



# Pour Some Sugar On ... Marco Rubio?

By fitsnews • on June 21, 2012

## WHY NOT ... US TAXPAYERS ARE SUBSIDIZING IT

We've made it abundantly clear on this website that we detest big-spending fiscal liberals – chief among them U.S. President **Barack Obama**. Of course we've also made it abundantly clear that we detest "Republicans" who refuse to cut government – chief among them GOP presidential nominee **Mitt Romney**. Who do we detest most of all, though?

So-called "Tea Party" fiscal conservatives who bail on their limited government principles when it's politically expedient for them to do so. At the top of that list at the moment? U.S. Sen. Rand Paul – whose decision to **endorse Romney's presidential bid** has infuriated limited government advocates.

*(To watch a damning video of Rand Paul "explaining" his Romney endorsement to a pair of reporters, [click here](#)).*

Of course Rand Paul isn't the only "fiscal conservative" selling out to the status quo.

U.S. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Florida) – who is on Romney's vice presidential shortlist – recently caved to powerful interests in his state when he voted to kill an amendment that would have phased out federal sugar subsidies that cost taxpayers nearly \$2 billion annually.

"The sugar program is essentially a producer cartel run out of Washington," **writes** Chris Edwards of The Cato Institute. "The Agriculture Department operates a complex loan program to guarantee sugar growers certain prices, which it enforces with import barriers and domestic production controls."

Sound fair? Of course not. Sound like the "free market" at work? Hell no. In fact according to the U.S. Government Accountability Office, 42 percent of sugar subsidies go to the top one percent of sugar farmers.

Cato (correctly) slammed Rubio for his vote.

"An obvious sop to the powerful Florida sugar lobby, Rubio's vote in favor of maintaining the federal government's Soviet-style sugar racket is an all-too-

common example of a politician choosing parochialism over principle,” Cato’s Tad DeHaven **wrote**.

We agree ...

Rubio’s sellout stands in stark contrast to the political courage showed by U.S. Reps. Jeff Duncan and Mick Mulvaney – who **voted against** reauthorizing the crony capitalist U.S. Export-Import Bank even though its prime beneficiary, Boeing, recently opened a manufacturing facility in the Palmetto State.

In a political world in which elected officials can’t shut up about “standing on principle,” Duncan and Mulvaney actually lived up to their rhetoric.

Rubio and Rand Paul?

Not so much ...

Don’t get us wrong, Rubio and Paul are still infinitely better than most “Republicans” in the U.S. Congress when it comes to protecting taxpayers (or trying to), but their recent betrayals of the movement they claim to represent are troubling.

After all, each time a “taxpayer hero” sells out it moves the political spectrum that much further to the left ... granting fiscal liberals like U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham (who voted the right way on the sugar subsidy, believe it or not) greater range of motion to inflict **broader damage** on our wallets and pocketbooks.