

Rebuttal



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Banning smoking in public places does not decrease the profitability of restaurants and bars; in fact, there are several benefits accruing from banning smoking in bars and restaurants. These include reducing the risk of fires, improving cleanliness in the premises, maintaining an attractive workforce, reducing the need for energy for ventilation needs, promoting a healthy environment and giving an incentive for smokers to quit. All these factors have a positive impact on the performance and profitability of businesses in the hospitality industry (Stuckler & Siegel, 2011). In addition, most of the studies done investigating the effects of the smoking ban on the profitability of this sector found no relationship between the two.

One of the main reasons for introducing the smoking ban in public places is to protect other people from secondhand smoke. If someone smokes in public places, especially overpopulated places like hotels and streets, a large number of people around the smoker inhale the smoke. Tobacco smoke is harmful to the users' respiratory system, leading to diseases like asthma, cancer, and heart disease (Barker, 2007). Imposing this ban will, therefore, protect all breathing individuals from the ailments resulting from tobacco smoke, thus reducing the cases of diseases like asthma, heart disease, cancer, and other diseases associated with smoking. Smoking privately ensures that the effects of the smoke are just felt by the individual smoker.

Some people assume that banning smoking in public places would increase alcohol consumption. However, denying smokers the opportunity to smoke in public does not guarantee their shift to other drugs and refreshments. In fact, alcohol does not have the same effects that smokers get from tobacco consumption. If alcohol were a substitute for smoking, then smokers would

opt for it where the smoking ban is applicable. Additionally, smoking does not reduce the cases of fatal accidents (Hiller, 2006). Thus, imposing the smoking ban will have no effect on the number, and on the frequency of fatal accidents caused by alcohol consumption. Actually, a public smoking ban would reduce the number of fatal accidents since smoking will not distract drivers.

Contrary to the writer's claim that smoking bans have a detrimental effect on the attendance of bingo halls and casinos, there is no insignificant effect of the smoking ban on the attendance of such places. Implementing the smoking ban in the casinos will not prevent a dedicated client from frequenting such a place. Most people spend only a small fraction of their time in casinos and bingo halls. Each day, the casinos serve different people. Therefore, an ambitious gambler will not allow a few hours at the casino or bingo hall to affect his or her smoking habits.

The smoking ban involves restricting the act of smoking in public in public places. The smoking ban cannot increase the number of smokers among the young population. If exposed less often to tobacco in public places or the media, younger people will be less likely to smoke. Educating the young people vigorously about the harmful effects of tobacco, while restricting access to those under the age of 18, will dramatically reduce smoking among young people.

Though the market offers other nonsmoking choices for smokers, there are other enforcements that the government can use alongside the smoking ban to ensure that smoking is increasingly difficult. For instance, the government

should impose cessation measures, increasing taxes for tobacco products, and, promoting anti-smoking education (Stuckler & Siegel, 2011). These would reduce the smoking rate thus promoting positive health outcomes. Restricting the local cultivation and production of tobacco, limiting the access of tobacco to minors, and giving incentives to smokers who quit smoking would also play a great role in creating a nonsmoking population.

Many establishments still lack designated smoking areas. Government regulations can create an environment beneficial to everyone. Cigarette smoke travels through air. Air is ubiquitous and highly difficult to confine to one specific location. Enforcement of proper ventilation through regulations has to be the second option to banning smoking completely in establishments.

Smokers are aware of the health risks associated with smoking; however, the benefits they experience from smoking do not outweigh the costs. Smoking does not create any health benefits.. However, there are many health costs associated with smoking. According to CNN (2011), in the US, for instance, 87% of lung cancer cases and 87% of lung cancer cases result from cigarette smoking. Smoking affects all citizens, whether they are smokers or not. The government shares the health costs accruing from smoking-related diseases among all the citizens.

Cigarettes contain DNA-damaging agents, heavy metals and the most harmful carcinogens. These substances fetuses carried by expectant mothers. Though other pollutants in the environment may cause birth defects, smoking is the most prevalent pollutant. Smoking adversely affects

the firsthand consumer; in addition, secondhand smoke adversely affects the fetus. Smoking mothers and those mothers who live with smokers are at a higher risk of stillbirths and bearing children with heart disease and other birth defects. While the smoking ban is optional, pregnant women do not have an option to breath. Pollutants emerging from smoking are more prevalent than other toxins and air pollutants; therefore, banning public smoking is the only solution to protecting the unborn from harm.