last five years as a result of higher sugar prices.
- **U.S. sugar policy is overly protectionist.** As a result, **U.S. sugar policy could interfere with current trade negotiations**, potentially causing the United States to lose out on expanded market access for other U.S. commodity exports.
- **India is denied any significant access to the U.S. sugar market**, so the sugar lobby does not have a whole lot to complain about in targeting India’s sugar subsidies.

As international trade agreements – such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership – move to the forefront in 2014, it’s time to reexamine the negative impact of U.S. sugar policy on trade.

Learn more about the need to reform U.S. sugar policy 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 Our objective is to reform the federal government’s intrusive, inefficient, restrictive and outdated sugar program – a decades-old subsidy that has repeatedly failed to provide adequate supplies of sugar to the U.S. market.