



# Sugar Program Proposals for the 2012 Farm Bill

**Remy Jurenas**  
Specialist in Agricultural Policy

May 25, 2012

**Congressional Research Service**

7-5700

[www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov)

R42551

## Overview of Sugar Program

The U.S. sugar program is up for renewal this year as Congress considers the future of all farm commodity programs in the context of the omnibus 2012 farm bill. As now structured, the sugar program provides a price guarantee to producers of sugar beets and sugarcane and to the processors of both crops. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) further is directed to administer the program at no budgetary cost to the federal government by limiting the amount of sugar supplied for food use in the U.S. market. To achieve both objectives, USDA has four available tools—authorized by the 2008 farm bill (Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008; P.L. 110-246, Subtitle D of Title I) and chapter 17 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedules of the United States—to keep domestic market prices above guaranteed levels. These are:

- extending price support loans at specified levels—the basis for the price guarantee;
- setting marketing allotments to limit the amount of sugar each processor can sell;
- establishing import quotas to restrict the amount of sugar allowed to enter the U.S. market; and
- making a sugar-to-ethanol backstop available if marketing allotments and import quotas are insufficient to prevent a sugar surplus from developing.

For an explanation of how these tools operate together, see CRS Report R42535, *Sugar Program: The Basics*.

## Supporters of Sugar Program

Producers of sugar beets and sugarcane, and the beet refiners and raw sugar mills that process these crops into refined sugar and raw cane sugar, respectively, advocate extending the U.S. sugar policy that Congress adopted in the 2008 farm bill. Spokesmen argue that the program has succeeded in ensuring “reliable supplies of high-quality, safe, responsibly-produced sugar at reasonable prices” for consumers, and provided producers “an economic safety net.” They emphasize that these objectives have been achieved at “zero cost to American taxpayers.”<sup>1</sup> Sugar crop producers and processors are represented by the American Sugar Alliance (ASA).

Two large general farm organizations support continuing the current sugar program. The American Farm Bureau Federation states that while other commodities will be faced with reduced government support in the next farm bill, “the sugar program should be left intact as efforts to generate savings would require convoluted policy structures.” The National Farmers Union supports continuing the sugar program and “encourages Congress to work with ... sugar producers to adopt a strong sugar program in future farm bills.” Also, a coalition of 17 developing countries that benefit from preferential quota access to the U.S. sugar market favor continuing current U.S. sugar policy, arguing that it “provides a guaranteed level of access ... at fair, predictable prices.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> American Sugar Alliance, statement submitted to the House Agriculture Committee’s Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearing on “Formulation of the 2012 Farm Bill: Commodities & Crop Insurance,” May 17, 2012, accessed at <http://www.sugaralliance.org/images/stories/PapersAndTestimony/ASA-HAC-testimony-5-12.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> American Farm Bureau Federation, “Policy Recommendations for the 2012 Farm Bill,” September 28, 2011, p. 5, (continued...)

## Opponents of Sugar Program

Sugar users (i.e., manufacturers of sugar-containing food products and beverages) are proposing changes to the U.S. sugar program. In their view, the sugar program “was made worse by the 2008 farm bill” and operates as “a textbook example of the consequences of excessive government intrusion in the marketplace.” They argue that the program, “by overly restricting the supply of sugar in the U.S. market,” has kept U.S. market sugar prices “far above” world sugar prices. This development, they contend, has resulted in U.S. consumers and food manufacturers paying more for sugar than foreign users do, encouraged the relocation of food processing jobs offshore, led to the elimination of thousands of U.S. jobs, and created a “dramatic inequity of the benefits provided to sugar growers over other agricultural producers” supported by other commodity programs.<sup>3</sup>

Sugar users are primarily represented by the Coalition for Sugar Reform (CSR). CSR includes the food and beverage companies that use sugar (e.g., confectionery firms, bakeries, cereal manufacturers, beverage makers and dairy companies, and the trade associations for these industries), consumer and trade advocacy groups, and business organizations. Two trade associations representing food manufacturing firms where sugar is a principal input have placed U.S. sugar policy at the top of their legislative agenda. They are the American Bakers Association and the National Confectioners Association.<sup>4</sup>

## Legislative Activity in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress

### Senate Farm Bill Activity

The Senate Agriculture Committee, in approving its farm bill (S. 3240) on April 26, 2012, reauthorized the current sugar program without any change through crop year 2017 (Section 1301 of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012). The committee also reauthorized the sugar-to-ethanol program in the bill’s Energy title (Section 9009). Senate leadership has indicated that this bill will be considered on the Senate floor in June.

The American Sugar Alliance noted that the committee “overwhelmingly agreed that America’s popular no-cost sugar policy should be continued.” It added: “This is great news” for those employed in the sugar sector, for U.S. food security, and for taxpayers who will benefit from an “ample and affordable” sugar supply without government cost.<sup>5</sup>

---

(...continued)

accessed at <http://www.fb.org/issues/FarmBureauRecommendations110928.pdf>; National Farmers Union, *2012 NFU Policy*, adopted by delegates at their March 2012 convention, accessed at <http://www.nfu.org/policy-nfu/218-article-i/973-e-commodities#anchor5>; ASA, “Developing Nations Reaffirm Sugar Policy Support, Praise Farm Bill,” May 21, 2012, accessed at <http://www.sugaralliance.org/newsroom/developing-nations-reaffirm-sugar-policy-support-praise-farm-bill.html>.

<sup>3</sup> Coalition for Sugar Reform, statement submitted to the House Agriculture Committee’s Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearing on “Formulation of the 2012 Farm Bill: Commodities & Crop Insurance”, May 17, 2012, accessed at <http://sugarreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/CSR-House-Ag-Testimony-May-17-2012-FINAL-.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> American Bakers Association, “Sugar Program Reform,” accessed at <http://americanbakers.org/issues/sugar/>; CSR, “Message from the Chairman”—President, National Confectioners Association, accessed at <http://sugarreform.org/about/message-from-the-chairman/>.

<sup>5</sup> ASA, “Senate Agriculture Committee Continues No-Cost Sugar Policy,” April 26, 2012, accessed at (continued...)

The Coalition for Sugar Reform expressed “disappointment” that the committee extended the “outdated and anticompetitive U.S. sugar support program.” It views the program as forcing “U.S. sugar-using industries to pay 50 percent or more above the world price for sugar, at the direct expense of U.S. consumers and jobs.”<sup>6</sup>

Senator Lugar had signaled that he would offer an amendment on the sugar program during committee markup, but subsequently announced that he will instead offer an amendment when the farm bill comes up for Senate floor debate.<sup>7</sup>

## **House Farm Bill Activity**

The House Agriculture Committee concluded its farm bill hearings on May 18, and reportedly will mark up its farm bill in June. The committee chairman and ranking Member have stated their support for continuing the sugar program without any change and their desire to move quickly in light of the expiration of most farm bill programs in 2012.

Two House members have signaled that if the Agriculture Committee “fails to undertake significant reform of the sugar program,” they “will be left with no other option than to offer House floor amendments to the farm bill to achieve sugar policy reform.”<sup>8</sup>

## **Bills Introduced by Program Opponents**

To date, Members have introduced eight measures that would make significant changes to U.S. sugar policy. **S. 25** (Stop Unfair Giveaways and Restrictions Act of 2011, introduced by Senator Shaheen) would phase out in stages the loan rates for the 2012 through 2014 crops from sugar beets and sugarcane. Price support would not be available for the 2015 and subsequent crop years. Price support during the three-year transition period would only be available in the form of “recourse” loans, meaning cash repayment irrespective of the market price (even if lower than the loan rate) when repaid. **S. 685/H.R. 1739** (Free Sugar Act of 2011, introduced by Senator Lugar and Representative Dold, respectively) would repeal all sugar price support provisions, effective with the 2012 crops. Title I, Subtitle C, of **S. 1658/H.R. 3111** (Rural Economic Farm and Ranch Sustainability and Hunger [REFRESH] Act, a comprehensive farm bill proposal introduced by Senator Lugar and Representative Stutzman, respectively) would repeal all sugar price support provisions, effective with the 2013 crops. **H.R. 1385** (Free Market Sugar Act, introduced by Representative Pitts) and Section 521(a) of **H.R. 408/S. 178** (introduced by Representative Jordan and Senator DeMint, respectively) would immediately repeal all sugar price support provisions.

---

(...continued)

<http://www.sugaralliance.org/newsroom/Senate-Agriculture-Committee-Continues-No-Cost-Sugar-Policy.htm>.

<sup>6</sup> CSR, “Costly Sugar Policy Receives Rubber Stamp Approval by Senate Agriculture Committee,” April 26, 2012, accessed at <http://sugarreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/CSR-Release-Senate-AG-Markup-FINAL-4-26-12.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup> Press release issued by Senator Lugar, “Lugar Vows to Offer Sugar Program Amendment on Senate Floor,” April 26, 2012, accessed at <http://www.lugar.senate.gov/record.cfm?id=336640&>.

<sup>8</sup> Rep. Joe Pitts and Rep. Danny Davis, “Sugar Caucus Co-Chairs Submit Joint Testimony—Urge Agriculture Committee to Change Sugar Program,” May 17, 2012, accessed at [http://davis.house.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=325&Itemid=1](http://davis.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=325&Itemid=1).

All eight bills would repeal all statutory authorities pertaining to sugar marketing quotas and allotments, payments made to processors to store sugar forfeited to the USDA, storage facility loans, and the feedstock flexibility program for bioenergy producers (i.e., sugar-to-ethanol) program. However, they differ in the changes proposed to the sugar import quota.

S. 25, H.R. 1385, and Section 521(b) of H.R. 408/S. 178 would require USDA to establish each year's import quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugars to ensure "a robust and competitive sugar processing industry in the United States" and "an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices in the United States." To meet these objectives, USDA is directed to consider five factors that take into account U.S. food demand for sugar, sugar production, carryover stocks from the previous year, the "quantity of sugar that would provide for reasonable carryover stocks" at the end of the marketing year, and U.S. import obligations made under trade agreements. By contrast, S. 685/H.R. 1739 and S. 1658/H.R. 3111 would go further and completely eliminate all U.S. tariffs on sugar imports as well as the quota-setting authority administered by USDA and the U.S. Trade Representative. In other words, the United States would no longer restrict imports of sugar from foreign countries granted most-favored nation trade status.

The Coalition for Sugar Reform commended the Members of Congress that introduced four measures proposing changes to U.S. sugar policy (S. 25; S. 685/H.R. 1739; H.R. 1385).<sup>9</sup>

## **Author Contact Information**

Remy Jurenas  
Specialist in Agricultural Policy  
rjurenas@crs.loc.gov, 7-7281

---

<sup>9</sup> Coalition for Sugar Reform, press releases issued January 27, March 30, April 6, and May 20, 2011, available at <http://sugarreform.org/news/press-releases-and-statements/>.