

Smoking ban laws in public places

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



The Benefits of Smoke-Free Laws Tobacco is one of the deadliest substances that is abused worldwide. Smokers of the substance become addicted to it because it has a high level of nicotine. Since smoking has severe health and economic consequences, it is necessary to have smoke-free laws.

Smoke-free laws are appropriate because they prevent premature deaths. Some smokers die prematurely from smoking-related illnesses that occur after a prolonged period of smoking. Most smokers do not live their full lives; some of them die of preventable illnesses such as lung cancer. Opponents of free-smoke laws argue that a ban on other drugs has been tried and failed. Thus, a ban on smoking would fail (Proctor). However, if smoke-free laws are enforced, premature deaths can be reduced because many people would refrain from the habit. Indeed, intensive smoking that is associated with severe health consequences can be avoided if strict smoking laws are enforced (ACS CAN 5).

Smoke-free laws are also appropriate because they reduce the number of smokers in a country. This can happen in two ways. First, smokers will have limited places where they can smoke freely. Since comprehensive smoking laws prohibit smoking in public places, many smokers will be forced to quit the habit. As a result, there will be a decrease in the number of active smokers in within a country. Second, young people who would otherwise become smokers will not have the opportunity to do so. Normally, when young people start smoking, they do so in places where there are no family members. Public places provide an ideal environment for starting the smoking habit (Guilfoyle). Opponents of smoke-free laws argue that tough smoking rules would encourage smoking in hazardous environments,

potentially endangering the lives of smokers (Proctor). However, with smoke-free laws, prospective smokers will not have anywhere to start the habit (Guilfoyle).

In addition, smoke-free laws are appropriate because they decrease health costs. Health costs are incurred by smokers and nonsmokers. Smokers are at a higher risk of developing smoking-related illnesses. Smoking can also worsen other chronic conditions such as asthma. Nonsmokers can develop health complications such as chest pain, stroke, and asthma from secondhand smoking. They can also increase their chances of contracting lung cancer. Opponents of smoke-free laws argue that although there may be a decrease in health costs, there will still be severe economic consequences. For instance, several multi-billion dollar cigarette industries would close down (Proctor). However, if there are strict smoke-free laws, such economic challenges would be overcome. In this way, a country would reduce its overall medical expense (Guilfoyle).

Moreover, smoke-free laws prevent businesses from incurring unnecessary costs. This can happen in two ways. First, smoking increases the chances of fires or other related accidents occurring in the workplace. However, in a smoke-free environment, the chances of fires breaking out or accidents occurring decrease significantly. Thus, firms with strict smoking rules can negotiate for lower fire and property premiums with insurance companies. Second, banning smoking in the workplace increases employee productivity. Smoking employees are more likely to be absent from work compared to nonsmoking employees. They become absent because of smoking-related illnesses. In some cases, if they are present at work, their productivity is

generally low. However, if smoking is banned in the workplace, will not incur unnecessary costs. As a result, their profits will increase (“Smoke-Free Environments”).

In conclusion, smoke-free laws are appropriate because they can prevent premature deaths. Most smokers will reduce the habit if there are limited places where one can smoke. Smoke-free laws are also important because they reduce the number of smokers within a country. Very few smoking places will prevent young people from engaging in the habit. Additionally, smoke-free laws are important because they reduce the health costs incurred by individuals. Both active and passive smokers will not develop medical conditions such as stroke, asthma, and chest pain. Lastly, smoke-free laws prevent businesses from incurring needless costs.

Works Cited

American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network [ACS CAN]. “Saving Lives, Saving Money: A State-by-State Report on the Health and Economic Impact of Comprehensive Smoke-Free Laws.” N. p., 2011. Web. 16 March 2015. .

Guilfoyle, Jessica. “Smoke-free Laws Work.” N. p., 10 July 2012. Web. 16 March 2015. .

Proctor, N. Robert. “Why Ban the Sale of Cigarettes? The Case for Abolition.” N. p., 22 May 2013. Web. 16 March 2015. “Smoke-Free Environments.” N. p., 2011. Web. 16 March 2015. .