

Sarah Cusano

Granby Memorial Middle School

Miss Janelli

9 April 2014

I believe that government should not regulate sugary drinks. There is already too much government interference in our private lives. It would not have an impact on public health, and it would negatively affect the beverage industry and the economy.

Regulating sugary drinks contradicts what America stands for. The Declaration of Independence states, "...they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." America's foundation was built upon personal freedom. Does the government want to abandon what our citizens have always believed? If Americans have the right to choose how they live their lives, why can't they choose how much sugar they ingest? Regulating sugary drinks sounds somewhat like "Big Brother", where the government controls everyone and everything. If a person can decide to have an abortion, they should be able to decide how much soda they want to drink. To quote President Lincoln, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the Earth." If the government is for the people, then people should be allowed to have a say in what they put into their bodies. Regulating sugary drinks would counter basic American beliefs.

Regulation would not have a great effect on the general wellness of the public. According to the Delaware-D.C. Beverage Association, "Calories in the American diet from added sugars in soda are down 39 percent since 2000. And food — not beverages — is the No. 1 source of added sugars in the diet, making up 67 percent." If the government's ultimate goal is to have an impact

on the obesity epidemic, they should investigate regulating sugary foods as well. The association also stated, “all sugar-sweetened beverages make up just 6 percent of total calories.” This means that the other 94 percent of caloric intake is food and other beverages. Regulation would not be the most logical way to address the obesity epidemic. Instead, the public should be better educated about nutrition and fitness. It would be just as simple to drink two bottles and get the same sugar as before regulation. Educating Americans will help them make healthy choices. Public health would not benefit from the regulation of sugary drinks.

The beverage industry would suffer as the result of regulation. Producing smaller drinks would mean less work hours. According to the National Beverage Association, the industry “provides more than 233,000 jobs.” If we want a low unemployment rate, wouldn’t it be counterproductive to eliminate these jobs? Some may argue that making beverages smaller would not have a significant effect on the United States’ economy. However, the National Beverage Association states, “Beverage companies and their employees, and the firms and employees indirectly employed by the industry, provide significant tax revenues - more than \$14 billion at the state level and \$22.7 billion at the federal level.” Revenues are provided by everyone working within the beverage industry. Laying off workers will decrease tax revenues used for government programs. The National Beverage Association reports that the beverage industry has “a direct economic impact of \$141.22 billion.” Regulation will have a negative impact on the beverage industry and a negative effect on the economy.

The government should not regulate sugary drinks. It would conflict with America’s core beliefs on personal freedom. Additionally, it would not have as large an impact on public health as thought. Lastly, it would negatively affect both the beverage industry and the economy. After

considering all of the negative outcomes that could come from this decision, why would Americans accept such a regulation?