

Stink!, Feature Documentary, Jon Whelan, <http://www.StinkMovie.com>, NetReturn Entertainment

page 1

1.			ACT 4
2.			BECAUSE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FAILS TO PROTECT AMERICANS UNDER THE TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ACT, STATE GOVERNMENTS HAVE TO BEEN FORCED TO PASS LAWS TO PROTECT ITS CITIZENS FROM TOXIC CHEMICAL EXPOSURES.
3.		<u>Proposition 65 (Prop 65)</u>	THIS TREND BEGAN IN THE MID-1980'S WHEN CONSUMERS IN CALIFORNIA FACED OFF AGAINST THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY IN A SHOWDOWN OVER TOXIC CHEMICALS – THE RESULT WAS A TOUGH NEW DISCLOSURE LAW CALLED PROPOSITION 65 OR PROP 65.
4.	ELEANNE VAN VLIET	<u>As You Sow</u>	Prop 65 prohibits businesses from knowingly exposing consumers to chemicals known to cause cancer or birth defects. They have to either reformulate the product to use less toxic ingredients, or remove the product completely from the market, or they have to put a label on the product.
5.	ARCHIVE		Announcer 1: <i>"Coke and Pepsi saying they'll change their recipes because of a chemical that could cause cancer.</i> Announcer 2: <i>Yeah, so Coke and Pepsi announced that they are going to change the formulation of the caramel coloring that they use in their sodas to avoid putting a cancer warning label. A consumer group found a chemical in there that has been linked to cancer in animals.</i>
6.	ELEANNE VAN VLIET		That's the good thing about prop 65, right, it puts the burden and the onus on the manufacturer. So as soon as coca-cola has to put a cancer warning on their main beverage, you know, their coke, then

			they are going to reformulate the product
7.			<i>Announcer2: Coke says that there has never been a problem in terms of cancer from this caramel coloring but they want to make the change to avoid that warning label.</i>
8.	ANDY IGREJAS		The idea with Prop 65 was that the state of California once they've identified that something causes cancer or birth defects you're required to warn people before you expose people to it and it has had an impact if you have to put that warning on a consumer product and there's another product that does have a warning – that actually has an impact.
9.	JANE HOULIHAN		I think if companies had to list what's in the products it would change the industry because once consumers know what's in the bottle the start changing what they buy.
10.			SUDDENLY, MANUFACTURERS IMAGINED A DOOMSDAY SCENARIO -- WHERE CONSUMERS ACTUALLY KNEW WHAT CHEMICALS WERE IN THEIR EVERYDAY PRODUCTS
11.	JUDI SHILS	Turning Green	Shampoo, conditioner, deodorant, toothpaste, moisturizer, hand sanitizer, like you pick up a product and you don't even think about what you're using another product and each one of these products has 15 or 20 synthetic chemicals – your body burden is enormous; you're just dumping all this toxic stuff into your bloodstream.
12.	JANE HOULIHAN		We find known human carcinogens, chemicals that cause reproductive harm // hormone disruptors // are they safe? Absolutely not.

13.	STACY MALKIN		They say it's just low levels of any given toxic chemical; just a little bit of carcinogen in the baby shampoo; a little bit of lead in lipstick, but those low levels are adding up every single day.
14.			BUT INSTEAD OF REFORMULATING TO MAKE SAFER PRODUCTS THAT COULD COST A LITTLE MORE, THE INDUSTRY OPENED A NEW FRONT ON THE WAR ON CANCER. BUT THIS WASN'T A FIGHT TO GET CARCINOGENS OUT OF PRODUCTS – IT WAS A FIGHT TO KEEP THEM IN.
15.			THE INDUSTRY FOOT SOLDIERS IN THIS WELL FINANCED CAMPAIGN COME FROM ORGANIZATIONS CALLED "TRADE ASSOCIATIONS." THESE TRADE ASSOCIATIONS REPRESENT CORPORATIONS INTENT ON REPELLING ANY CHEMICAL REGULATION.
16.	ANDY IGREJAS	<u>American Chemistry Council</u>	The biggest problem with Washington is the special interest money that corrupts the process and it's most embodied in the American Chemistry Council - the trade association which almost acts like a political party, a fierce little communist cell or something.
17.			THE AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL OR ACC IS ONE OF THE MOST POWERFUL TRADE ASSOCIATIONS ANYWHERE. THE ACC SPENDS HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO INFLUENCE PUBLIC OPINION. FUND POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS. AND UNDERWRITE AGGRESSIVE LOBBYING EFFORTS.

			ALL TO AVOID REGULATION THAT WOULD IMPACT THE PROFITS OF THE LARGEST CHEMICAL COMPANIES IN THE WORLD.
18.	JUDI SHILS		These companies you know have it down they're going to do whatever it takes to make more money to feed their bottom line – and of course they are going to lobby against any kind of legislation that's going to legislate that they have to stop they don't want to
19.	DR. JENNIFER SASS		The trade organization has become the representative to say things that the companies I don't think would dare to say because a lot of times it's untrue and it // misrepresents the harm of chemicals and it hides important information from government regulators as well as the public about how to protect themselves from these chemicals.
20.			WHEN I HEARD THERE WAS A HEARING IN MY OWN STATE ABOUT BANNING CARCINOGENIC FLAME RETARDANTS CHEMICALS IN CHILDRENS' PRODUCTS, I WAS CURIOUS IF LOBBYISTS WOULD SHOW UP TO BLOCK LEGISLATION INTENDED TO PROTECT KIDS.
21.	ANDY IGREJAS		The American Chemistry Council, they deploy people to all kinds of state capitols and sometimes they hire local lobbyists whose job it is to try and push back on this stuff.
22.	GRETCHEN LEE SALTER		they are in every state house in every hall of Congress we go to – they are there. They have a lot of money, they are pouring a lot of money into making sure they are never regulated and when we do pass laws, they are there the next year trying to get that law off the books
23.	<u>STEPHEN ROSARIO</u>	Director, Northeast Region at American	TESTIFYING ON BEHALF OF CONSUMERS WERE WORLD RENOWNED SCIENTISTS, PEDITRICIANS, EVEN FIREFIGHTERS.

		Chemistry Council	AND THEN THERE WAS STEVE ROSARIO, A LOBBYIST FROM THE AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL.
24.	ROBERT K. SWEENEY	New York State Assembly Member	<i>Robert Sweeney: What type of evidence, would be compelling enough to the American Chemistry Council to prohibit the use of a particular chemical?</i>
25.			<i>Steve Rosario: Not being technical, I can't answer that question but again..</i>
26.			<i>Robert Sweeney: Don't be technical – if there are peer reviewed scientific studies, if there are testimony from the medical community and others saying this stuff if toxic it's hazardous, especially to kids – is that a reasonable standard?</i>
27.			<i>Steve Rosario: If the information is sufficient to show actual causal harm. We believe that whenever you ban a chemical or product that is a very drastic um proposal.</i>
28.	BRIAN KAVANAGH	New York State Assembly Member	<i>Brian Kavanagh: Why is that drastic?</i>
29.			<i>Steve Rosario: It is drastic because you're impacting way, way more than the health concerns that are being alleged against a particular product or chemical without sufficient science</i>
30.			<i>Brian Kavanagh: You think the standard for government to ban carcinogenic substances, endocrine disruptors that people are being exposed to that we know people are being exposed to from products that your industry is putting out there from consumer products should be extraordinarily high but you're not articulating a standard other than to say it ought to be virtually certain if not certain that it's actually causing the harm before we ban it.</i>

31.			<p>Robert Sweeney: The toxic substances control act , TSCA, which I am sure you are well familiar with, how many chemicals has the federal government banned under TSCA in the thirty some odd years that it has existed?</p> <p>Steve Rosario: I believe the number is five.</p> <p>Robert Sweeney: Five. I would not believe for a single moment there are five of eighty thousand, that are problematic - chemicals are a part of our everyday life, they're all around us, they're a necessity but some of them hurt people</p>
32.			<p><i>Robert Sweeney: Why shouldn't we shift to a standard that says before you can use it, you have to prove that it's safe?</i></p> <p><i>Steve Rosario: That's the Precautionary Principal</i></p> <p><i>Robert Sweeney: Exactly</i></p> <p><i>Steve Rosario: And the issue with the Precautionary Principal is that you would never be able to prove with certainty that anything is perfectly safe, and that's why we think that our system is actually better than the Precautionary Principal.</i></p>
33.			<p>LOBBYIST LIKE STEVE ROSARIO ARE PAID TO INFLUENCE THE POLITICAL PROCESS SO IT SHOULDN'T SURPRISE ME THAT WHEN HE'S NOT TRYING TO KEEP HARMFUL CHEMICALS IN KIDS PRODUCTS, HE'S ALSO RUNNING FOR POLITICAL OFFICE</p>
34.			<p>I CAUGHT UP WITH STEVE AT A DEBATE IN UPSTATE NEW YORK, HE'D JUST BEEN ENDORSED BY PLANNED PARENTHOOD</p>
35.	<p>STEVEN ROSARIO</p>	<p><u>Planned Parenthood</u></p>	<p><i>JW: Mr. Rosario, congratulations on your Planned Parenthood endorsement</i></p> <p><i>Steve Rosario: Oh, thank you.</i></p>

			<p><i>JW: Do they know you're a lobbyist for the American Chemistry Council?</i></p> <p><i>Steve Rosario: May I ask who you are?</i></p> <p><i>JW: Jon Whelan, nice to meet you.</i></p> <p><i>Steve Rosario: Likewise</i></p>
36.			<p><i>JW: But does Planned Parenthood know you're a lobbyist for the American Chemistry Council, because Planned Parenthood lobbies against the ACC in state capitals so I am wondering if you disclosed that to them.</i></p>
37.			<p><i>Steve Rosario: I am very proud of what I do, I have been doing it for 21 years.</i></p> <p><i>Tom Putnam County: Are you a lobbyist?</i></p> <p><i>Steve Rosario: I am a Senior Executive, I have my certificate as a certified executive association manager, Do I advocate? Yes.</i></p>
38.			<p>THE AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL AND OTHER TRADE ASSOCIATIONS HAVE SOMETHING TO HIDE</p> <p>Jw: what do you think about TSCA reform. Do you think we should have to prove chemicals are safe before exposing them to woman and children. Would you be able to answer that question</p> <p>Steve Rosario: I will answer no questions from someone I do not know.</p>
39.	HOLLENDER		<p>Business is writing the rules, government isn't really writing the rules, it's the businesses, the trade associations, the lobbyists, that write these rules and they are not written with us in mind, they are written thru one lens – what do we want to do that increases the</p>

			profitability of our industry and our businesses.
40.			<p>WHEN WE BUY PRODUCTS, A PORTION OF OUR MONEY FUELS A CORRUPT SYSTEM STARTING AT THE RETAILER, TO THE MANUFACTURER AND INTO THE POCKETS OF TRADE ASSOCIATIONS. TRADE ASSOCIATIONS USE OUR MONEY TO GHOST-WRITE LEGISLATION AND HIRE LOBBYIST TO BRING MONEY AND INDUSTRY FRIENDLY BILLS TO CONGRESS THAT WILL DENY CONSUMERS OF OUR RIGHT TO KNOW WHAT IS IN THE PRODUCTS WE BUY.</p> <p>AND GUESS WHO IS PAYING FOR IT?</p>
41.			<p>BUT THERE ARE POLITICIANS WHO DO CARE THAT AMERICANS ARE BEING HARMED AND THEY'RE PUSHING LEGISLATION TO PROTECT US.</p>
42.	<u>STEVE ISRAEL</u>	U.S. Congressmen, NY	<p><i>Steve Israel: You know, after a tough day of legislating on the floor of the House of Representatives, I like to come back to the office and clean up a little bit. That's why I've introduced HR 3057, The Household Products Labeling Act.</i></p>
43.			<p>Steve Israel: My bill is very simple and it's just a matter of common sense and it's based on this simple model. People know if you know if you buy cigarettes there's a skull and crossbones; they know you buy certain food it tells you trans fats but what they don't know is the cleaning product that they just used to scrub the floor that their baby is now crawling on and ingesting may be just as dangerous.</p> <p>The fundamental problem is that nobody knows what the chemicals are, and I think they have a right to know. All we're saying is inform them and let them make whatever decision they want.</p>

44.			ANOTHER BILL WOULD PROHIBIT THE PERSONAL CARE INDUSTRY FROM USING CHEMICALS THAT ARE BANNED IN OTHER COUNTRIES
45.	JANICE SCHAKOWSKY	U.S. Congresswoman, IL	<p>Jan Schakowsky: How many chemical ingredients have been banned for use in cosmetics in the United States?</p> <p>FDA: I think the number is about a dozen.</p> <p>Jan Schakowsky: Actually I believe it's ten. And how many chemical ingredients have been banned for use in cosmetics in the European Union?</p> <p>FDA: I don't know.</p> <p>Jan Schakowsky: That's over 1,200</p>
46.	JANICE SCHAKOWSKY		The Safe Cosmetics Act would require that ingredients that are found to be carcinogenic or interfere with development, or cause reproductive harm would be phased out of products, that there be a list of ingredients including the components of what are called fragrances.
47.			BUT NO MATTER HOW REASONABLE THE REGULATION OR BALANCED THE BILL REPRESENTATIVES LIKE LEONARD LANCE OF NEW JERSEY REPUBLICAN MUST MAKE SURE THEY NEVER MAKE IT INTO LAW
48.	LEONARD LANCE	U.S. Congressman, NJ	Leonard Lance: these products are among the safest regulated by the FDA and the agency has a strong authority to regulate cosmetics.
49.			<p>FOR OVER A DECADE LEONARD LANCE HAS CHAMPIONED THE CAUSE OF THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY - OUT OF NECESSITY.</p> <p>JW: Were off to find the elusive Congressman Leonard Lance of New Jersey</p>

			WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF LANCE’S HOME TURF ARE THE HEADQUARTERS OF CHEMICAL GIANT BASF, J&J, P&G, UNILEVER, L’OREAL, REVLON AND IT’S HOME TO SOME OF THE LARGEST FRAGRANCE AND FLAVOR COMPANIES IN THE WORLD.
50.			IN THE CASE OF COSMETICS, LANCE INTRODUCED OPPOSING LEGISLATION
51.			JW: There's some speculation that Personal Care Product Council, the trade association wrote the bill and Mr. Lance is simply the face of it. LANCE'S BILL DOESN'T PROHIBIT CARCINOGENS AND EDC'S – IT PROHIBITS STATES FROM PASSING LAWS THAT WOULD PROTECT CONSUMERS USING A LEGAL CONCEPT CALLED PRE-EMPTION.
52.	JANICE SCHAKOWSKY		The Lance Bill, would preempt any state regulation which I think is um a very bad idea particularly given the fact that states like California have much stronger protections for consumers and to preclude legislation from being passed in the future from going into effect - that's it's idea really.
53.			SIMPLY PUT, A WEEK FEDERAL LAW WOULD REPLACE STRONG STATE LAWS
54.			JW: Congressman Lance, why did you introduce the Cosmetics Safety Amendments Act?

55.	JANICE SCHAKOWS KY		I think it would be really a dangerous piece of legislation that would leave consumers very vulnerable.
56.	LEONARD LANCE		<p>JW: Good morning Congressman Lance, I wonder if you have time to talk about the Cosmetic Safety Act?</p> <p>Leonard Lance: Ah, the Cosmetic Safety Act, Yes, certainly, yeah.</p> <p>JW: I just want to know why you introduced the bill?</p> <p>Leonard Lance: Um, because I want to make sure that we have appropriate regulation.</p> <p>JW: Do you think consumers have a right to know if there's a carcinogen in a personal care product?</p> <p>Leonard Lance: Ah, Yes, I do</p> <p>JW: But, under your bill, they would be able to put ingredients in there and not have to disclose they're in there?</p> <p>Leonard Lance: I want to make sure that everything is appropriately identified and I want to work with all of those who are interested in this issue.</p> <p>JW: What about the fragrance loophole that allows people to put styrene and formaldehyde and not have to disclose that.</p> <p>Leonard Lance: I am certainly willing to discuss ways to make sure that your views are concerned</p> <p>JW: Ok</p>

			<p>Leonard Lance: Thank you</p> <p>JW: Thank you</p> <p>Leonard Lance: And what is your name?</p> <p>JW: My name is Jon Whelan</p> <p>Leonard Lance: And where are you from Jon?</p> <p>JW: New York</p> <p>Leonard Lance: ah ha, great</p> <p>JW: Do you think companies should have to prove ingredients are safe before they expose them to woman and children?</p> <p>Leonard Lance: I certainly think that we should have regime that protects the American people.</p> <p>JW: Would you be able to answer that question?</p> <p>Leonard Lance: I want to make sure the public is completely protected.</p> <p>JW: What was your inspiration to author the Cosmetic Safety Amendment Act?</p> <p>Leonard Lance: I want to work will all of those involved to make sure that the American people are completely protected.</p> <p>JW: Ok</p> <p>Leonard Lance: Thank you</p>
--	--	--	--

			JW: Thank you for your time.
57.	DR. JENNIFER SASS		The biggest reason why the chemical industry fights transparent and public knowledge about the hazards of its chemicals is because of liability claims - it doesn't want to pay for harm.
58.			I THINK OF MY LIFE WITH HEATHER ALL THE TIME. I REMEMBER ONE MORNING, WHILE HEATHER WAS GOING THROUGH CHEMOTHERAPY, I SAW HER PLANTING TULIP BULBS IN THE NEGLECTED SIDEWALK FLOWER BED OUTSIDE MY OFFICE WINDOW. THAT'S WHAT SHE ALWAYS DID – SHE LEFT THINGS BETTER THAN SHE FOUND THEM. HEATHER WANTED THE GIRLS TO REMEMBER HER IN AN ENCHANTED PLACE SURROUNDED BY COLOR AND LIGHT. SO WE TRANSFORMED AN EMPTY STUDIO APARTMENT INTO HER PINK AND PERIWINKLE SANCTUARY – FULL OF LIFE, LOVE AND HOPE. BUT WE DIDN'T GET TO ENJOY IT LONG ENOUGH – HEATHER DIED HERE SIX DAYS LATER. WE WERE ALL BY HER SIDE.