

In just two short years, the Obama Administration gained controlling interests in our nation's health care system, automobile industry, and Wall Street. Now it wants to control what parents feed their children.

The IWG has proposed marketing guidelines that only allow certain foods to be marketed in a way that could be appealing to children.

These food marketing guidelines are yet another example of the Obama Administration having a good intention: *curbing childhood obesity*, followed by a poorly-considered plan. Well, *something* isn't always better than *nothing*. The IWG's proposals will not curb childhood obesity. It is a mere assumption that limiting children's exposure to food advertisements combats obesity. There isn't a single scientific study to back it up.

Though adopted IWG guidelines wouldn't work *as intended*, they would have several negative and unconsidered consequences.

These guidelines would result in thousands of jobs destroyed in the midst of an economic crisis. That is what cutting a company's marketing business in half does. It cuts into sales, production, and product storage and transportation activity. Unfortunately, the IWG didn't acknowledge this because a cost-benefit analysis wasn't part of their planning stage.

The IWG guidelines would deal a major blow to our first amendment and its guarantee of free speech. It would set a dangerous precedent for the marketing world. What would be next? Would the EPA ban all truck advertising for trucks that don't get 50 mpg? Would low-top shoes be denied commercials because they don't offer as much heel protection as high tops?

The IWG guidelines would challenge the role of parents in our modern society. I thought that parents decided what their kids ate, not corporations - "parenting" is supposedly done by parents, right? Enforcing the IWG proposals would diminish the role of parents and prop up the role of government as "the big decider" in homes. We simply don't want to do that. We don't want to threaten the American family.

The IWG should completely withdraw their proposed marketing restrictions, and should instead complete a study and report to Congress - as Congress originally intended in the FY 2009 Omnibus Appropriations Act.

If future food marketing proposals are made, the agencies involved should base their studies and report on peer-reviewed science and include a careful consideration of benefits and costs.

We cannot risk the negative consequences of adopting misguided guidelines. We cannot risk demoting parents' authority when it comes to family food decisions. Most importantly, we cannot risk having a nanny state telling us what we can and cannot feed our children.