

Re: Are we protected from Junk Food Corporations?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.nutrition/2004-08/2154.html>

From: john (*nospamoriots_at_vaccine.com*)

Date: 08/30/04

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 10:01:18 +0000 (UTC)

it's a conspiracy to poison us with added benefit to them (Illuminati corporations) of robbing us too <http://www.whale.to/b/junk.html>

"DonQuijote1954" <nolionnoproblem@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:4e4a3f58.0408291358.74b11672@posting.google.com...

- > *The legislation is moving to protect, of course, the rights of the*
- > *food corporations not to be sued. How can they ever be on the side of*
- > *the public? Even the new sugar intake guidelines is watered down to*
- > *say nothing that offends big food corporations. They argue that*
- > *whoever eats junk food is responsible for it...*
- >
- > *It happens though that you can argue the same thing for cigarettes,*
- > *whose manufacturers are very much liable for it. And then there's the*
- > *other issue of smoking being a decision that you take when you are an*
- > *adult, not a helpless child in front of the television screen who's*
- > *bombarded with "Happy Meal" propaganda.*
- >
- > *Sure enough, there's legislation banning advertising on children*
- > *television in Denmark and other Scandinavian countries. Should others*
- > *be protected as well?*
- >
- > *Eateries Push for Obesity Suit Protection*
- >
- > *Sat Aug 28, 4:33 PM ET*
- >
- > *By IRA DREYFUSS, Associated Press Writer*
- >
- > *WASHINGTON – Bills to protect restaurants and food companies against*
- > *lawsuits by people who claim the meals or snacks made them fat are*
- > *moving ahead in the states like hamburgers passed out a drive-thru*
- > *window.*
- >
- > *Measures known as "cheeseburger bills" bar people from seeking damages*
- > *in court from food companies for weight gain and associated medical*
- > *conditions, including heart disease and diabetes.*
- >

sci.med.nutrition: Re: Are we protected from Junk Food Corporations?

- > *Supporters say the proposals shield businesses from having to pay to*
- > *defend themselves against frivolous suits. Opponents contend the*
- > *claims often are valid and ought to be heard in court.*
- >
- > *Two cases against McDonald's accused the company of causing obesity in*
- > *thousands of children. In dismissing the cases last year, U.S.*
- > *District Judge Robert Sweet in New York said consumers ought to know*
- > *that eating lots of fast food can make them fat and that they cannot*
- > *ask courts to "protect them from their own excesses."*
- >
- > *That ruling has not stopped lawyers from holding conferences on how to*
- > *win such claims. Also, the possibility of a legal defeat haunts the*
- > *food industry, whose leaders say they should not be held responsible*
- > *for people's eating decisions.*
- >
- > *Many lawmakers agree.*
- >
- > *So far this year, a dozen states have enacted laws against such suits,*
- > *according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.*
- >
- > *A Washington state law prohibits people from suing food manufacturers,*
- > *sellers and advertisers based on claims arising from people's weight*
- > *gain, obesity, or related health conditions.*
- >
- > *The law, backed by the state restaurant association, keeps the*
- > *responsibility for eating where it belongs, said Democratic state Rep.*
- > *Patricia Lantz.*
- >
- > *"It was so common sense," said Lantz, a trial lawyer who heads the*
- > *House Judiciary Committee (news – web sites) in her state. "Most*
- > *people don't see any reason to impose liability for an individual's*
- > *inability to push himself away from the dinner table."*
- >
- > *Similar bills have won approval in other states. But efforts at*
- > *passing a national shield have faltered in Congress.*
- >
- > *One bill, sponsored by Rep. Ric Keller (news, bio, voting record),*
- > *R–Fla., was passed by the House. A second, sponsored by Sen. Mitch*
- > *McConnell (news, bio, voting record), R–Ky., is before a Senate*
- > *Judiciary Committee subcommittee.*
- >
- > *The prospects that a ban will pass are not good because time is*
- > *running out on the congressional calendar and lawmakers are facing*
- > *re–election in November.*
- >
- > *The issue is politically charged. Republicans say companies need*
- > *protection from greedy lawyers. Democrats say that the courts should*
- > *decide whether the cases are worth hearing.*
- >
- > *Some consumer advocates also oppose the laws. "These cheeseburger*
- > *bills are shameful efforts to deprive the public of the right to have*

sci.med.nutrition: Re: Are we protected from Junk Food Corporations?

- > *a day in court if they feel they have been aggrieved," said Michael*
- > *Jacobson, executive director of the Center for Science in the Public*
- > *Interest.*
- >
- > *Class-action lawyers will find ways around the state laws, and big*
- > *fast-food companies could be their targets, predicts John Banzhaf,*
- > *professor of public interest law at George Washington University.*
- >
- > *Banzhaf, who favors the suits, said companies could be vulnerable for*
- > *failing to tell customers how much fat is in their food.*
- >
- > *"Is it a shoo-in? No," said Banzhaf, who helped mastermind suits*
- > *against the tobacco industry. "But if we pick our plaintiffs*
- > *carefully, the guy who eats there every day, we can make our cases*
- > *stick."*
- >
- > <http://committed.to/justiceforpeace>
- >
- > *more...*
- >
- > <http://engforum.pravda.ru/showthread.php3?threadid=94094>