Boycott and High Sugar Prices

To The Denver Post:

THE QUESTION OF sugar prices being a comment from the standpoint of industrial consumership as well as the plight of the housewife. As a selector of Fund Raising Chocolates to non-profit organizations, my company has seen a direct rise in prices over the last 3½ years in excess of 550 per cent.

My competitors and I have struggled with rising prices and consumer backlash over the same period. The household buyers have not seen a corresponding rise in prices although those prices have shot up uncomfortably high in the last 18 months due mainly to buying pressures outside the United States.

It burns me to no end to see a price spiral in which I as a personal consumer have no control whatsoever. I have mixed emotions about supporting this sugar boycott. On one hand, I must sell candies to meet my quota and make a living for my family. On the other, somewhere, somehow this mess of inflationary escalation has got to stop. Frankly the considerations of career have to have weight in my deliberations. I have decided not to buy sugar in the two week period, but in going to sell fund raising programs with a delivery period after the sugar boycott to protect customers' profits and my commissions.

Now a comment on two highly related items of note and ambiguity. First, Congresswoman Pat Schroeder, in her campaign rhetoric has alluded to fact that she is interested in the little person's problems concerning inflation. However, when an obscure bill came up before the House, she and many other of her colleagues were directly responsible for a direct rise in the price of sugar of $1.50 per hundred in months of July and August. When it comes time to vote in November a lot of you will do well to remember that.

Second, the Great Western Sugar company was recently up for sale to a farmers consortium. The deal was to be consummated in the early part of this month. When the stockholders meeting in New York convened, the board of directors of that distinguished company refused to sell out because of the higher profit figures envisioned for the coming year. I'm certain you heard the news stories of the greed of those directors. What gets me is the unmitigated gaul of this company to then come out and say "there are no excessive profits in sugar." If the statement is true, why in the hell didn't they sell out to the farmers? I hope these notes will be food for thought.

A. DARLINGTON
Lafayette