



Toxic Metal Levels and Baby Foods



201 responses

Please indicate your view of this resolution as an ISMS priority.



199 responses

Comments

SR No.	Response No.	Response Text
1	5	Sounds good, but I don't know what benefit this serves as we would only be signing on to FDA guidance without contribution
2	33	I believe this resolution requires more background on what baby food ingredients contain toxic metals and what toxic metals are included
3	38	I am not aware of the amounts of toxic metal in baby food. For that matter, why would any human-ingested food have toxic metal in it. If there are toxic metals in foods currently, the levels should be as low as possible based on evidence of harm to humans.
4	41	This is out of the scope of the mission of the society, and it shouldn't be discussed.
5	48	Why not endorse those guidelines. It costs us almost nothing.
6	49	agree
7	51	I would prefer to see better background information as to the need for such a resolution before deciding on the merits of this resolution. It sounds like a good idea but does not give the extent of the current problem to help in deciding it's priority.
8	55	There should be some information about why this is important-is baby food making it to market with high levels?
9	73	this is for the infants safety and on into adulthood-I favor as the the author
10	77	I don't know if the problem exist
11	80	This seems obvious.
12	110	I would support referral for a report back on this issue. We should not endorse another group's recommendation, but instead should support the actual details of the recommendation so that changes to the FDA standards don't automatically become our policy without our ability to review them. Further, I'm not sure what the logistical impacts of executing the second resolved would be.
13	111	Has this gone to the AMA?
14	122	I'm not well versed in this area to know how much of a problem this is but it seems like a common sense area of regulation for the ISMS to support
15	157	I HAVE NO INFORMATION REGARDING THE LIKELIHOOD OF HEAVY METAL PRESENCE IN BABY FOOD. IF THIS ASSERTION IS EVIDENCE BASED, OBVIOUSLY IT SHOULD BE SUPPORTED. LET US REMEMBER HOWEVER, THAT THIS WILL INCREASE THE COST OF BABY FOOD. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRESENTER OF THIS

		RESOLUTION TO PROVE THAT THIS IS A SIGNIFICANT RISK WORTHY OF RAISING PRICES.
16	158	As far as I know, baby foods are just as safe as the foods adults consume.
17	175	A very good idea.
18	177	I can support the FDA guidelines if they are in line with current medical research, which is the first resolved. Not sure about the logistics of the second resolved and would hate to have doctors tell others how to do their job. Do not support the second resolved.
19	191	aSK FOR INPUT FROM MANUFACTURERS AND TOXICOLOGY EXPERTS BEFORE SUBMISSION LAW OF UNINTENDED COLNSEQUENCES
20	215	Reasonable resolution, but should it also address food storage containers used at home after the purchase?
21	233	For
22	242	I can't believe that this important initiative is not already carried out on a national level. There is no greater role for government then to safeguard the interest of the most vulnerable among our citizens.
23	260	A very clear undisputed resolution
24	265	Not sure what is being done currently on a federal level or in other states, or in other countries
25	279	Mother, the flag, apple pie and this resolution. How can we oppose ?
26	320	Need more info