



December 2, 2013

## Washington Post Editorial: “Congress Needs to Roll Back Subsidies to Sugar Producers”

---

Excerpt:

- *“Federal policy coddles the U.S. sugar industry through import controls, soft loans and price targets. The result is **higher consumer prices** — **and fewer jobs** in the U.S. food industry. Still, for many years Big Sugar and its defenders could claim that the program was designed to avoid any direct expenditure of taxpayer funds and that it had, in fact, achieved that goal.*
- *“Not anymore. The Agriculture Department **lost \$280 million** on the sugar program in fiscal year 2013, with **more losses expected next year**. A surge of imports from Mexico has driven down U.S. sugar prices — to the point where it’s profitable for processors to take advantage of a U.S. law that lets them forfeit the sugar they posted as collateral for government loans and keep the cash. Stuck with mountains of excess sweetener, **the government has two choices: hoard it until prices go up or sell it at a huge loss to the few ethanol makers willing to take it.** ...*
- *“Now, the sugar lobby says, the United States should adopt a ‘zero-for-zero’ policy: We’ll stop fiddling with the sugar market when everyone else in the world does the same. ...*
- *“... Politics 101 says that’s not going to happen soon, so demanding ‘zero-for-zero’ amounts to an excuse for perpetuating policies that **benefit U.S. producers at the expense of food processors and consumers.** ...*
- *“The United States should **stand for free trade in sugar and against protectionism.** Setting a better example would help.”*

Read the full editorial [here](#).

**Only Congress can fix a program that hurts U.S. consumers, taxpayers, food manufacturers and their workers with simple reforms to U.S. sugar policy.**

Learn more about the need to reform U.S. sugar policy at [www.sugarreform.org](http://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 Our objective is to reform the federal government’s intrusive, inefficient, restrictive and outdated sugar program — a decades-old subsidy that has repeatedly failed to provide adequate supplies of sugar to the U.S. market.