



HANSARD
SOCIETY

HeadsUp Forum

www.headsup.org.uk

'You decide... should smoking in public places be banned?'

(September 19th - October 7th 2005)

An online platform providing young people with a secure and structured space to discuss their perspectives on the smoking in public places debate

This proved to be the most successful online debate ever held on HeadsUp where young people could share their perspectives on the smoking in public places debate with a record number of MPs taking part online with students posing questions and debating directly with them. These included:

- Andrew Lansley MP, Shadow Minister for Health
- Steve Webb MP, Shadow Health Secretary
- Nick Gibb MP, Shadow Minister for Young People
- Tim Loughton MP, Shadow Minister for Children and Health

Please note - relevant Ministers and Labour MPs were also asked to participate in the debate but declined.

The students participating in the debate received written statements of encouragement from a large number of relevant parliamentarians, these included:

- Steve Webb MP, Shadow Health Secretary
- Tim Loughton MP, Shadow Minister for Children and for Health
- Peter Bottomley MP, Member of the All-Party Group on Youth Affairs
- Lord Faulkner, Secretary of the All-Party Group on Smoking and Health
- Helen Goodman MP, Member of the All-Party Parliamentary Group for Children

From June to September 2005, the Government ran a consultation on the smokefree elements of the Health Improvement and Protection Bill. A partial ban has been proposed which would see smoking permitted in a few pubs and bars.

This timely Forum was held to decide whether smoking should be banned in public places and highlight the impact smoking is having on the lives of young people. In keeping with the objective of HeadsUp, special attention was paid to how British politics focuses on the importance of the health of the nation.

During the debate, students had the opportunity to talk about their perspectives on the impact smoking is having on the health of people around them. They could contribute their perspectives on the financial implications of the ban and assess the impact upon the environment. They also put forward suggestions for what they believe should be top of the decision-maker's agenda in Parliament.

The objective of the HeadsUp project is not only to facilitate peer-to-peer deliberation on topical political issues, policies or events but also to provide students with a means of informing themselves about the topic. In keeping with the youth participation agenda, a summary report outlining key findings and quotes is disseminated to interested parties, particularly parliamentarians and government, enabling young people's voices to be heard by key decision-makers.

As with every Forum, 'You decide... should smoking in public places be banned?' was supported by detailed, student-centred background notes that included an explanation of the key areas surrounding the government consultation, an overview of the key issues around the debate, a comprehensive glossary and summaries of arguments for and against the issue. These and other relevant facts and figures were presented in a student-centred tone, with a deliberate effort to keep jargon to a minimum.

The debate involved students from secondary schools around the UK. They were between the ages of 11 and 17. A number of students had participated in previous Forums but most were taking part for the first time. The participants made multiple visits over the duration of the debate and there were **356 posts in total**.

This report summarises the debate that took place and includes key posts from students. Conclusions from the debate are to be found at the end of the report. Special care has been taken to ensure that the report is non-partisan and representative of the views expressed by the participants.

The participating young people and the Hansard Society would like to voice their appreciation to the decision-makers who took part in this Forum. We

would also like to extend an invitation to interested parties, particularly parliamentarians and government, to respond to the findings.

Responses and requests for further information should be directed to:

Barry Griffiths
Project Manager
Hansard Society
40 - 43 Chancery Lane
London
WC2A 1JB

020 7438 1214

b.g.griffiths@hansard.lse.ac.uk or citizenship@hansard.lse.ac.uk

'You decide... should smoking in public places be banned?'

Forum Summary

Messages to the decision-makers

Young people were asked what issue should be top of the decision-maker's agenda and this proved to be the most populated message space in the debate. This participant pointed to the scientific research and evidence gathered which proves that smoking is a health risk:

"Smoking wasn't banned ages ago because it was a social thing to do and even the royals did smoke. Today there is a change and there is more scientific research proving that it is dangerous to smoke. Every fag you have takes something like 2 hours of your life and this amount is halved if you passive smoke. Think about it 1 hour of your life every time. is it worth it!!!"

Others were clear that their main message for the decision-makers was that they were equally aware and concerned about the threat posed by passive smoking:

"The WHO says that a non-smokers chances of getting lung cancer are increased by 16-17% if they are regularly exposed to other people's smoke."

"It has been scientifically proven that passive smoking also damages your health then i feel that there should be a complete ban of smoking in all public places."

This HeadsUp Forum benefited from the intervention of key decision-makers from Parliament at numerous stages of the debate. Young people were willing to post their comments even if they were in disagreement with the MPs. Passive smoking was analysed from a health and safety point of view by Steve Webb MP:

"if there was a workplace which was dangerous because of (say) chemical fumes, you wouldn't dream of saying that we don't need to do anything about it because people can also choose to work somewhere else - you would say that the health and safety of whoever worked there was important and should be protected. The same surely applies to passive smoking?"

However, another young participant was quick to think of all sides of the argument picking up on what Steve Webb MP had to say:

“it is unfair for all the people working behind bars and smoking restaurants. But some may say that if they don't want to be there then don't work there. But it is not that easy. They can't just give up a perfectly good job as some people can't afford to be out of work. But it is unfair as their health is being destroyed!!!”

Both Nick Gibb MP and Andrew Lansley MP used the Forum to point the young people towards the extensive experience and lessons learned from other countries and cities who already have a ban in place:

“In New York, when they banned smoking in restaurants, the number of people going out to restaurants to eat rose dramatically”

“I do think now is the time to tell pubs and hospitality industry that unless they can offer a smoke free environment to everyone who wants it within say 3 years, we should consider legislation which provides the necessary protection. Meanwhile, let's look at how it's working in New York, in Ireland since last year and in Scotland from next April.”

Nevertheless, some students were quick to suggest the possibility of having more distinct separate spaces for smokers and non-smokers in public places such as bars and restaurants, going much further than what already is on offer at the moment:

“Some restaurants do have “smoking” and “non-smoking” areas, but I don't think this is enough as the smoke still drifts into the “non-smoking” area”

“It would be a good and fair compromise to say that every pub/restaurant must have a specifically designated non-smoking area, which would never have more than so much smoke in the air (and health and safety people would be able to measure it at any time.)”

Forum participants agreed that these distinct separate spaces or rooms in restaurants were a potentially manageable solution to avoid a complete ban on smoking in public places. However, Steve Webb MP saw a drawback in this idea which underlined the problems facing the government:

“Whilst in theory workers can simply go and work in a non-smoky environment, in practice choice for employees may be more limited. For example, if a pub had a smoking area and a smoke-free area a member of bar staff would be in a very weak position if they insisted only on working in the smoke-free area.”

Young people were not afraid to tackle one of the more complex parts of this government consultation, that is to define what is meant by ‘public place’. This HeadsUp Forum participant felt that the ban should extend to cover a mixture of enclosed spaces and shared thoroughfares:

"I think smoking should possibly be banned in shopping centres, the street, schools etc - places that are true public places or where people are made by the law to go..."

Steve Webb MP turned the attention of the participants on the HeadsUp Forum to whether a partial ban would be sufficient and underlined the rights of people working where no food is served:

"If the main objection to smoking in enclosed public places is the impact on the people who have to work there, why exclude places where no food is served - don't people who work there have rights too? ...a partial ban will be hard to enforce, and will worsen health inequalities as it tends to be poorer areas that on average have more pubs that are drink-only."

Picking up directly on Steve Webb MP's comments, this participant called forcing people to work in smoke-filled environments unethical:

"Surely you cannot force someone to work in an environment that is harming to their health. We all know that smoking is harmful for us and passive smoking too, so surely it is unethical to force someone to have their health deteriorated?"

The time-consuming problem of enforcement for the government was of most concern to this student who gave reasons for opposing the proposed ban:

"I think that to ban smoking in public areas will only cause more problems for the government...to keep track on everywhere that allows people to smoke or not, will take up time that can be better used sorting out more important issues."

Prevention was an important factor in the whole smoking debate. Students both witnessed and understood the dangers of smoking first hand, leading one to intervene throwing their dad's cigarettes in the bin:

"That's the reason I haven't started (smoking), I'm scared, when my Gran was in a hospital with lung disease (not caused by smoking) I saw some pretty horrible things... I think all kids should see first hand what it can do and early in their lives to."

"How would you like it if any of your family members died of lung disease, it wouldn't be nice!! Smoking should be banned in all public places to stop this happening in our society."

"My parents use 2 smoke especially my dad in the end he stopped smoking because the amounts of times I told him what they can do to you and I always use 2 throw his cigarettes away in the bin."

Although Tim Loughton MP emphasised his negative feelings about smoking as a habit, he went on to say that whilst it is still legal people should be allowed to make that choice for themselves:

“Smoking is one of the most disgusting, noxious, anti-social habits legally available to man and I am determined to see as many people give it up as possible, and more importantly many fewer young people take it up in the first place. But whilst smoking remains legal in this country we should be able to treat everyone as adults to make the choice for themselves as to whether they want to puff and wheeze themselves into an early grave.”

The important and contentious issue of rights is touched upon by Andrew Lansley MP, something which was discussed in more detail in the environmental impact Forum topic space (see pages 8 - 9):

“I think we should allow people who don't want to breathe other people's smoke, not to have to do so. I don't think people have the right to expose me or my children to their tobacco smoke.”

A further perspective was offered by this participant who attempted to simplify the smoking ban for other HeadsUp students:

“This smoking ban is not asking people to quit smoking, it is just asking them not to smoke in public places. Which i think is not too much to ask. But then again im a non-smoker and im sure smokers will have a completely opposite opinion.”



'You decide... should smoking in public places be banned?'

Forum Summary

What are the financial implications of the ban?

In this part of the debate young people were asked to assess what they thought would be the main financial obstacles of the proposed ban on society. The discussion started with an analysis of the reduction in taxes the government could expect to collect, as this participant informed his/her peers:

"If people in the UK stopped smoking altogether, the government would actually save money. The government gets £8,093 million during the 2003/04 financial year from tobacco taxation etc., but smoking costs the NHS approximately £1.5 BILLION(!) a year for treating smoking-related diseases."

Nick Gibb MP offered his perspective on the cost of treating smoking-related diseases versus the average cost of smoking for 20 years:

"My own calculations show that the average smoker pays about £1,500 a year in tobacco tax. Over 20 years that is about £30,000, which is far less than the cost of treating lung cancer. But I think the key issue is the effect that someone smoking has on other people. That is a far more important argument than taxation or restaurant usage. What right has someone to inflict an unpleasant and dangerous substance on those around them?"

Enforcement fines could be one solution to the financial vacuum that could exist after the partial ban is imposed, according to this HeadsUp student:

"The financial savings of the government that the fines from people caught smoking in public places and pub/restaurant owners not enforcing the law would also make up for the loss of tobacco sale taxes."

These students offered their thoughts on the financial impact of the smoking ban on cigarette companies and underlined their belief that the partial ban is for the benefit of non-smokers:

"I dont think cigarette companies will be affected by a ban becasue as i say again, people will just have to smoke else where."

"People are aware that smoking is not only harmful to yourself but to others too, by banning smoking in public places, it doesn't stop people from smoking, it just protects people who don't."

One participant was quick to point out the potential for allowing pubs and restaurants to come to their own decision about smoking in their establishment:

“Why can't the owners of pubs and restaurants be allowed to decide themselves whether to allow smoking or not? If they make it clear on the door, people can decide whether to go there or somewhere else. That way the owners can decide what is best for their business.”

On the subject of smoke free pubs and restaurants, Tim Loughton MP went on to say that he felt that some proprietors are missing out on a profit-making opportunity:

“If there really is such a demand for smoke free pubs and restaurants then landlords are missing a trick and should be tapping into a potentially lucrative gap in the market and doing it voluntarily. Indeed, that is what is happening already. We should encourage this and importantly, premises allowing access to children should be smoke free.”

One HeadsUp participant came up with the novel and interesting idea of taxing restaurants that encourage/allow smoking on their premises. This step they believed would also encourage more restaurants to become smoke free environments:

“A step before a ban would be to make it more attractive for businesses to go smoke free by adding some sort of tax or expensive license (price related to the amount of business the pub gets) people must buy to have smoking allowed in their business”

However, Tim Loughton MP, felt that the main drawback to this proposal was the pressure this new tax would put on new businesses:

“I think yet another tax on restaurants or pubs would be a bad idea. We have to remember that many of these places will be small businesses struggling to keep a float and they don't need to be filling out more forms and giving more money to the Government.”



'You decide... should smoking in public places be banned?'

Forum Summary

How will the proposed ban impact upon the environment and the people around you?

The environment has proved to be of high importance to groups of HeadsUp participants in several previous debates, and certainly this one was no different. They showed themselves extremely aware of the example they could set through their own actions in safeguarding the planet for future generations, rather than turning a blind eye.

A collective effort from the UK Parliament and Government was called for by several participants, who felt that this was the perfect opportunity to help people protect the environment through a series of simple measures:

"The government should be making it easy for people to live without harming the environment. Radical but sensible things need to be done. Free public transport, much higher taxes on fuel... I'd suggest a ban on private cars"

An ongoing and hotly-debated theme throughout this topic space was the effect smoking has on the environment compared to similar well-publicised ecological threats such as litter and transport pollution. These two participants both agreed that traffic pollution was more threatening than smoking from their perspective:

"Smoking does not have a considerable effect on the environment, especially not when compared to traffic and such, and smoking does not cause much litter."

"The truth is that planes, road vehicles, and polluting factories contribute far more to air pollution than smoking. There has been a story in the news recently about how much planes, being the fastest growing travel industry, are contributing to the carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere. If it continues growing at this rate, the Government's target for reducing carbon emissions won't be met and it will actually be worse than it is now."

"smoking should not be banned on the streets or in your houses, but it should be banned when it comes into the food industry, because if chefs are not allowed to smoke in the a working kichen (because it ios aligal) the people who are eating it in the restrant should not be allowed either. when people are smoking out side of food industy does not effect the environment that much, not like other polusions around."

This participant agreed with the previous users about the importance of protecting the environment, but felt that more could be done to prevent the litter associated with smoking:

"Litter is a problem in any shape or form. On the streets there are many fag butts left on the ground and cigarette packets and the plastic seal that covers the packets, just float in the wind in the suburbs of the towns and cities. Looking at pros and cons of smoking, is the only pro feeding the addiction?"

The debate moved on to the issue of rights and civil liberties. Again young people demonstrated their awareness of the intricacies of the arguments.

Nick Gibb MP provided an interesting and helpful analogy on the Forum to make it easier for the students to understand the impact of every person's liberty:

"There is a phrase, "my liberty ends at the point where my fist touches your nose." That applies, in my view to smoking. It is not just a question of the environment, litter or whether smoking adds to the green house effect, it is a question of freedom... I feel that my freedom is deeply infringed by other people smoking at a nearby table in a restaurant, so much so that I feel unable to go to those restaurants and many people feel the same. It is a question of conflicting freedoms, the freedom to smoke versus the freedom to breathe clean air. I don't see why those who want the freedom to smoke have a greater right to the mantle of freedom than those of us who want the freedom to breathe in a smoke free atmosphere."

The ban on smoking in public places was deliberated at length by the participants throughout this debate. This participant was typical of the type of comment posted in support of the ban:

"I am quite conscious of passive smoking, as I love playing sport I am conscious of my health and ability....If this ban helps enforce this behaviour, I give it the thumbs up!"

However, those participants against the ban were equally determined and confident that their stance was correct and substantiated their opinions accordingly. For example, this student felt that the proposed ban would lead to widespread disharmony and could even drive tobacco underground:

"A complete ban on smoking is one of the worst ideas ever. It would cause endless crime and horror - so many people would still want to smoke, drug dealers would sell tobacco at ridiculous prices and there would be a lot of violence over it."

'You decide... should smoking in public places be banned?'

Conclusions

Dialogue with decision-makers, healthy nation & environment

The quality of debate and deliberation was of a high standard throughout the Forum. HeadsUp students entered the debate with well-researched arguments, were keen to ask questions and speak their minds.

On analysing the comments posted by the students a three way tie occurred - those in favour of the partial ban, those against the proposed ban and those best described as 'undecided'. The fact that this Forum was so closely debated only serves to highlight the fact that a lot of questions still remain unanswered and that the ban was not as simple and straight-forward as the Government had hoped.

As young people themselves have emphasised in this Forum, they are very much aware of the threat posed by passive smoking, with some even taking action to stop family members smoking. Students made several pleas in the Forum; to the decision-makers in Parliament to look into the possibility of adopting distinct separate spaces or rooms in restaurants as a manageable solution to avoid a complete ban, and to people everywhere to make informed choices on a raft of inter-related environmental and financial issues before they enter smoke-filled establishments, protecting the most important civil liberty i.e. personal freedom.

The intervention of the enthusiastic and high profile MPs during the second and third weeks gave the debate extra focus, momentum and validity from the young people's perspective. This interaction between young people and decision-makers was a significant moment as it was more than likely their first ever correspondence with an MP. The involvement of several MPs within the active Forum space itself is an important development for HeadsUp which sets a healthy benchmark for future Forums.

Overall, participants demonstrated that they were not only interested in the issues, policies and events taking place but that they were also capable of participating in them and making a positive contribution to the outcomes.

'You decide... should smoking in public places be banned?' was a crucial Forum for HeadsUp to stage and one that was welcomed by young people who participated, other NGOs and MPs from across the political spectrum. It provided a secure, structured but non-sanitised platform for young people

to voice their perspectives on the smoking debate at a very important time from a political perspective.

The timing of this Forum was deliberate. Young people have frequently expressed their frustration about the lack of opportunities for them to participate in topical political discussions and events. This HeadsUp Forum was scheduled to tap into the media coverage and general public debate about the issues surrounding smoking in public places.

HeadsUp tackles complex political problems but is not designed to make set recommendations. Like adults, young people have a range of perspectives on political events, issues and policies, and often favour different solutions. This resource was established not to give the 'definitive line'; rather it is about providing a space for people to share their views, challenge those of others and, in turn, be challenged.



Forum Topic Transcript

You decide...

Your messages to the decision-makers

19/09/2005 08:51:00

justice

First post...

Welcome to the smoking in public places debate...

The Government is currently consulting on whether smoking in public places should be banned.

Key decision-makers in Parliament are following this debate very closely and are extremely interested in what you have to say – see who's listening

(http://www.headsup.org.uk/content/default.asp?page=s88_1)

But what concerns should be top of their agenda?

Do people have a right to be healthy? Does the health of other people matter?

What in your opinion should be the definition of a public place? The government defines a public place as "only a space where food is being prepared". What do you think?

Something else, different to these concerns?

What are the reasons behind your choice?

19/09/2005 15:30:00

mole

'public places'

I'm a bit confused as to what is meant by a 'public place'. I don't think that pubs and restaurants are as public as the streets. When people go into a pub, it's because they like that type of pub.

Not everybody would go into that pub. I think that pubs and restaurants should be given the choice whether to be non-smoking or not. That way the customers can choose whether to go in or not, in the same way that they can choose if they like the food or atmosphere of the place.

22/09/2005 10:06:00

NickGibbMP

Public places

But what choice does a non-smoker have if all restaurants and pubs allow smoking? In New York, when they banned smoking in restaurants, the number of people going out to restaurants to eat rose dramatically.

22/09/2005 12:42:00

Levitica

NickGibb

A non-smoker still has the choice about whether or not to go into a restaurant. If there was enough demand for a non-smoking pub, someone would have opened a non-smoking pub. Companies would have picked up on this demand by now.

The people of England, at least where I live, still accept smoking as normal. A comparison with Ireland would be a lot more relevant than a comparison with New York.

22/09/2005 14:56:00

NickGibbMP

Restaurants

Few restaurants will dare to become non-smoking even though there is a pent up demand for non smoking restaurants. It is a critical mass issue. If a single restaurant bans smoking it will lose all the customers who like to smoke but it won't necessarily gain new customers from the millions of people who would like to eat out more often but don't because they expect restaurants to be smoky. People who have decided not to go to restaurants because of the smoke are not going to bother researching for the ones that ban it. They simply go to restaurants less often. If there were a complete ban then the pent up demand for this type of restaurant would be released. This is precisely what happened in New York. Eating out in New York is a real joy - masses of packed restaurants and no smoke. And it is what is happening in Dublin, I understand.

22/09/2005 16:07:00

mole

decision makers

This is really for the decision makers to answer. When making this decision, whose interests do you think should take priority (understanding that consideration is given to all):
rights of choice for individual smokers and non-smokers?
those affected by passive smoking?
health of nation as a whole?
businesses?
broad financial implications for country?
In other words, if the government is going to step in and make a decision on this, what grounds would they say justifies their intervention? In whose interests are they acting?

23/09/2005 13:30:00

gslade

Smoking in public places

I believe that smoking in public places should not be banned in this country. Since people have started smoking, nobody had made a real complaint about it, but suddenly it is a possibility that smoking in public places could be banned without many people being informed, like smokers. Then if people who are smokers to smoke in a public place are caught, then they will be fined without even knowing. Also, many people think this smoking in public places is rubbish so, in my opinion, I am strongly against smoking in public places being banned.

23/09/2005 13:30:00

finchmic

Smoking in public places

I believe that smoking should be banned in public places as it is unfair that non-smokers have to inhale smoke fumes when in pubs and restuarants. Even though they do have a section for smokers this doesnt stop the fumes spreading. And as it has been scientifically proven that passive smoking also damages your health then i feel that there should be a complete ban of smoking in all public places.

23/09/2005 13:36:00

bumblebee

Ban

I think that smoking should be banned from all public places, but not just in places in which to eat. Some restaurants do have "smoking" and "non-smoking" areas, but I don't think this is enough as the smoke still drifts into the "non-smoking" area.I think that smoking outside can be very bad as well. For example, if someone were to smoke in a park, they would be affecting the health of not just themselves, but those around them too. It is rude and anti-social.

23/09/2005 13:37:00

cheesy625

Smoking in public places

I think that smoking in public places shouldn't be banned. I think this becuase when you smoke the fumes go straight into the air, and you dont even no its there. Also they have smoking areas in most pubs and they are usually well ventelated areas so the fumes don't go into the resteraunt or where people are eating. But they go into the air. I think the whole "passive smoking" is a loud of rubbish. It might cause some deaths, but overall i don't think it is that harmful. I only think if pubs don't want people smoking in the pubs they should ban it. I don't think there should be a complete ban.

23/09/2005 13:38:00

beckiforsey

no ban!!!!

i think the smoking ban is stupid people will still smoke and no results will come out of it!! also it may cause threats to shop/pub owners who have to order people to leave this may cause threat! another point i would like to make is what happens if people give fake id how will you make them pay?? and what if people dont pay how will u make them send the to prison!! the results out of this scam will be stupid!!! im not saying smoking is good for you but people have been smoking in public places for years so what changes things now!!

masterzen

MPs

According to a recent survey, two thirds of MPs would back a law to make all workplaces and enclosed public places smoke-free. Does this figure surprise you - is it smaller or larger than you

would expect?

elaine30

The Ban

I think that to ban smoking in public areas will only cause more problems for the government. To keep track on everywhere that allows people to smoke or not, will take up time that can be better used sorting out more important issues.

23/09/2005 13:39:00

higgs

personal decision

i belive that smoking should not be banned in publiv places, as itis a personal choice and for many years now has never been a problem. I dont see why smokers should feel like outcast in civillisation against non smokers! Individulas should the the right to decide wheter they smook or not without gettin a fine just for smoking in a public place

23/09/2005 13:40:00

hatherallvic

public places

I think that smoking shouldn't be banned in public places, because it's up to the smoker, to quit or to carry on smoking. Other people can't suddenly stop other people from smoking in public places just because they don't like it. Why is it such a problem now when people have been smoking for years, and medical researchers have known the effects of smoking and passive smoking for ages, why suddenly do something about it now? . There is already ways to stop people being around smokers, such as non-smoking areas in resturants and pubs, however, the smoke does drift, causing other people to inhale the smoke. If anything I think that there should be more specific areas that are larger, and futher away from non-smoking areas so that other people are not effected, or even have completely different rooms in pubs and resturants. I personally dont have a problem being around people who smoke and have no problem with people being around people in public places who smoke.

23/09/2005 13:42:00

salad

New to the game

First off im sorry that this is half way through the forum rather than at the start, this is my first time here and I'm finding it confusing.

But from what I've seen, this case seems to be like the partition of Ireland, your always going to have a side thats unhappy, as i see it, pubs should be allowed to have smokers as there are plenty of outside seats for non smoking customers and most pubs dont get customers for meals.

Resteraunts however are different, meals is the essential buisness there and they dont always have out door tables, these places are where smoking needs to be banned or at least reduced. smoking areas work fine as long as they are well ventalated and a good distance from non smokers so instead of a complete and utter ban I think that pubs should be let off, and resteraunts must pass a quick test to see if their smoking areas are of enough quality to keep non-smokers happy if they are fine, if not give them a set time to change the problem or ban them from having smokers.

23/09/2005 13:44:00

higgs

reply

yes this figure is surprising, i expected it to be more as the goveremnet would be loosing money in the tobacco industry!!! i thought teh majority would not want it banned! what do u think???

23/09/2005 13:46:00

fightingforlesbianrights

smoking areas?

In a lot of restaurants and Pubs they have smoking and non-smoking areas that are well ventilated and cigarette smoke is removed through vents. I am personally against smoking around me because passive smoking can harm me and my health and still block some of my arteries; heart attacks don't really appeal to me!! I also feel it is unfair that smokers should be confined or segregated! What will the Government do to solve this problem?

23/09/2005 13:47:00

linzi

keep smokin evrewhere!!

i think the smokin ban is a stupid idea because pubs are one of the most likely places to have a fag while socialisin with m8s!! i think there shouldnt be a smokin ban aslong as the smokers are a good distance away from the non smokers it would be fine.

23/09/2005 13:47:00

chloem

2/3?

i think that only 2/3 of mps would vote to bann smoking is surprising because i think that more would have said they ought to ban it. do you think that 1\3 of the mps smoke? this would make sense as why would they ban somthing they enjoy doing. when mps vote on the issue it will be unfair as most smokers will vote against and most non smokers will vote for.

23/09/2005 13:47:00

craigybaby

hrmm

I think that smoking in public places shouldn't be banned. I think this becuase when you smoke the fumes go straight into the air, and you dont even no its there. Also they have smoking areas in most pubs and they are usually well ventelated areas so the fumes don't go into the resteraunt or where people are eatting. But they go into the air. I think the whole "passive smoking" is a loud of rubbish. It might cause some deaths, but overall i don't think it is that harmful. I only think if pubs don't want people smoking in the pubs they should ban it. I don't think there should be a complete ban.

23/09/2005 13:47:00

tomyoung

i say, i say, i say

wat do we have here, we have abit of a vote goin on and wat do i think hmmm.....i think that smokin shouldnt be banned even though im not a smoker, this is because most of my mates are and im allways with them when there smokin so if you banned it i would get tagged along wiv my mates to somewhere which would be very annoyin, so i think it shouldnt be banned, people who smoke should be able to smoke where evr they want apart from the non-smokin places,

23/09/2005 13:48:00

cheesy625

responce to finchmic

all smoking areas are well ventelated and the fumes don't go into were the area were people are eating.

23/09/2005 13:48:00

stjimmy27

Smoking in Public places!

I think that smoking in public places should be banned. I think this because it is unfair on people who dont want to inhale the smoke others. If people who smoke want to die early that is their problem not non-smokers. But i do think it is ok if smokers want to smoke in the privicy of their own homes.

23/09/2005 13:49:00

gslade

finchmic what r u thinkin?

the ban is probably the most stupid thing I've heard!! I think u guys should rethink what you wrote and finchmic I thought you were against the ban but now your with the ban

23/09/2005 13:49:00

hatherallvic

smoking in pubs/resturants

Sorry about my last point, i Put 'people' too much at the end. =D I do think that its ok to smoke in pubs, because it's that sorta of environment, however, I do think that the food issue is important because it really does put people off eating when people smoke around them. I don't think that it should be completely banned, but going back to the my last point, i Do think that the smokers should be in ,maybe, seperate rooms, just to keep the non-smokers happy =D

23/09/2005 13:49:00

higgs

reply to finchmic

does smoking rle bother u that much? do any of your friends smoke?? just cause it bothers you does not mean a total nban in smoking places, simply move away from teh crowd!!

23/09/2005 13:50:00

coxjam

response to FinchMic

i agree with finchy because it is unfair for non-smokers to have to put up with other smokers fumes. in restaurants, they have no smoking areas, but smoke easily spreads to other parts of the restaurant and it can make people feel uncomfortable. it is just as unhealthy to passive smoke as it is to smoke and it is unfair for us non-smokers.

23/09/2005 13:51:00

finchmic

GSlade,

GSlade is totally wrong!!! smoking should be banned in public places so that there will be reduced numbers in the amount of people that are passive smoking. How would you like it if any of your family members died of lung disease, it wouldnt be nice!! Smoking should be banned in all public places to stop this happening in our society.

23/09/2005 13:51:00

higgs

finch mic reply

finchmic!!! the prospect of lung cancer within a family has nothing to do with this matter, i see your point but weve known for years now the dangers of smoking, yet it lies in the decision of the smoker!!1 so y now... why now decide on a ban

23/09/2005 13:52:00

salad

RE: MP's

Im not surprised at all, if the ban did go through the government would claim millions maybe more off fines from smokers and resteraunts that break the law. Its realy easy to belive that everything is run solely by money now a days.

But one thing I have noticed is that smokers seem to be getting all the free pass here, everyone says that non smokers have a choice but so do smokers, an average meal at a resteraunt must last around 2 hours at the absolute most, surely people can go without a stick thats going to kill them for 2 hours... cant they?

23/09/2005 13:54:00

connie

smoking in public places

at the moment just having different sections for smokers and non-smokers is not good enough. this doesn't prevent the smoke spreading through the whole restaurant/cafe. in confined rooms i think smoking should be banned, its just polite not to smoke near someone who doesn't want to inhale the fumes.

23/09/2005 13:55:00

hatherallvic

finchy shhh!

i Don't think that it should be banned. Why is it such a big issue now? If they knew that passive smoking caused lung cancer, and other problems for the person then why didn't they ban it ages ago?

23/09/2005 13:57:00

beckiforsey

ban the ban(i belive i can fly remix

this is what me and linzi think

i belive people can smoke,

this ban is stupid,

n im gunna choke,

i think about it every night and day,

smoke a fag ,

forget what they say,

i belive i can toke
forget all that pasive smoke,
what do u think?????

23/09/2005 13:59:00

finchmic

hatherall SHHH back to you

Smoking wasnt banned ages ago because it was a social thing to do and even the royals did smoke. Today there is a change and there is more scientific research proving that it is dangerous to smoke. Every fag you have takes something like 2 hours of you life and this amount is halved if you passive smoke. Think about it 1 hour of your life every time. is it worth it!!!

23/09/2005 13:59:00

hatherallvic

welldone linzi and becki *claps*

very good, i dont think it should be banned!

23/09/2005 13:59:00

gslade

peeps against the ban

u guys should really think about wat ur saying. Most people dont mind being around smokers and people shud maybe rethink their points about this topic. Not mentioning any names (COXJAM AND FINCHMIC!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!)

23/09/2005 14:00:00

higgs

what

i do not belive the last post involving sing song, prosepts the issue of banning smoking

23/09/2005 14:00:00

cheesy625

finchmic n coxjam

smokin shouldnt be banned you dont no wat ur talkin about, in pubs n restuarants there are always well ventelated areas and passive smokin isnt tht harmful, every1 just says it is

23/09/2005 14:01:00

minx

whey!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

well sed well sed i agree!!

23/09/2005 14:01:00

salad

RE: vic

.- vic, the reason it didnt go through ages ago is the public didnt find out it killed you until the 1960's and even then there was alot of speculation over wheather they wer just false claims. And even after all this, most MP's had shares with tabbaco companies that kept them living cumfortably, it's obvious they didnt want to loose one of their main sources of income. Now people are getting a grip of reality and realising smoking causes themselves and others. I dont agree with an out and out ban but as far as resteraunts are concerned... well just read my first post ^^

23/09/2005 14:02:00

higgs

smoking

this should be takin seriously

23/09/2005 14:02:00

beckiforsey

cheers hun hi every one at harde

smoking shouldnt be banned!!! the tabacoo market will fall in numbers.

23/09/2005 14:02:00

hatherallvic

grrr ='(

nooooo u dont understand!! if they knew that it caused damaged to other people as well as them selves, then why didnt they do anything about it...oh i give up!

23/09/2005 14:02:00

dirt_jumper4life

finchey shut up

it is the smokers choice to smoke and if ppl dnt like it then they can move away

23/09/2005 14:02:00

chilli

BackUp

Critics of the ban, led by the tobacco industry, say the claim that passive smoking increases the risk of lung cancer, has not been conclusively proved. But what do you think - to get all the facts and figures behind the health and money issues check out the Backup section

23/09/2005 14:03:00

coxjam

Cheesy625

of course it is harmful to your health. why do u think people get lung and heart cancer.

23/09/2005 14:03:00

connie

choicess

people say that the doesn't give smokers freedom of choice. But at the moment people who don't smoke don't have the choice whether they want to inhale cigarette smoke or not.

23/09/2005 14:04:00

gslade

good song by becki and lindz lol

im lovin the song I agree with what you guys r sayin smokin shudn't be banned

23/09/2005 14:04:00

salad

RE: beki

saying the ban is just stupid wont get far in a normal conversation let alone a court case...

why is it stupid? do you have a reason or is it simply because you smoke your self and feel that this ban will penalise you and treat you in an unfair way?

23/09/2005 14:05:00

bumblebee

Life Loss

I actually thought it was something like 5 minutes per cigarette but that's still 5 minutes, think about how much that adds up to.

23/09/2005 15:44:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Something that should be thought

What will the government do to enforce this ban? And what will be the penalty of braking this law?

Who will be relied upon to carry out the enforcing, just policemen or will citizens be relied upon to enforce it? What will encourage the citizen to enforce it wont the just save them selves from the bother of court proceedings?

23/09/2005 16:09:00

Levitica

Another Alternative

Does anyone agree that it would be a good and fair compromise to say that every pub/resteraunt must have a specifically designated non-smoking area, which would never have more than so much smoke in the air (and health and safety people would be able to measure it at any time.) If this area was guaranteed to be (as much as a house with no smokers in it would be) smokeless, no one could have a problem, could they?

Resteraunts could choose how large their smoke-free area would be, and they'd be making them

bigger as if someone came in and asked to sit in the smoke-free area (which a lot of people would do, even if they don't feel strongly about it. They'd just think "why not," I know I would) and they couldn't provide it, they'd be losing business.
There could be a law saying that at least 25% of the restaurant had to be specifically smoke-free.

23/09/2005 16:18:00

fightingforlesbianrights

RE: Levitica

Hay, thats a good comment, alot of resturants have that. But also written into the bill should be having certain amounts of ventalation in the smoking area so smoke is less lickly to drift!
What about people smoking in the streets how would this be provented, and all the cigarett butts lie in the street? what comment do you guys have on this?

23/09/2005 21:26:00

Levitica

Re: Fighting for Lesbian Rights

i'm thinking the health and safety man could go into the non-smoking area with a little "smokometre" and check the amount of smoke in the air was within the limits.
I'd just say no, full stop, to smoking in the street. The street is a true public place. I don't see cigarette butts as a big litter problem though. Fine, they're there, but they're not everywhere like chewing gum.

26/09/2005 11:06:00

gslade

to finchy...

what r u thinking smokin is sumthin people have a choice to do when n where as well

26/09/2005 11:10:00

gslade

hey salad

wat opinions do you have on this smoking ban?

26/09/2005 11:11:00

salad

Yup

Yea i agree completely, dont have an out and out ban just moderate the amount of smoke in areas where its not wanted. The street wont be a problem because its outside and you have the fresh air to clear away most smoke, litter wise its not that much of a problem although i think it would be best to have a few fines for dropping them or something, just so that no one can complain about it going un-attended or something.

26/09/2005 13:56:00

Dougydude

Smoking outside

I agree, putting a all out ban would neither work, nor be popular, but, I personally think a ban in every building, other than homes should be banned. This means that people will not be affected by smoke building up in rooms and getting trapped in clothes, where as if smoke is outside, it can escape into the atmosphere.

26/09/2005 16:18:00

biged

the story so far...

There has been some impressive discussion taking place on the Forum. To sum up in a nutshell, your areas of concern and messages to decision-makers so far are that...

* The definition of a "public place" is a grey area and therefore very important

* The balance between a "smoking" and "non-smoking" area in a restaurant is another topic of contention which needs clarification

* It is clear that some of you are worried about passive smoking but know a lot about the dangers associated with inhaling second hand smoke

Are there any other important messages you'd like to pass on to decision-makers?

Do people have a right to be healthy? Does the health of other people matter?

26/09/2005 17:33:00

Maisie

smokin

i do fink smokin shoul be bannd in public places coz the amount of people diein coz of passive smokin/2nd hand smokin

some1 in my family died because of 2nd hand smokin.

well i understand if people want 2 smoke but also im sure they know what kind of damage it can cause.

my parents use2 smoke epsecially my dad i the end he stopped smiking because the amounts of times i told him wot they can do to u and i alwaysed use 2 throw his ciggerates away in the bin.

26/09/2005 17:36:00

Maisie

2 dougiedude

kk that iz true but i dnt fink it is ok in d street because people can still breath it in nd can be dangerous 2 asthmatic people like myself aswell.

26/09/2005 17:41:00

Maisie

2 linzi

dat iz stupid wot u sed about if smokers keep away frm non smokers it will b fine. thats not true coz the smoke will fill the room their smokin in. 'silly'.

also wot if their asthmatic.

i could go on nd on coz there is sooo many reasons

26/09/2005 18:31:00

dipsy

the little ones....

Not just the adults getting affected by the smoke the children are aswell. There future as an adult could be ruined by inhaling just one puff of smoke. Also kids have a weaker immune system compared to adults, so they would not be able to fight off any diseases from the smoke.

26/09/2005 19:06:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Maisie

Maisie although you may feel that linzi's oppinions are 'stupid' you still have to respect their oppinions. the reason of a debate is to understand other peoples points of veiw but try to persuade them that your oppinion is the better one. an argument on the other hand is where you are trying to de-value what they are saying, be considerate and smart with what you are saying...

...back to the discution... i agree with what maisie said about smoking in the street although there may be 'fresh air' you can still passive smoke and isnt the street where most passive smoking takes place? for example bus stops, markets in the street! what is going to define the PUBLIC place? in my eyes the street is very much public!

26/09/2005 19:11:00

fightingforlesbianrights

RE Levitica

that is a idea but it could mean a high cost for the government to pay these people? and also these checks would probably only take place per annum or quarter as there are many bars and restuarants to 'check' is this realy a realistic solution?

26/09/2005 19:25:00

fightingforlesbianrights

To all those....

that think smoking outside is not big deal then maybe you should look on my post, enviromental issues forum page 6 titled GLOBAL WARMING

26/09/2005 20:13:00

fightingforlesbianrights

just somthing i thought while readi

Smoking and non-smoking areas..

this may seem a suitable solition but there are some implications..

if this was in place eveywhere then this would mean a segregation which could lead to prejudice! and also if this was something put in place it would be difficult to do, for instance, night clubs there

would have to be a smoking club and a non smoking club which would lead to further segregation. As a smokers' social group may not consist of smokers that smoker may take it upon themselves to go to the non-smoking club with his/her friends, the majority of smokers would do this so therefore the ban is being self-inflicted!
Another point is that all aeroplane flights are Non-smoking. so you either choose not to smoke or dont fly anywhere, so the same action is quiet reasonable for bars reastuarants bus stops and the endless list of Public places!!

27/09/2005 11:48:00

AndrewLansleyMP

Opening thoughts

As far as I'm concerned I think we should allow people who don't want to breathe other people's smoke, not to have to do so. I don't think people have the right to expose me or my children to their tobacco smoke.

I find tobacco smoke generally unpleasant and occasionally irritating, though the scientific evidence suggests prolonged exposure to other people's second smoke can significantly increase the risk of cancer and heart disease. For children it can exacerbate conditions like asthma. So the question is how do we get to the position where no one breathes someone else's smoke who doesn't want to. Many restaurants and some pub chains are going that way but too many aren't. Far too many still have smoking areas from which the smoke drifts across everybody. For people who work in these environments there are real long term dangers.

The government have this idea of banning smoking where prepared foods are served, but that would leave a lot of pubs and clubs as "smoking dens" - especially in more deprived areas, which is often where people have some of the worst health already.

I really do think we should ban things only when we know that other options won't work but I do think now is the time to tell pubs and hospitality industry that unless they can offer a smoke free environment to everyone who wants it within say 3 years, we should consider legislation which provides the necessary protection.

Meanwhile, let's look at how it's working in New York, in Ireland since last year and in Scotland from next April.

27/09/2005 17:33:00

TimLoughtonMP

Smoking is disgusting but people

Smoking is one of the most disgusting, noxious, anti-social habits legally available to man and I am determined to see as many people give it up as possible, and more importantly many fewer young people take it up in the first place. But whilst smoking remains legal in this country we should be able to treat everyone as adults to make the choice for themselves as to whether they want to puff and wheeze themselves into an early grave.

We have too much 'nanny state' already but that is not to say we shouldn't make smokers feel as uncomfortable and 'stigmatised' as possible and make sure that non-smokers have as much choice as possible to keep away from smokers.

28/09/2005 10:41:00

masterzen

Tony Blair's thoughts

Did any of you read the Prime Minister's thoughts on smoking in public places?

He made his views clear at the Labour Party conference this week, and he was asked directly why the government is not imposing a complete ban? Here's what he said...

TB: "I think it's just a balance really. I mean in the end the ban will cover the vast majority of premises. The question is in circumstances where you've got a reasonable restricted number of premises that don't serve any food at all, is it right to ban it there too? Look, there can be different views about it but I think we shouldn't ignore the fact that this government, by putting restrictions on advertising in respect to smoking and by the ban that we're proposing, will push this agenda forward in a way that no other government has done before us and I think we'll make a big difference. And there's no doubt at all incidentally, the evidence is that the damage smoking causes is huge.

So the question is do you go that last bit of the way in circumstances where the resentment that it may cause outweighs the benefit, that's the issue."

Is his reasoning behind this decision sound in your opinion?

What about the comments from other decision-makers in the Forum - which viewpoint do you agree with the most and why?

28/09/2005 13:02:00

Levitica

Replies

"that is a idea but it could mean a high cost for the government to pay these people? and also these checks would probably only take place per annum or quarter as there are many bars and restuarants to 'check' is this really a realistic solution?"

What the government plan to do, completely banning smoking in businesses that serve food, will use just as many people and be harder to police.

The law will be people cannot smoke on the premises. If people do on the spot checks that noone is smoking, they see noone smoking but the air is still smoky, that business will get away with it. They can say "no, noone's been smoking, it must have drifted in" and get away with it as it cannot be proved that someone smoked, but if the law was against a certain amount of smoke being in the air, it would be a simple test they'd have to do and businesses would have no excuses.

"if this was in place eveywhere then this would mean a segregation which could lead to prejudice!" And segregation would not occur if the one pub was full of non smokers eating bar meals and the one next door served no food and was full of smoke? Does segregation between people who want to smoke and people who don't really matter anyway? People who like to watch football on a Saturday go to the football ground whereas those who want to go to Asda go to Asda. Do we worry about them being segregated?

What about pubs that serve food at certain hours? Is smoking allowed outside of these hours? If it isn't, I think almost all of those pubs will just give up on serving meals...

"and also if this was something put in place it would be difficult to do, for instance, night clubs there would have to be a smoking club and a non smoking club"

But nightclubs don't serve food, so they have nothing to do with this.

"As far as I'm concerned I think we should allow people who don't want to breathe other people's smoke, not to have to do so. I don't think people have the right to expose me or my children to their tobacco smoke."

I agree with this, and that's why I think smoking should possibly be banned in shopping centres, the street, schools etc - places that are true public places or where people are made by the law to go (I think it's disgusting that I have no choice whether or not to go to school and get smoked on, which damages my health.)

But I think smoking should definitely still be allowed in homes and pubs, as I see pubs as closer to an open home than a public place - I couldn't just walk through a pub, could I? People who go there are choosing to go there.

28/09/2005 14:52:00

SteveWebbMP

Tony Blair's thoughts

The idea of excluding places where no food is served seems like a cop out by a Government that is unwilling to take a lead. If the main objection to smoking in enclosed public places is the impact on the people who have to work there, why exclude places where no food is served - don't people who work there have rights too?

I think the Government should not be so afraid of public opinion but should take a lead and go for an outright ban. A partial ban will be hard to enforce, and will worsen health inequalities as it tends to be poorer areas that on average have more pubs that are drink-only.

29/09/2005 09:01:00

kswan

should smoking be banned in pub

well in certain areas i think it should be like shopping centre and resturaunts but on the streets it would be very hard 2 ban if people want to smoke they should do it in their own homes and suffer the smells them selves without making others suffer

29/09/2005 16:10:00

dgilligan

Smoking in public places

Although it is a personal choice as to whether a person wants to smoke or not, I believe that passive smoking can damage people's health. The WHO says that a non-smokers chances of getting lung cancer are increased by 16-17% if they are regularly exposed to other people's smoke. Also, passive smoke can be a massive problem for people with asthma, meaning it is more difficult for them to enjoy a meal etc. People would still be allowed to smoke, just not in places where it may cause long term harm to others.

29/09/2005 16:37:00

Levitica

People at Work

"The idea of excluding places where no food is served seems like a cop out by a Government that is unwilling to take a lead. If the main objection to smoking in enclosed public places is the impact on the people who have to work there, why exclude places where no food is served - don't people who work there have rights too?"

I agree that doing it only in a few businesses takes away a lot of the good points for the ban and introduces a whole set of bad ones.

I don't see the concern for people who work in these places though. They choose to work there, there are plenty of other places to work. Do other people think that it is morally wrong that someone could have the choice between a £5.50/hour job in a clean shop and a £6.50/hour job in a smoky bar, so are therefore selling their health? Looking at it that way makes it seem pretty sick. No one has answered the question about what will happen to pubs that serve food within certain hours. Does no one know?

30/09/2005 13:11:00

SteveWebbMP

Rights of workers

Whilst in theory workers can simply go and work in a non-smoky environment, in practice choice for employees may be more limited. For example, if a pub had a smoking area and a smoke-free area a member of bar staff would be in a very weak position if they insisted only on working in the smoke-free area.

Also, if you think about it from a health and safety at work point of view, if there was a workplace which was dangerous because of (say) chemical fumes, you wouldn't dream of saying that we don't need to do anything about it because people can also choose to work somewhere else - you would say that the health and safety of whoever worked there was important and should be protected.

The same surely applies to passive smoking?

Steve W.

30/09/2005 13:23:00

linzi

2 masie

wot u on bout masie every1 has there own opinions n u gotta respect that!! wen i dont lyk wot ur writin i dont call u stupid so y do u call wot i say stupid?? eh?? and if people are asmatics then thats ther problem not myn!!

30/09/2005 13:23:00

higgs

higgs

think smoking, think lung cancer, think pain, think loss of breath, think death, think tears, think lonley, think time stoppin

30/09/2005 13:24:00

gslade

fighting for lesbian rights

i totally agree with what you have to say. everybody has their own opinions for what they want to say, and this is just like decisions that people have to make for whether or not they want to smoke or whther they get away from smokin places and totally move away from the local pub or restaurant or whateva.

30/09/2005 13:26:00

beckiforse

masie u dnt kno what ya on about

linzi has her own opnion n it aint stupid but urs is!!! if their asmatic that aint her problem!! this is a simple debate theres no need 2 get bitchy about it!! DONT BAN SMOKING!!! oh n u said u can give loads of reason y it should b so go on share wid us!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

30/09/2005 13:26:00

higgs

hey

in an re lesson i learnt that smokers not be just addicted to the nicotine but also to the feel of something in their mouth!!! a true fact people who smoke and like the feel of something to their lips actually represents their mothers nipple, from where they were breast feeded as youths!!! smoking is proved to not be an easy thing to give up, uv got 2 respect that people somke and accept the fact the cant give up all the time..... iys harsh to not allow them to smoke when ans

where they want... its part of them living

30/09/2005 13:27:00

hatherilvic

I think that there are loads of points that come up, when deciding whether smoking should be banned or not. Everyone has to look into who it'll benefit and who it won't. I think that it will benefit a lot of people, such as improving health for the smoker and also the non smoker. I think people should see who it would benefit more, and whether this is a good thing or not. I personally think that it would benefit the non smoker more, as they are not at risk from inhaling the smokers smoke and then having the risk of getting ill from this. It could also improve the smoker, from cutting down the amount they actually smoke. Those are a few points people should actually talk about, i still think though, that it shouldn't be banned, but that's just my opinion. =>

30/09/2005 13:28:00

linzi

2 higgs

yer i agree wid u on that 1 lol a mothers nipple?? u jokin lol is that true? xxx

30/09/2005 13:29:00

smashingpumpkin256

People at work

Surely you cannot force someone to work in an environment that is harming to their health. We all know that smoking is harmful for us and passive smoking too, so surely it is unethical to force someone to have their health deteriorated?

You could say that they can "just move somewhere else" but that is harder than is suggested. If a person working behind a bar that allows smoking doesn't want to work in a smoking environment, they cannot just move elsewhere as the bar is the only place for them to work. They would have to work in a non-smoking bar.

30/09/2005 13:29:00

higgs

gslade

gslade stop it!!!! give up smoking!!!! its not helping uor ur kids

30/09/2005 13:30:00

minx

hmm....

i think that it doesn't matter if u smoke or not and where u choose to smoke. its up to people if they want to smoke or not and if they do then its their choice. you cant have a go at someone because they've decided to smoke and you havnt, its just a difference in opinion. and smokers choose where they want to smoke just like you choose where to go and eat or whatever, its a decision you make and you can have your own opinion, but dont complain about other peoples.

30/09/2005 13:30:00

beckiforsey

well in higgs!! by the way ma bda

that a good coment higgs!! i totally agree, some people have better will powere then others so its not easy to quit. smoking can become relied on!! glad ur actually learnin something lol!!!

30/09/2005 13:31:00

higgs

linzi

yes it was true..... my religious studies teacher told me..... its a proven sceintific fact linzi

30/09/2005 13:32:00

fairy

Re:hatherilvic

So basically you are bringing ups ome very good points that are very good reasons for the ban to take place, and disagreeing with yourself. Surely all these things you have thought about would change your mind! Why do you not agree with the ban, what are your arguments???

30/09/2005 13:32:00

hatherallvic

non smoking places

everyone says that there shud be more non-smoking places, i agree as then both smokers and nonsmokers

would be happy. However some people think that the smoke would drift alot, but then the idea of ventilation comes in, or the idea of having completly seperate rooms. I think that the smoker can smoke when ever they want to outside, and its in fresh air, however when it comes to resturants and pubs and eating places then it should be cut down alot more.

30/09/2005 13:32:00

salad

Steve

Yea I never thought about how it may effect staff.

The whole argument has been mostly based around bars and resteraunts untill now.

You deffinatly couldnt have a work policy where, if you didnt like the smoke, you had to go and find another job, there wouldnt be anyone to employ! Now being my age i cant comment on how offices and stuff may be in terms of smoke and how serious passive smoking is.

But as for resteraunts in particular I dont think it would be to much of a problem, all the ones Ive been to do seem to have a specific split in waiters, in terms of a certain bunch seem to be around the smoking areas and another are kept to the non-smoking. May just be how it is and they accept it and get on with it and in that case it still isnt really a problem unless they complain.

The area that needs most attension, as Lavitica said is schools, there its alot more than a case of passive smoking as kids every day (who have never tried smoking) are actually being "passed" a fag and begin smoking properly. The whole image around smoking needs to be sorted and on a wide scale. The odd T.V advert isnt going to cut it, you need to scare them, make them think twice before they start or urge them to give up. Have people that have had lungs removed because of cigarettes come to school... If that doesnt stur some thought I dont know what will.

Thats the reason I havnt started, I'm scared, when my Gran was in a hospital with lung disease (not caused by smoking) I saw some pretty horrible things, no blood and gore and the like, but just people finding it hard to just speak, having to carry a oxygen tank around with them.

I think all kids should see first hand what it can do and early in their lives to.

30/09/2005 13:33:00

higgs

thank you

id jst like to thank every1 who has showed me their support in this debate!! its shows ur opinions are similar to my own, although id love to hear what the other side think??? people who want it banned??? plz spk up?? y do u feel so strongly about it??? have u ever tryed smoking??? is it because ur family do not smoke??

30/09/2005 13:33:00

finchmic

Smashing Pumpkin

Great point!! it is unfair for all the people working behind bars and smoking restuarants. But some may say that if they dont wanna be there then dont work there. But it is not that easy. They cant just give up a perfectly good job as some people cant afford to be out of work. But it is unfair as their health is being destroyed!!! Is there a solution to this???

30/09/2005 13:34:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Smokeless tobaco

You may think what the hell? but i saw some information about smokless tabacco on the internet unfortunately i havent been able to reasech into it that much but it does exist; it gives the nessessary dose of nicotine but with out the nasty toxins and chemicals etc

a little stat for you ... Passive smoking increases your chances by 25% to get heart reltated diesases

30/09/2005 13:34:00

linzi

2 evre1

obviously the non smokers are going to benifit more from the ban and the people who dont smoke but dont mind what happens arent going to care if ther is a ban. the non smokers who dont lyk the smoke around them should respect the fact that people DO get addicted to it and find it hard to quit.

30/09/2005 13:34:00

gruff

Facts and Figures

Some well thought out comments but if you want to make sure what you are saying is accurate, check out the back up section for all the latest information on smoking, the environment and health.

30/09/2005 13:35:00

bumblebee

Re Kswan

"if people want to smoke they should do it in their own homes and suffer the smells them selves without making others suffer"

Ok that is a fair point, but what about their family and friends? If smokers aren't allowed to smoke anywhere but in their own homes, it will make matters even worse for their families; especially the children (because of the immune systems as mentioned earlier). I think this is unfair on those that are close to the smoker.

30/09/2005 13:35:00

gslade

higgs

r u tellin me sumthin im not aware of, my kids r perfectly fine!! lol But i do agree about the comment of will power. If people dont have will power then they will harder to stop smoking if they want to that is, but if u do have will power then all you can do is giv up a couple of fags a day and that would probably make the people who want the ban shut up a bit like finchmic.

30/09/2005 13:35:00

wilson

smoking

smoking is somethink that people choose to do and if you do not like it then do not go near anyone with a fag in their hand

30/09/2005 13:36:00

cheesy625

i dont think there should be a ban. i think pubs and restuarants would loose a lot of money if the ban was made. I think if pubs and restuarants should have the choise if they want to ban smoking. Or if they want to have a smoking place, they should have a certain room which has very good ventillation and the smoke level is checked in the room (it shouldn't be near the enterance as well).

30/09/2005 13:36:00

beckiforsey

thats k higgs

i totally agree i would be intrested if the people that are against it dont smoke tham selfs and nor does their family!! get ur opinions flowing in!!!

30/09/2005 13:37:00

dirt_jumper4life

to finchmic

there isnt a solution to that cause thats just wot happens if they hate it that much then the would quit there job and i think this debate is pointless. people have smoked in loads of places for over a hundred years so why stop that

30/09/2005 13:38:00

salad

Addictions?

Yea I wouldnt disagree with it. But all I think is if you cant quit something that's got a good chance of killing you... what will do you have? So yea it can be hard, and yes theres all these stories of gaining weight after you quit and all but by starting you take on a great price, one that you have to pay in one way or another; a lung, your life, or as much as around 4 months of feeling un-easy. Which sounds more expensive?

But as for saying that you gain weight after you quit smoking, thats all your choice as well, just make the right one, your not going to gain wieght if you eat sensibly are you?

30/09/2005 13:38:00

fightingforlesbianrights

RE: Linzi

its not about smokers giving up its about protecting the non-smokers its not just the fact that they dont like the smell or atmosphere its also about the health risk of passive smoking!

30/09/2005 13:38:00

wilson

smoking

fightingforlesbianrights you have been watching to much television

30/09/2005 13:39:00

beckiforsey

re: fighting for lesbian rights

thats good idea we should look into it more!!! there should be away of smoking that wont effect people who arent!!!

30/09/2005 13:39:00

ockwellnat

smoking ban

i think that smoking should be banned in public places especially resturants. why should nonsmokers have to take in other peoples smoke when they are eating.

but i dont think it should be banned in pubs and clubs as most people smoke when they are drinking anyway and it isnt fair on the people that want to go for a drink and not being able to smoke.

30/09/2005 13:39:00

minx

i agree

if u dont like the fact that some people smoke then dont just complain about it and stand there breathing in the smoke and everything, move away. its the smokers decision if they smoke and where they smoke and its your decision not to smoke and you decision to move away from the smoke or not. if you dont like it then move away, dont just stand there and complain!

30/09/2005 13:39:00

finchmic

Linzi

I respect that smoking is VERY hard to give up and you cannot just give up like that. it takes a lot of will power!! Fair point Linzi!! I know that smoking is hard to give up as my brother smokes and struggles to do so. This is the main reason i am against smoking as i can see the effects it has on my brother and family.

30/09/2005 13:41:00

salad

Wilson

Why should smokers get all the rights? "It's MY cCHOICE to smoke if others dont like it THEY can go somewhere else" thats the overall argument of people that smoke and yes its a fair one, but only if they can accept that others have all the right to say "its MY CHOICE not to smoke, if others dont like it THEY can go else where"

30/09/2005 13:41:00

fairy

...

Sure buisnesses would loose money to start with, but its not jusr a couple of resteraunts, its the whole country so people would have to get used to it, and eat or drink in a non-smoking environment. It would be the same situation for buisnesses all across the uk so it would be less of a problem than you think.

30/09/2005 13:41:00

higgs

re....salad

i agree with u, salad, there is nothing worse than to see a member of your family suffer down to the

hands of lung cancer!! not only are they leaving us forever but they are leaving people people behind.. feeling insecure and scared!!! the thing is..... death is a part of life!! wheter we are hit by a car, die of an illness, suffer of old age, dye at birth. the point im getting across is that we all die salad! we all dye
yes smoking kills,,,,, yes passive smoking kills, but thats life i mean, should we ban driving??? or is that to much of a disadvantage for you?? did u know that car fumes cause cancer, brain damage, blindness..... all true!! its also a passive smoking cause even non drivers are at risk of dying by getting hit by a car!!!!!!!
what would u say if we were to ban driving? or would this be to much of a disavantage to u as ud have to walk everywhere
im not defending smoking im jst saying its life salad"! its life!"!! and people who are being told that its banned aare at a disadvantage, because they have to chnage there way of life
think about it
?????????????????
"death comes to us all, jst know that to a certain extent u have the power to choose how"

30/09/2005 13:41:00

wilson

smoking

bumblebee you do not know what you are talking about go reed a fact book or somethink the smell dose not make people in public places feel ill or anythink like that does it

30/09/2005 13:41:00

masterzen

Re: Smokeless tobacco...the fact

You don't smoke it. You don't swallow it. All you do is slosh it around your mouth and spit out the brown juices every few seconds. OK, so it actually is pretty disgusting. But so what? After all, it's called smokeless or chewing tobacco. That means you chew and spit it, not smoke it, so it can't be as bad as inhaling tobacco smoke into your lungs, right?

Wrong . . . unfortunately, smokeless doesn't mean harmless. The fact is, chewing tobacco is every bit as dangerous as smoking it.

So What's the Danger?

Just like smoking cigarettes, chewing smokeless tobacco can eventually rip apart your body and kill you. It's that simple, really. There's no such thing as a "safe" tobacco product.

30/09/2005 13:42:00

coxjam

Cheesy625

i agree with cheesy.restaurants should have a choice becasue if restaurants have 2 do it they could lose loads of money.they should just get given money by the governerment to extend the retsaurent so their is a seperate room that is just for smokers.

30/09/2005 13:43:00

linzi

to: fightingforlesbianrights

yer i no it ent just about quittin but itink that most non smokers would prefer it if smokers quit so i was just sayin tht is it is hard!!

30/09/2005 13:43:00

dirt_jumper4life

another point

i think that smokers are restricted from going into places with a fag enough so why add to the pointlessness of trying to stop people it will just be a waist of time. WHATS THE POINT?

30/09/2005 13:43:00

gslade

dirt jumper 4 life

I meaqn the government are the only ones who r goin to make anything happen about this stupid ban. If people r wantin the ban then they shud go to the government and attempt to get the ban.

30/09/2005 13:43:00

ZoeR

reply to ockwellnat

right!!!!!!! i dnt agree with u at all sum ppl mite want a nice fag after there meal nd there is smokin areas so if u dnt like smoking eat at home.

30/09/2005 13:43:00

hatherallvic

re:fairy

hello there, im just saying (in my last point).. that if people want it to be banned, or for smoking to be cut down alot more in public places, then they have to think about what sort of things could be done to achieve this. I was bringing up some points that could be discussed alot more, i also said that i Pesonally I think it shouldn't be banned. I was just mentioning those things that people could talk about, if they wanted it to be Banned because people aren't really talking about HOW it could be cut down, if they were to choose this.....but now they are, so dont worry =Dcarry on

30/09/2005 13:44:00

linzi

higgs

i defo agree wid u higgs thats a well gud point well dun!!!

30/09/2005 13:45:00

beckiforsey

well in higgins thats amazin

thats a very good point!!! agree 100% higgs well in!!!

30/09/2005 13:45:00

tomyoung

R A W R ! ! !

OH HAPPY DAYZ (OH HAPPY DAYZ)

WHEN PEOPLE SMOKE (WHEN PEOPLE SMOKE)

THEY TOKE AND CHOKE (TOKE AND CHOKE)

OH.....HAPPY DAAAAAAAAYYYYYZZZZ!!

SMOKING SHOULDNT B BANNED

CUZ.....i dont smoke but my m8's do SO.....

OOOOOOOOHHHHHH.....OH HAPPY DAYZZZZZ!!!!!!

30/09/2005 13:47:00

higgs

linzi

thanks you linzi glad im appreciated

30/09/2005 13:47:00

cheesy625

coxjam

yea thats good thinkin coxy, they should be given money to build an EXTRA room, just for smokers.

this would stop smoke getting to the places were people are eatin, and then the pub or restuarant

would loose any money. i think this should manly happen in restuarants becuae in restuarants

people only go to eat food. in pubs people go to drink and socialise.

30/09/2005 13:48:00

tomyoung

I AGREE WIV LEWIS!!!

.....

30/09/2005 13:48:00

beckiforsey

tom

nice song tom good point!!

30/09/2005 13:49:00

linzi

gd point tim young

lol oh happy days!!!! lol hehe thts a gud song but it ent as gud as myn b bexs tho!!!!!!

30/09/2005 13:49:00

hatherallvic

hmmm

i dont smoke, but i can easily say that it is hard for the smoker to just give up smoking, so i agree with lindzi and becky and claire, because you can't just tell a smoker to stop smoking just because you, (not aimed at anyone in particular) dont like it. That smoker needs to find a way to cut down smoking, because they aren't allowed to smoke in public. Even if people dont agree or agree that it should be banned, we need to think about both the smoker and the non-smoker.....good song tom as well=D

30/09/2005 13:49:00

salad

Re: Higgs

Yea we all die, but... why shorten that which is already short? incase you cant figure that one out, its life.

30/09/2005 13:49:00

bumblebee

Re ZoeR

Why should the non-smoker have to move away if they are unhappy with people smoking around them? Smokers are in the minority and are the ones choosing to do something that makes others unhappy. I think that smokers should have to move away, not the other way round.

30/09/2005 13:50:00

minx

tomyoung

love it! tats well gd lol

i dnt fink smoking shld b banned either, its a social thing you do when your out with friends lol i dont see the point in banning it

30/09/2005 13:50:00

finchmic

Cheesy and Coxjam

Good point lads. this would mean that non-smokers could have a place that is smoke free and then wouldnt damage their health. This is a good compromise.

30/09/2005 13:50:00

elaine30

smoking

I think that if a smoker is outside then it doesn't effect a non-smoker that much! I also think that it is up to the pub or restaurent if they allow smoking and if a non-smoker doesn't want to be around smokers they will go to a pub or restaurant that doesn't allow smoking.

30/09/2005 13:51:00

gslade

agreement

I totally agree with coxjam and mint cheesy. If there is a solution to the problem that is probably the only one that the government can enforce and then make smoking in public places safe for people who dont like being around smokers!! gud thinkin u guys!!!

30/09/2005 13:51:00

linzi

vicki

thanx 4 agreein wid our points hunni lol xxxx

30/09/2005 13:51:00

hatherallvic

salad...

its up to that smoker whether they want to shorten their life or not, thats their own personal choice, they have to make it not anyone else.

30/09/2005 13:52:00

tomyoung

I KINDA AGREE WIV YA COXY
ON THE SMOKIN ROOM BIT BUT.....SMOKIN OUTSIDE IS ALL GD BUT IN
PUBS/RESTURANTS ITS THE LANLORDS CHOICE. ANYWAYS IF THERE WAS A ROOM
PEOPLE WOULD FEEL UNCOMFORTABLE, THEY WOULDNT EAT AT THE RESTURANT THEN.

30/09/2005 13:52:00

crazychick

re zoe r

yeah thats true but the none smokers , shouldnt have to breath in other ppls smoke . Even though i smoke my self i still think that it should be banned in resturants ! or have like a wall between the smoking and none smokers cause even if they have a none smokers part they can still breath in there smoke !

30/09/2005 13:52:00

minx

salad

its up to people of they want to smoke or not so then its up to them if they want to shorten their life. its a decision that is unique to everyone so you shouldnt criticise peoples choices!!

30/09/2005 13:53:00

higgs

salad

because its ur own descion!! its an act of freewill!

incase u didnt know we all have freewill.... we all use it differently..... be respectful sald!! ur being disrespectful to smokers,its their descion, they make it, thier life! even if it does shortne their life, u dont know the full extent behind tehir actions, eg living a life of stress eg.....
myb we hould bann alcho!!! that cause liver damage, and death!!!

30/09/2005 13:53:00

finchmic

higgs

Back to the point about a 'driving ban'. I understand where you are coming from but you cant, for obvious reasons,ban driving!!!!!!

30/09/2005 13:54:00

cheesy625

me n coxy

we rule mate lol, i think this is what should happen, they should build an extra room that is no were near the enterance and away from the eating area. this room would also have to be well ventillated and the smoke level should be checked reguarly.

30/09/2005 13:54:00

ockwellnat

reply to zoe

we shouldnt have to go home just becouse you want to have a fag, at the end of the day you should go out side to smoke as you are the ones putting the harm onto us, your choosing to smoke and were not so we shouldnt have to go home or out side just becouse you dont mind harming yourself and others around you.

30/09/2005 13:55:00

chloem

RE minx

true. but i think that people should be made to respect others by not smoking around people that dont want to be smoked by.

30/09/2005 13:56:00

prettypunk182

smoking ban

This smoking ban is not asking people to quit smoking, it is just asking them not to smoke in public places. Which i think is not too much to ask. But then again im a non-smoker and im sure smokers will have a completely opposite opinion.

There should be specialised areas in which people can smoke and where they cannot.

I don't think smokers should just be able to smoke where they please because the smoke is not just effecting them but others around them too, this includes young children, pregnant women, older generations, and all of these people could be seriously harmed by other's smoke. I think smoking in public is selfish as the smoker is obviously not thinking about those around them, just themselves.

30/09/2005 13:56:00

finchmic

minx

i agree that it is up to people whether they smoke or not but you got to realise the effects smoking has on other people. NOT JUST YOURSELF!!!

30/09/2005 13:57:00

gslade

finchmic!!!

probably 4 the first time in the whole of this debate i do actually agree wiv u. They cant exactly ban drivin because no-one will agree with the ban and then eventually u the government will probably have to bring back drivin. Gud point im afraid to say finchmic lol !!!!!!!!!

30/09/2005 13:57:00

ZoeR

re: ocellnat

yes its fair to have sum places where we cant smoke but smokers shouldn't be put down because they smoke! and if were walking down the street we should be able to have a fag as the people can move around u away from the smoke if they dnt like it.

30/09/2005 13:58:00

tomyoung

I DONT AGREE FINCH

I DONT AGREE ON WAT UR ON ABOUT, TOTALLY UNCALLED FOR. EXTRA ROOMS IN RESTURANTS IS BAD. (JUST 4 SMOKERS). NO-ONE WOULD EAT THERE BRUV M8.

30/09/2005 13:58:00

salad

You probably know but...

It sounds like some people think thers going to be an out and out ban on smoking all together, Its just for public places.

Oh and higgs with the driving ban and evrything, I'd much sooner get hit by a car and experience a quick, mostly painful death than have lung cancer and know whats going to happen, and experience pain. Alot of pain.

Besides smoking related illnesses kill more people per year than any road accident, that includes cars and lorries if your really unlucky.

You heard about Heart disease right? Well guess what, It's the UK's biggest killer and can anyone tell me what its connected to ALSO by scientific proof? anyone? I think you probably got a clear answer in your head.

30/09/2005 13:59:00

minx

chloem

yea ok thats fiar enough, but then if you dont like smoking and dont want to breahte it in then maybe those who dont want to smoke can move aswell! its not just up to the smokers whether 2 move or not, they've gone out to have some fun with friends or whatever and so dont want to be rude and get up and move away just to have a fag, its the whole point in having smoking and non smoking areas!! if you dont like smoking, tough, deal with it!

30/09/2005 13:59:00

hatherallvic

....hmm...agen

yeh true, its up to the person whether they ruin there own lives, and that the non -smokers shud be considered as well, but that is why there are non-smoking areas around. They have tried to make both sides happy, however...it seems this isn't enough...hmm, we all need to think how we could resolve this for everyone, so everyone can be happy.....any ideas?

30/09/2005 14:00:00

higgs

finchmic

y not??? y not but use a metaphor to see smoking the same as driving?? y not ban?? do u feel it would be a disadvantage?? because putting ur self in a smokers position they feel at a disadvantage! surley u see where i am coming from

30/09/2005 14:00:00

dirt_jumper4life

to finchmic

wot are you on about are you saying that we hav to ask everyone around us if they mind before we spark up that is stupid we will hav to start asking after our fag to hav the next one in the next half hour. ill repeat its stupid

30/09/2005 14:00:00

crazychick

re zoe

TO RIGHT why do ppl always put smokers down its up to them if they wnt to smoke or not xx

30/09/2005 14:00:00

ockwellnat

nats

i agree with you prettypunk. smokers dont just have to quit because of us non-smokers but should respect our feelings as we dont want to breath in there fumes, if we wanted to harm our bodies and smell like ash trays then we would take up smoking aswell and its not just us they are harming they are harming younger children.

30/09/2005 14:02:00

connie

smoking in pubs without food

i think its right not to ban smoking in places where food is not served (i.e. some pubs) as most people smoke in these places. Smoking where food is served doesn't really happen anyway as they are too busy eating?!?!

30/09/2005 14:02:00

finchmic

ZoeR

Why should people have to move away from you. Why not the other way around. Smokers Move away from non-smokers. I dont believe that anyone should have to move away from anyone that is why if smokin was banned in PUBLIC PLACES then this wouldnt mean people moving away from others.

30/09/2005 14:02:00

smashingpumpkin256

Free will

If you wanted to jump of a cliff, then you shouldn't be allowed to force someone else to do the same. If you wanted to cut off your leg, you shouldn't be allowed to force someone to do the same. You make decisions for yourself, not for anyone else. So why should you be allowed to smoke around other people?

30/09/2005 14:02:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Prettyandpunk182

i agree with what you are saying... My dad is a smoker but he would prefer the ban to be in place, if we ever go out for a meal he won't smoke. he feels its a rude jesture to smoke in front of people that potentially donot like it!!

30/09/2005 14:03:00

higgs

salad

yet again i urge u to respect what people are saying salad?? u think being hit by a car is an easy painfree death.... well think again!!!! soem1 extremely close to me in my family was hit by a car and

no,,,,, it wasnt painfree!! at least smokers get the choice , it their choice., this 4 year old didnt!!!
smokers decide whetherthey want to continue, but dont compare it salad

30/09/2005 14:03:00

gslade

salad

im thinkin that you want a complete ban on smokin in public places. But i must say that it is wrong to smoke in restaurants but i think that it wud be alright for smokin in pubs and non smokers shud go to a different room.

30/09/2005 14:06:00

salad

WEEE RAMPAGE

ALSO as for all this "It's my right" chat yes you have that right, dont abuse it, On average 1 in 5 15 yearolds and older smoke, thats 20% that means theres 80% who may not want a single thing to do with smoking, if this was a game of odds smokers would be flattened, be gratefull you got the choices you have at the moment, loosing the ability to smoke in a few public areas sounds alot better than what could quite easily happen; an out and out ban, no smoking nothing of the sort. If you were going to end up hating all these pressures that may come with smoking why di you start? thats what really confuses me! why do people of this age, who have all the facts start.

30/09/2005 17:41:00

Levitica

A few replies (I didn't really all the

"if u dnt like the fact that some people smoke then dont just complain about it and stand there breathing in the smoke and everything, move away."

If you're at school, or walking on your way to school through a crowd of smoking people, you don't have that choice, do you?

To all the people talking about quitting smoking and the poor diddumses who don't have enough "willpower": What on earth is will power anyway? If you don't want to smoke, you don't smoke. It's that simple. The problem of giving up is that you really want to smoke, not that your body is pushed towards a cigarette and made to light it up. If someone wants to not smoke, they won't smoke.

Most people who "try anf fail to give up" do so because they want to quit, at times, less than they want a cigarette.

Personally, I think those people who think they have natural "low will power" and say they can't give up smoking deserve to have all the health problems that come with smoking for being so pathetic.

07/10/2005 13:20:00

hatherallvic

giving up

I don't smoke, but im guessing from peoples opinions and facts that it may be hard to give up smoking. If you have been smoking for a long time and have got into some sort of routine or have got addicted to it, i guess it is hard to quit, but i suppose its true that if you really wanted to give up you would

07/10/2005 13:21:00

dirt_jumper4life

smoking

smoking shouldn't band if people have a problem with it they know where to go

07/10/2005 13:22:00

finchmic

Salad

Very Good point salad. Be gratefull that you have the choice to smoke.

07/10/2005 13:22:00

smashingpumpkin256

Will power

I think it is unfair to call people who say they have low will power "pathetic". There are possibly lots of psychological reasons why people can't give up smoking as well as physical reasons. The nicotine makes it physically addictive, but some people think that they can't get through a day without a cigarette.

07/10/2005 13:23:00

hatherallvic

plus..

plus i think it isnt pathetic that people find it hard to give, if it was pathetic..why do doctors and hospitals give out help and advice to people who want to give up..i personally dont think that helping someone in need is pathetic

07/10/2005 13:24:00

minx

responses

have you ever tried giving up smoking? do you know what its like to try and stop? have you ever had cravings for a fag when you've said 'never again'?

no?..... didnt think so!

how can you know when you've never tried because you've never smoked?

its not easy to give up at all! why would there be so many help lines and things to help give up if it was as easy as saying 'im not going to smoke anymore' it doesnt work like that!

ok, if you really want to give up obviously you'll try everything you can to do so, but sometimes the temptation is just too great and you cant help but feel the need for a fag!

07/10/2005 13:24:00

connie

will power

if you haven't ever smoked before you can't comment on how difficult it is to quit as you haven't actually experienced it yourself

07/10/2005 13:25:00

cheesy625

any like my lil dude?

just thought id say dont hav the ban.

07/10/2005 13:27:00

finchmic

should we follow other cities

Many other public places such as New York, Norway and Ireland all have bans in place now.

Should we follow this example?????

07/10/2005 13:28:00

gslade

to all people against ban

if people can't live with the fact that people make the decision to smoke, then the non smokers hav 2 liv with that. if non smokers cant liv with that then they know where to go!!!!

07/10/2005 13:28:00

higgs

lavitia

i find u very strong opionated, this is a good thing but..... in order to have people respect what u r sayin, u need 2 respect them, look at other peoples points of views, then tell me how u feel... from the smokers point of view?!

07/10/2005 13:30:00

salad

Higgs

Actually i said being hit by a car would be painfull, it's stupid to expect a huge stack of metal to hit you at 30-50 miles an hour and not get hurt by it.

All form of death will involve pain, how peacefull it is, is determined by the length of that pain.

Hit by a car... Well saying you die on impact, I'd say around 30 secounds or so of, probably extreme pain at the absolute most, but if you were "lucky" in a strange respect, about 5 secounds of pain.

Being diagnosed with Lung cancer, few months if it you found out late, possibly a few years if you found out early, fear for knowing whats going to happen to you, pain of the operations, pain of the disease.

And if you want to go onto family matters, how theyd feel, if someone in my family, especially if they were close was diagnosed with cancer, caused by smoking... I'd have a sense of hate for them, how they gave their life away ignoring how it may effect me and others. If they were hit by a car, it would be a clean break, horrible emotions but all for a short time compared to cancer. Besides I think thats enough of the sappy moral arguments, do you actually have any real points as to why smoking should stay in all public places? why 75% of englands population should be ignored to keep 25% happy? No i know its not fair on those 25% BUT like you said your self... it was their choice.

07/10/2005 13:31:00

beckiforse

re: Levitica

dont even get me started on how easy it is to give up!!! you dont smoke and probally never have so you cant really say how easy it is to give up!! speaking from experence it is not easy to quit its not allways that you choose to stay smoking it becomes something you rely on!! people have been somkeing for a number of years and it hasnt caused to many problems. chocolate and ice cream isnt good for you but people still eat it. obesity causes many diseases and although it may not be causing harm people surrounding the eater it is still proven that the amount of money spent on ice cream and chocolate throughout the year could get the world out of poverty!! so while people are complaining about taking in a few smoke fumes that hasnt done much damage through out the past they should think about stopping all the diseses and dieing in the 3rd world contries FIRST as i think these take priorty!!!! put that in ya pipe and smoke it!!!!!!!!!!!!

07/10/2005 13:33:00

higgs

smoking

smoking is a very serious thing, it bads! Cigarettes contain disgusting things that you would never think about putting in your body. For example, cigarettes contain tar, carbon monoxide and chemicals like DDT, arsenic and formaldehyde (a gas used to preserve dead animals).

The tobacco in cigarettes also contains nicotinethe drug that makes smoking addictive. All of these things are bad for your body. Nicotine raises your risk of heart attack and stroke. Tar and carbon monoxide cause serious breathing problems. And you know tobacco smoke causes cancer.

dont start,,, try give up!!!

even though we do respect thease facts above, i respect smokers, they need help, as they see nothing wrong with their habit, and 2 be honest their isint its their choice! just.... if u smoke, think aout wot ur doing and how that extra 5 mins that a cigarette steals from your life, think baout what u can do in dat time

07/10/2005 13:33:00

fairy

...something different...

As we are talking of the ban of smoking in public places...has anyboddy considered banning smoking whilst driving??? Already a ban has been set on mobile phones in cars!! Smoking in cars seems to be just as bad...there are many more risks. Just think... you aree driving along in your car, with one hand on the wheel, cigarette in the other and for some reason u have to put ur breaks on in a panic...the ciggarette drops from your hand, and there is nothing you can do about it, because u are unable to pick it up as it will distract your driving. We are talking about a vehicle full of extremely flammable fluid!!!! Why is nothing being done about this???????

07/10/2005 13:39:00

chloem

RE hatherallvic

very true, i think that it would be really hard for people to give up as they need cigarets. however i think people do need to give up so the government should spend more money on giving people help to give up this would help alot of people.

07/10/2005 13:39:00

hatherallvic

hmm

i personally think that levitica was wrong to call people pathetic, because no body should be called that when they are trying their best to quit and find help =)

07/10/2005 13:40:00

prettypunk182

hatherallvic

I definatly agree with vicky that smokers find it hard quitting, i am also a non smoker but many of my friends smoke and find it hard to quit. The ban would prevent smokers from smoking as much as they are used to smoking, which would be a good thing for all of those people who want to give up. But this ban is not asking people to give up, it is merely asking them to respect non smokers around them.

07/10/2005 13:42:00

cheesy625

finchmic

no we shouldnt follow them, we r a different country n we dont have 2 do everythin every1 else does. i think it shud b banned in restuarants but not anywere else.

07/10/2005 13:43:00

minx

.....

right, i will be blunt with you leviticia you havnt smoked so how can you know what its like to give up?!!!!

dont go around calling people pathetic just for asking for help because they cant deal with it on their own.

people smoke for different reasons, sometimes because they think its cool, other times because of stress and they need a way to unwind and relax.

everyone has their reasons just like you have different ways of looking 'cool' or 'relaxing' so dont have a go at other people just because they choose to do something differently!

07/10/2005 13:44:00

gslade

make a decision

there are lots of decisions that can be made about this smokin ban!!!! people hav the right to whether or not they want to smoke.

I dont mind the smokers around me because I get used to the smoke but all the people who dont like the smell of smoke around them they shud just get away from the so called 'dangerous smoke' which really hasnt affected me in anyway!!!!

if there is a ban it will gotten rid of within a matter of seconds becoz of the complaints made by smokers and people who dont mid the smoke around them.

07/10/2005 13:45:00

tomyoung

DIRT JUMPER 4 LIFE

i-agree-wiv-wat-ur-sayin-bruv--people-that-hate-smokin--hate-smokers--like-you-said-bruv-mate-they-no-where-to-go-init-

07/10/2005 13:45:00

hatherallvic

=D

thank you abby. Im sure smokers..if they have been smoking for a long time would find it hard to give up...=D

07/10/2005 13:47:00

cheesy625

whats the point

can any1 tell me wat is the point of doin this, no1 is guna listen to wat we say. they government r guna decided if there is a ban or not, so i dont see the point of doin this

07/10/2005 13:47:00

higgs

salad

i c ur point , but yet again your 2 opinionated, u neglect the sensitivity of others around u , feeling that jst becus a member of family smokes they r being selfish, for once stop revolving the argument around u, think of that member of family!! y did they smoke?? how did they feel, how many times did they give up? how many times salad?? people who smoke rnt jst trying to be cool, they feel that they NEED the cigarette!!! buyt have u ever asked ur self y?, have they become dependant, r

they depressed, our they? so stop with me me me , they r selfish, think about them, y do dey do,it if u want the real answer if u have to dig futher beneath the surface because usually we only c what is afloat, what has sunk is futher down in a deep mist of blue..... try digging for the answer

07/10/2005 13:48:00

salad

Levitica

Levitica has some good points, shes a little more fighting spirit than others but what she says is a harsh truth, remeber, all these psychology and hospital help services are quite recent, thousands of people quit befoe they came around. We're building a situation that actually convinces people they need help to quit and submerges them into more comfort with thinking " It's ok to keep going, someone will stop me" No. They wont only you can.

But as i said I dont wanna sound like i want to kill anyone that smokes near me, I have friends that smoke its their choice, cant say i realy respect it but then again its their choice all the same. If something happens to their health as a result i'll be very dissappointed but still treat them just as i would normally.

But there are alot of people out their that think differently and as unfair to smokers as it is they are the majority. Did you know that the biggest voting population are the ederly, and many of them dont have happy thoughts about smoking, if they dont want it, they dont get it. Keeps them happy for the next ellection y'see?

Also i dont want an out and out ban, I dont even want all public places to ban it really, just bring the availability down.

07/10/2005 13:48:00

coxjam

Gslade

i dont agree with u gary.the smoke is dngerous and this has been proven because they say that when u around other smokers it takes 1 hour off your life.so not only are the smokers killing themselves, they r killing other people.they should have a ban and then less people will die from passive smoking.

07/10/2005 13:48:00

craigybaby

no bannnn

NOOOOOOOO! bannnnn

07/10/2005 13:48:00

hatherallvic

the ban

i don't think that smoking should be banned completely. We should get back to disscussing about areas that are non-smoking areas, and introducing more places like this in pubs resturants and other public areas.....hmmm im confuzzled

ockwellnat

..

yoyoyoyoyo smokin is bad

07/10/2005 13:49:00

connie

smoking in cars

i do think smoking in cars is bad especially if u are a passenger and have to breathe in the fumes and it is in a very confined space.

07/10/2005 13:49:00

higgs

finch

i agree with ur comment, we should revolve our desions around other countries! we live as individuals, with different ways and times

07/10/2005 13:49:00

gslade

cheesy625

i totally agree with what ur sayin about the following of another country stuff. i think that if we follow

another countries we will get loads of stick from people from other countries because they think we can't come up with ideas for ourselves!!!!

07/10/2005 13:49:00

bumblebee

fairy

I completely agree with you that smoking while driving should be banned. In fact, I think that smoking in the car at all should be banned because of the flammable liquid inside.

07/10/2005 13:51:00

finchmic

cheesy

I was just asking on people's opinions. DONT SHOOT THE MESSENGER!!! I feel the same as you, smoking should be banned in public places. but I don't mind if smoking is banned or not outdoors or in people's homes as it doesn't affect the majority of non-smokers

07/10/2005 13:51:00

connie

gov

I agree I don't think the government will listen most of us aren't even legally allowed to smoke

07/10/2005 13:53:00

salad

Cheesy

Heheh yea good one, you're probably right. But still I'm enjoying my little moral and political argument fits

07/10/2005 13:53:00

gruff

Decision Makers

If you check out the back up section under who is listening you will see that you are being listened to and your views will be put forward to MPs and decision makers. You have a right to be consulted and asked your opinion on stuff that affects you - smoking and other people smoking does affect you....

07/10/2005 13:54:00

hardenhuish

what's the point

It's a shame, Cheesy625, that you feel this way. This is a good start to get your ideas across. Perhaps you need to think about how else you could make your ideas known. Have you contacted your own MP directly. One of the reasons why decisions are made seemingly regardless of what people think is because people complain about things without expressing their ideas to the actual people who make the decisions. This is one way of doing that, but only one way! We all need to think about what else we can do to ensure that the correct decisions are made.

07/10/2005 13:54:00

fairy

re:gslade

That is not how it works...it's not about reputation and whether we can think up our own ideas, it's about what is best for the country and the people in it... it's the real world not a school playground, it's not one big popularity competition.

07/10/2005 13:55:00

tomyoung

DIRT JUMPER 4 LIFE

I agree wiv wat ur sayin bruv, people that hate smokin, hate smokers, like you said they no where to go. I think cheesy is rite wiv the is there any point thing.

07/10/2005 13:55:00

gslade

government

the government will eventually ban the smoking ban if it's put in place so what's the point of making

up the ban in the first place!!!! wats the point of this ban anyway it wont stop smokers from smoking!!!

07/10/2005 13:59:00

tomyoung

hardenhuish

i agree wiv the bit bout if no ones listenin to u, then contact ur MP but wat kid are age is guna contact r MP bout smokin. Alot of people my age is smoke n the MP's aint guna listen to em!!

07/10/2005 14:00:00

smashingpumpkin256

Getting your voice heard

The problem with many people who complain that they don't get heard and that anything that they do will not make a difference is that they don't try hard enough to make their voice heard. They could try and persuade other people towards their point of view for example. If you communicate with the people who actually make the decisions you are getting your voice heard.

07/10/2005 14:01:00

cheesy625

hardenhuish

for starters i duno who my mp is (i live in marshfield, south gloustershire), and they wont listen to younger teenages like us becuase we are not even legal to smoke. also if the local mp dose listen to wat i say, the goverment wont listen, they will just do wat they want to.

07/10/2005 14:01:00

higgs

tom young

i think your being a bit overrated to non smokers, its very steriotypical 2 say non haters hate smokers, thats not true

07/10/2005 14:02:00

salad

Tom young

He who dares wins. Thats a lil saying for ya, basically you dont know if they listen if you dont ask and when you ask i think they have to listen.

07/10/2005 14:02:00

dirt_jumper4life

to mim

i think that you are right in everyfing u say and i think that the levita person is completely wrong cause she dont no what its like

07/10/2005 14:02:00

gslade

re:fairy

the problem is that the government doesnt know what is best for the country. noone will isten to you if you want to make a suggestion they just make the decisions by themselves and they cant figure out what is the best solution and this is why this smoking ban is rubbish!!!!

07/10/2005 14:02:00

connie

re: fairy

i agree, other countries don't need to be involved on whether the government are banning smoking in public places. thats going off the point a bit

07/10/2005 14:02:00

chilli

MPs are listening....

Hey, this forum is where young people like you get to have your opinions heard - check out some of the earlier posts - MPs have posted and will visit this site later to read them and comment. After the forum closes all the comments are put together and sent to MPs so we do make sure you are being listened too. When we get feedback from them it is posted, so you will get to see that too if

you revisit the site.

07/10/2005 16:04:00

justice

Thank you

It seems a shame to close this Forum but that's the way it goes unfortunately.

But what a debate it has been!

You should all be proud of yourselves. You made your points, used evidence, asked questions, tried different viewpoints and came up with practical solutions - all around a set of very difficult and controversial issues. That's no small achievement!

Those MPs who agreed to provide feedback afterwards have certainly got a lot to chew over.

Watch this space!

The next Forum is on the subject of Anti-social behaviour which begins on November 21st.

Hope to see you there.

Forum Topic Transcript

You decide...

Financial implications...

19/09/2005 08:56:00

justice

Subject: Welcome to the smoking debate..

The Government is currently consulting on whether smoking in public places should be banned. Key decision-makers in Parliament are following this debate very closely and are extremely interested in what you have to say – see who's listening

(http://www.headsup.org.uk/content/default.asp?page=s88_1)

The health of the nation and rising NHS costs are topics of hot contention for 21st Century Britain. But what are the financial implications of the ban on society? Should it concern us? The ban would significantly reduce the amount of taxes the government could collect – so where could this money come from?

Can we have an impact on smoking in public places?

Can we make the situation better? Can we make it worse?

What's your take on it?

19/09/2005 15:36:00

Mole

Subject: Businesses

Why can't the owners of pubs and restaurants be allowed to decide themselves whether to allow smoking or not? If they make it clear on the door, people can decide whether to go there or somewhere else. That way the owners can decide what is best for their business.

19/09/2005 22:34:00

Levitica

Subject: Financial Implications

How will a ban on smoking in "public places" have an effect on the amount of tax money collected? Almost all people who smoke would still smoke if there was a ban in place; they'd just step outside if they had gone out for a meal. They won't smoke considerably less as people don't spend much time in these places (apart from workplaces, but most people cannot smoke whilst working any way.) The amount of cigarettes sold will not drop far enough for it to cause financial issues for the government. It could be very bad for businesses whose direct competitors have a smoking license whereas they don't, though.

19/09/2005 22:57:00

Levitica

Subject: In Reply to Mole:

In reply to Mole: That is the case at the moment. Businesses do have the right to demand that their establishment remains smoke free. In some types of businesses, family restaurants (Pizza Hut, for example) it is a common thing, but in other businesses, such as pubs, there's just not enough demand for a business to wish to turn smoke free, so the government are proposing to force them too. The natural step from the present situation is not to force the businesses to go smoke free with a ban but to encourage smoke free businesses, possibly by making a business pay for an expensive smoking licence, but that would most likely force small pubs, like local pubs, out of business, unless they had to pay a certain proportion of their business's worth.

20/09/2005 19:18:00

eranny70

Subject: Levitica

If people in the UK stopped smoking altogether, the government would actually save money. The government gets £8,093 million during the 2003/04 financial year from tobacco taxation etc., but smoking costs the NHS approximately £1.5 BILLION(!) a year for treating smoking-related diseases. This is all in the Backup Section, along with the death-count and how much the government spends on prevention education (ie. advertising).

21/09/2005 11:02:00

gruff

Subject: Why so slow?

You've all made some good points... What are the reasons behind the slow transition toward a complete ban in the UK? Is it purely down to money and economics? By comparison, the Scottish Executive has already voted to introduce a complete ban by 2006.

21/09/2005 12:52:00

Levitica

Subject: Reasons Behind Ban

This step is not happening because of economics because, as I said before, no one is going to benefit economically from a ban on smoking in public places. It will not even have a noticeable effect on cigarette sales. This step is probably just a result of the pressure some people have been putting on the government.

22/09/2005 10:17:00

NickGibbMP

Subject: Cost of Smoking

On the argument about restaurants offering the choice of whether they ban smoking, the problem with this is that if the majority of restaurants still permit people to smoke, there will be no overall boost in the number of people using restaurants from those who do not like to eat in a smoky atmosphere - they will have little confidence that a particular restaurant has banned it. The boost in restaurant usage comes from the knowledge that all restaurants have banned (or have been forced to ban) smoking. Re the tax take for the government, my own calculations show that the average smoker pays about £1,500 a year in tobacco tax. Over 20 years that is about £30,000, which is far less than the cost of treating lung cancer. But I think the key issue is the effect that someone smoking has on other people. That is a far more important argument than taxation or restaurant usage. What right has someone to inflict an unpleasant and dangerous substance on those around them.

22/09/2005 12:40:00

eranny70

Subject: Re: NickGibbMP

As much as I agree with what you said about the damaging effects of passive smoking, an equal problem is that of hypocrisy: Why does the government think it can allow the selling and advertising (indirectly, as a direct tobacco advert is illegal now, but if you look carefully, there are still adverts with a cigarette pack here and there) of tobacco, a drug that does nothing for you, and tell people to "Just say no" to a drug that has only positive effects? (The same question can be applied to alcohol, but another time.)

22/09/2005 12:50:00

Levitica

Subject: NickGibb

If there was that much demand, the non-smoking pub/restaurant would be sticking it on big signs or on TV advertising. Pizza Hut, like other family type restaurants, is non-smoking. They don't think it is worth it to stick "Smoking is not permitted in our restaurants" on their TV adverts. They probably think it's not

worth it as it would mean less business for them from smokers who would then deliberately avoid going there. The key reason for this ban is the damage that's being done to people's health. You asked "What right has someone to inflict an unpleasant and dangerous substance on those around them?" When someone enters a pub or a restaurant, they are entering someone else's space. They don't have to be there, and they're perfectly welcome to leave, so the owner of that space should be able to do, within reason, what they want. They're allowed to serve these people fatty foods. Smoking should be banned in places people are actually need (to some extent) to go, like on public transport, and it could easily be argued that smoking should not be allowed in publicly owned areas.

22/09/2005 15:06:00

NickGibbMP

Subject: Restaurants

Re the response to my earlier posting. You have to change the whole ethos and reputation of restaurants as a whole to encourage those who dislike smoky atmospheres to go to restaurants. For that to happen you need a step change and that can only happen if it is banned completely. It was only when the ban was introduced in New York that you saw a large increase in the number of people eating out and a large increase in the number of restaurants. Re the hypocrisy argument, government is not just one person it consists of compromise views on a whole range of issues. Just because you may not be happy with Britain's approach to alcohol doesn't mean it cannot proceed to deal with problems arising from tobacco. I certainly do not want to ban alcohol. My two glasses of wine in the evening are hurting no-one, not even me. If people binge drink and then become violent, we already have a law against being violent and we can prosecute those who engage in it regardless of why. Smoking, on the other hand, itself causes distress and possibly harm.

22/09/2005 15:47:00

mole

Subject: Levitica's last point

I agree with Levitica's point that customer would be able to choose whether they eat at a restaurant depending on if it is a smoking or non-smoking restaurant. The restaurant makes the decision (to a point) on the health of the food they serve, and it is up to customers to choose on that basis. Has any research been done into how many people who are smokers would not eat at a non-smoking restaurant because they are not allowed to smoke and how many non-smokers would not eat at a restaurant because smoking is allowed. These trends would tell us about any real, significant financial implications on restaurants.

22/09/2005 19:28:00

eranny70

Subject: Re: NickGibbsMP

This wasn't about alcohol at all, it was about the legal status of one drug but not of others. You say the government is formed of many people with differing opinions, of course, but any decision the government makes has, presumably, been made by voting or, even better, consensus. So in effect any law passed by a government is the majority's opinion. I'll try and make my questions clearer next time.

22/09/2005 20:31:00

Levitica

Subject: Nick Gibb

If I eat in a pub, I find the atmosphere very unpleasant. This is not because of the smoking, but because of drunken people (men, to be honest.) They may not have damaged my health, but I suppose they've damaged my "mental wellbeing" a few times. That is why I'd choose not to eat in a pub or a restaurant on a Friday night. (Note: I most definitely wouldn't support a ban on drinking in these places.) I still disagree with you, any ways. Pubs and restaurants, for the most part, know what's going to get them business. If there was this huge market, surely one or two of them would have picked up on it? They know how to get their message out.

23/09/2005 13:38:00

dirt_jumper4life

Subject: Financial implications

How will a ban on smoking in "public places" have an effect on the amount of tax money collected? Almost all people who smoke would still smoke if there was a ban in place; they'd just step outside if they had gone out for a meal. They won't smoke considerably less as people don't spend much time in these places (apart from workplaces, but most people cannot smoke whilst working any way.) The amount of cigarettes sold will not drop far enough for it to cause financial issues for the government. It could be very bad for businesses whose direct competitors have a smoking license whereas they don't, though.

23/09/2005 13:40:00

minx

Subject: hmm.....

i dnt fink smokin shld b banned as its up 2 the ppl who smoke where they smoke. there are non smokin n smokin areas so y cant the public jst b satisfied?! its up 2 the smokers where they smoke n it aint fair if they cant smoke in public places as it basically means that they can hardly smoke ne where!!!!!!!!!!

23/09/2005 13:40:00

prettypunk182

Subject: Second hand smoking

Well firstly i would just like to say that although smoking is bad for yours and others health it is up to the smoker whether or not they smoke. But where they smoke is a completely different issue. I've never really bothered if people smoke in public or not but after reading about second hand smoke and how it effects children, it made me think twice about smoking in public. Here are some things i found out about second hand smoking around children: Babies and children exposed to a smoky atmosphere are: Twice as likely to have asthma attacks and chest infections More likely to need hospital care in their first year of life Off sick from school more often More likely to get more coughs, colds and wheezes Medical research also shows they have: Much higher risk of cot death than the children of non-smokers Increased risk of meningitis More chance of getting ear infections and 'glue ear', which can lead to partial deafness

23/09/2005 13:43:00

coxjam

Subject: Financial Implications

I dont think that a ban on smoking will affect how much the government make. people will just smoke outside or before they go into a restaurant. i think it may affect buisnesses like pubs because people who go to pubs like to socialise and a lot of people smoke while doing this. i dont think cigarette companies will be affected by a ban becasue as i say again, people will just have to smoke else where.

23/09/2005 13:45:00

minx

Subject: hehe

i dnt care where ppl smoke, its up 2 them n i dnt av a problem wit it. if ppl dnt like bein around smokers then they shld jst move away instead of standin around n complainin bout it, tis pathetic!!

23/09/2005 13:46:00

dirt_jumper4life

Subject: responce to coxy

i dont care if the government make any money or not i think that if people want to smoke they should be aloud to smoke where they want and no one should complain

23/09/2005 13:48:00

bumblebee

Subject: Money

Can I just add to the financial savings of the government that the fines from people caught smoking in public places and pub/restaurant owners not enforcing the law would also make up for the loss of tobacco sale taxes.

23/09/2005 13:54:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Subject: MPs -Government Funding

I understand that the Government aquires alot of tax from cigarette purchases, how will the government Equilibrate the loss of money from the cigarette purchases if the ban goes ahead?

23/09/2005 13:55:00

chloem

Subject: cures

i think that the ban of smoking would mean more money for the government as other people have said. also as less money would go to treating diseseases caused by smoking more money could be better spend in the NHS, for example towards finding new cures and vacines.

23/09/2005 13:56:00

elaine30

Subject: Money

I dont think that the government will make more money! This is because you will only be able to fine a person for smoking in a public place if you catch them and there are so many people that smoke in England that every few people will be caught.

23/09/2005 13:57:00

prettypunk182

Subject: yuh but what about the children?!

Okay, so people like to smoke where ever they please, but for non-smokers it's not so pleasant. And especially for babies and young children, i mean they don't choose to smoke, so they shouldn't have to!! What about the children!??

23/09/2005 14:05:00

fairy

Subject: Hmm yes

I agree completely with prettypunk182. Children and others who are non smokers, smoke whether they like it or not. Shuldn't people have the choice whether they smoke or not? It's all very well people choosing to smoke, but they are not giving others that choice. People are aware that smoking is not only harmful to yourself but to others too, by banning smoking in public places, it doesn't stop people from smoking, it just protects people who don't.

23/09/2005 14:05:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Subject: RE: Pretty Punk 182

I agree with you completly, young children may not like whats going on but dont have the ability to distance them selves from whats going on. these children aren't protected, if smoking isnt banned then babies health might be at risk and what about pregnant women?

23/09/2005 14:55:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Subject: RE: Fairy

I agree completly esp. the last part THE BAN WILL NOT STOP PEOPLE SMOKING AND ALSO HELP PROTECT THOSE WHO ARE AGAINSY PASSIVE SMOKING every1s a winner arnt they?

23/09/2005 16:14:00

Levitica

Subject: People's rights...

You say people have the right to choose whether or not they breathe in tobacco smoke. Do we not have the right to choose whether or not we breathe in fumes from vehicles?

23/09/2005 16:23:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Subject: RE to above

yes, people should have the right to choose if they are in the situation of passive smoke. With vehicle fumes most cars are fitted with filters that supplies a, maybe small but, barrier against the brunt. what protection do people have against passive smoke?

23/09/2005 16:57:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Subject: Social Disadvantages

we are all aware that underage smoking goes on! 80% of smokers start in their teens, 450 children start smoking everyday, and 1/5 15year olds are regular smokers. if the ban is in place wouldnt this reduce the places in which children can smoke?

23/09/2005 17:08:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Subject: woops missed out abit

70% of current smokers would like to give up smoking all together so with this ban in place they would have less oppertunitites to smoke which will help motovate them to give-up. if smoking is entirly banned wouldn't the people that have abided by this law benifit? not only by health reasons but they would be

saving alot of money not smoking. if average smokers smoke 20-a-day then and the average cost of 20 cigeretts is £4.50 then that would make an indeividual saving of: £1642.50 a year and a nationwide saving of £19 710 million a year.

23/09/2005 21:31:00

Levitica

Subject: Replying...

"we are all aware that underage smoking goes on! 80% of smokers start in their teens, 450 children start smoking everyday, and 1/5 15year olds are regular smokers. if the ban is in place wouldnt this reduce the places in which children can smoke?" No. How much of her time does an average 14 year old girl spend in resteraunts and pubs? Almost 100% of teenage smoking is done in the streets or at school. Incidentally, I think smoking should definitely be banned in schools. I'm forced to go to school so I feel I should not be smoked all over while I'm there.

26/09/2005 14:02:00

Dougydude

Subject: Statistics

Thing is, we know what the statistics are, and knowing them won't change anything. What do YOU think the government should and can do about smoking

26/09/2005 16:36:00

biged

Subject: story so far...

There has been some impressive discussion taking place on the Forum. To sum up in a nutshell, your thoughts on the financial implications of the ban are that...

* The implementation of smoking fines, and subsequent collection was raised as a concern for some of you

* You were discussing where the government might collect the tax shortfall that it previously collected from smokers and the tobacco industry.

Can we have an impact on smoking in public places?

Can we make the situation better?

Can we make it worse?

26/09/2005 18:33:00

dipsy

Subject: the poor peeps

Alot of people will be ifected if smoking is banned in public places. The people selling cigerettes from machines will be out of job, and eventually most of the smoking empire commpany.

26/09/2005 18:55:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Subject: Replying to Levitica

but isnt a school a public place? therefore with the bill in place it would definatly be banned although it is my school anyway! also are pubs and restaurants the only PUBLIC places that the smoking ban will be in place? isnt the street just as public? peoples argument to that maybe that the street has lots of fresh air around but isn't it where the majority of passive smoking is taken place? also markets are held in the street if your at the food selling parts of the market smoking there should be banned and in other stalls there could be smokers! people may also say that in the street you have the freedom to move away from the smokers, but not at a bus stop! although on buses there is a no smoking policy shouldnt this also become law?

27/09/2005 17:35:00

TimLoughtonMP

Subject: Restaurants should ban smoking

If there really is such a demand for smoke free pubs and restaurants then landlords are missing a trick and should be tapping into a potentially lucrative gap in the market and doing it voluntarily. Indeed, that is what is happening already. We should encourage this and importantly, premises allowing access to children should be smoke free. Simply banning it everywhere and forcing people to retreat into the confines of their own homes to light up, in front of their families, could be counterproductive.

28/09/2005 13:06:00

Levitica

Subject: Reply

"but isnt a school a public place? therefore with the bill in place it would definatly be banned although it is my school anyway!" They're not banning smoking in public places. Their "ban on smoking in public places" means that they are banning smoking in pubs or resteraunts where food is prepared. Not the same! " although on buses there is a no smoking policy shouldnt this also become law?" Buses have smoking banned because being on a smoky bus would be very unpleasent as it is such a closed in space. (But the buses make up for the clean air inside the bus by pumping out their vehicle fumes to everyone outside...)

28/09/2005 13:09:00

Levitica

Subject: Reply

"If there really is such a demand for smoke free pubs and restaurants then landlords are missing a trick and should be tapping into a potentially lucrative gap in the market and doing it voluntarily. Indeed, that is what is happening already. We should encourage this and importantly, premises allowing access to children should be smoke free. Simply banning it everywhere and forcing people to retreat into the confines of their own homes to light up, in front of their families, could be counterproductive." I agree with this, defintely. A step before a ban would be to make it more attractive for businesses to go smoke free by adding some sort of tax or expensive license (price related to the amount of business the pub gets) people must buy to have smoking allowed in their business, so for the most part it would not be worth it. A ban on children being in smokey premises is a good idea... I can't help feel sorry for the children whose parents wouldn't take them out anymore because of that rule though.

30/09/2005 13:29:00

connie

Subject: RE

I doubt that that would be the case, just because there is a ban on smoking in public places parents who smoke wouldn't necessarily stop taking them to these places. i doubt that parents would smoke anywhere in these places as it is generally not very social to smoke in these places. ie pubs and restaurants. It may even have a good effect on them by showing that smoking is so bad for ur health that has been banned in these places.

30/09/2005 13:36:00

elaine30

Subject: no tax

There should not be a tax for pubs or restaurants, if they allow smoking in there premisis, as it would only be volintary for a pub or club to become non-smoking.

30/09/2005 13:50:00

smashingpumpkin256

Subject: Taxes on pubs

Although I am generally against smoking in public, I believe that there should not be a tax for pubs who allow smoking because it will mean that smokers won't have anywhere outside their own home to smoke. If we gave pubs which allowed smoke special tax benefits, all pubs would allow smoking, therefore all pubs should have the same allowances.

30/09/2005 17:45:00

Levitica

Subject: connie

"I doubt that that would be the case, just because there is a ban on smoking in public places parents who smoke wouldn't necessarily stop taking them to these places." In my experiance, I think they would. I was deprived of Pizza Hut visits as a child.

30/09/2005 17:47:00

Levitica

Subject: Smashing pumpkin

"Although I am generally against smoking in public, I believe that there should not be a tax for pubs who allow smoking because it will mean that smokers won't have anywhere outside their own home to smoke." A lot of pups would choose to pay for smoking though, as it would get them so much more business, especially if their competitors chose not to. "If we gave pubs which allowed smoke special tax benefits," Can you explain this? I don't think being taxed is really a benefit...

03/10/2005 09:03:00

TimLoughtonMP

Subject: Re: Taxes on pubs

I agree, I think yet another tax on restaurants or pubs would be a bad idea. We have to remember that many of these places will be small businesses struggling to keep a float and they don't need to be filling out more forms and giving more money to the Government. What are your thoughts on the argument that justifies a ban by saying it would help people to give up smoking and therefore save them a considerable amount of money? My view on this is that the State should try as hard as possible not to regulate the way in which individuals spend the money they earn and that this kind of suggestion would lead to a slippery slope where a government could justify telling us not to spend our money on lots of other things.

04/10/2005 12:21:00

HotSoupMerangue

Subject: smoking

this proposed proposal of a smoking ban is in most areas a good idea. it will improve public health making a stronger country, we will not have to spend as much cash from our tax bill on surgical procedures etc. alternitavly we could look into non-dangerous cigarettes or an improved filter system??

07/10/2005 13:27:00

smashingpumpkin256

Subject: Levitica- tax benefits

When I referred to tax benefits I meant being excused from paying a full tax (e.g. income tax or property tax).

07/10/2005 13:33:00

chloem

Subject: re; hotsoupmeragne

i dont think there is really such a thing as a safe ciggaret. even if the filters are improved then there would probabbly still be some harmful things coming through

07/10/2005 13:34:00

connie

Subject: reducing cost of cigarettes

i don't think people would give up smoking just because it was banned in public places where food is served. this doesn't mean that they can't smoke in their own home outdoors so i doubt it owuld discourage them. This is probably why the government are implementing this ban as it would not affect cigarette sales in general and they do profit from this.

07/10/2005 13:40:00

bumblebee

Subject: Taxing Pubs

I personally think that the extra tax on pubs which allow smoking is a good idea. However, I suggest that they should reduce tax for those pubs that do not allow smoking, as this will be a more positive way to encourage the disallowing of smoking in pubs.

07/10/2005 13:54:00

smashingpumpkin256

Subject: Unfair taxes

But under the circumstances of the ban, it's not really fair to allow smokers nowhere to smoke outside of their own homes. If we encourage the pubs financially to ban smoking then smokers will be left with nowhere outside of their homes and the homes of their friends, which isn't fair on them, if under the circumstances we are allowing allocated smoking areas . If we had an all-out ban, however, I would agree with you.

07/10/2005 13:59:00

chloem

Subject: RE bumble bee

thats a good point i think that a positive implication would be much more effective than a negative one this would mean that a lot more pubs would want to go smoke free meaning that there would be more places for non smoking people to go

07/10/2005 16:05:00

justice

Subject: Thank you

It seems a shame to close this Forum but that's the way it goes unfortunately. But what a debate it has been! You should all be proud of yourselves. You made your points, used evidence, asked questions, tried different viewpoints and came up with practical solutions - all around a set of very difficult and controversial issues. That's no small achievement! Those MPs who agreed to provide feedback afterwards have certainly got a lot to chew over. Watch this space! The next Forum is on the subject of Anti-social behaviour which begins on November 21st. Hope to see you there.

Forum Topic Transcript

You decide...

How will the proposed ban impact upon the environment and health of people around you?

19/09/2005 08:57:00

justice

Welcome to the smoking debate..

The Government is currently consulting on whether smoking in public places should be banned.

Key decision-makers in Parliament are following this debate very closely and are extremely interested in what you have to say – see who's listening

http://www.headsup.org.uk/content/default.asp?page=s88_1

What kind of impact does smoking have, if any, on the people and environment around you?

Does it have any influence on an overall litter problem which we seem to have?

What do you think of passive smoking? See the jargon buster for explanation

http://www.headsup.org.uk/content/default.asp?page=s89_1

Are you concerned about passive smoking or not?

Who should be taking responsibility for environmental issues?

What do you think?

19/09/2005 22:49:00

Levitica

Smoking and the Environment

Smoking does not have a considerable effect on the environment, especially not when compared to traffic and such, and smoking does not cause much litter. Banning it in pubs/resteraunts will not make much more litter - perhaps a pile of filterends just near a door here and there.

I am concerned about passive smoking, but that is because I live in a smoky place, not because I've ate in a few in the last few months.

The government needs to take responsibility for environmental issues. An average citizen cannot do anything and businesses are in a smilar situation. The government should be making it easy for people to live without harming the environment. Radical but sensible things need to be done. Free public transport, much higher taxes on fuel... I'd suggest a ban on private cars, but it's a little too much for a second post. But with these high taxes, the UK economy would be seriously wrecked. Changes need to be made by many nations at a time to give them a chance at being sucessful. There is nothing anyone can do without convincing someone else to do it first.

21/09/2005 10:53:00

masterzen

Is banning smoking disproportion

What do you think of Peter Bottomley MP's question asking whether banning smoking is disproportionate, i.e. inconsistent or unbalanced? Do you agree or is the issue more complex than that?

Click here to read Peter Bottomley MP's statement in full

http://www.headsup.org.uk/content/default.asp?page=s88_1

21/09/2005 12:49:00

Levitica

Is banning smoking disproportion

Whether or not a ban on smoking in public places is disproportionate depends a lot on the reasons for banning it. If it is for environmental reasons, then it is completely disproportionate, but if it is for health reasons and to cut down on passive smoking then it is not. If, as I think the MP said in his comment, smoking is to be banned because people dislike seeing people smoking and being around smoking people, then it is probably also disproportionate. Other things are much more unpleasant to be around.

22/09/2005 10:29:00

NickGibbMP

Liberty

There is a phrase, "my liberty ends at the point where my fist touches your nose."

That applies, in my view to smoking. It is not just a question of the environment, litter or whether smoking adds to the green house effect, it is a question of freedom. People often say that as a libertarian I should be against banning smoking in public places. But I feel that my freedom is deeply infringed by other people smoking at a nearby table in a restaurant, so much so that I feel unable to go to those restaurants. and many people feel the same. It is a question of conflicting freedoms, the freedom to smoke versus the freedom to breathe clean air. I don't see why those who want the freedom to smoke have a greater right to the mantle of freedom than those of us who want the freedom to breathe in a smoke free atmosphere.

22/09/2005 12:54:00

Levitica

Nick Gibb

But what about someone with an allergy to tomatoes? If he comes in close proximity to a tomato, he will become short of breath. Should all restaurants stop using tomatoes because this man will react to them, or is it this man's responsibility to avoid restaurants where tomatoes might be served?

22/09/2005 15:09:00

NickGibbMP

Levitica

It is eating tomatoes that causes the allergy. If it were the fumes from tomatoes that were so damaging I would agree with you.

22/09/2005 15:58:00

mole

environment

I just wanted to add that when we talk about the effect that smoking has on our environment, I think that we should be careful that we don't talk about the environment as if it is something separate out there that can be damaged. Our environment is that which surrounds us including the air we breathe. To say that smoking has a small effect on climate change etc. misses the point that there is a drastic effect on other people, in the form of passive smoking. This is the issue of environment for me. If you have been in a smoky environment for a short time, you still come out with you clothes and hair smelling of smoke. This is the environment that smokers are creating for people to live in.

22/09/2005 20:39:00

Levitica

Tomatoes and the Environment

"It is eating tomatoes that causes the allergy. If it were the fumes from tomatoes that were so damaging I would agree with you."

He's my fictional person; I get to decide his allergies. He, like people who have stong peanut allergies, although I've never known what would happen if they did come into contact with a peanut (and I'm not going to experiment.) I have heard of people with allergies where they do not have to eat the thing. I'm allergic to cats. Sometimes that makes me ill, and I've never eaten one. Any way. My man can be the first ever person with such a tomato allergy. Or he can be allergic to something in common air fresheners instead.

I'm sorry, I don't really understand what you were agreeing to anyway. Do you think everyone should ban tomatoes/air fresheners?

About the environment: I don't think people's health, their smelly clothes and things inside a building would be considered as environment, so that is why my post centred more on the outside environment.

23/09/2005 13:33:00

sherdan

smoking and the environment

smoking should not be banned on the streets or in your houses, but it should be banned when it comes into the food industry, because if chefs are not allowed to smoke in the a working kitchen (because it is illegal) the people who are eating it in the restaurant should not be allowed either. when people are smoking outside of food industry does not affect the environment that much, not like other pollutants around.

23/09/2005 13:33:00

purchase

smoking and the environment

I don't think that you should try and stop smoking and I don't think you will be able to either cause cannabis is illegal to smoke in the street or anywhere but people all over the world still smoke it anyway even know they know it is against the law I think that you are just going to try make loads and loads of money by giving people fines when the law is put in place it's GREEDY

23/09/2005 13:36:00

wilson

should smoking be banned

I think that smoking should not be banned because it will then be sold in the way that drugs are already being sold among our people on the streets

23/09/2005 13:38:00

wilson

smoking legal

I agree with you entirely I think that you know what is right and smoking should stay legal

23/09/2005 13:39:00

chloem

complete ban

the ban at the moment does not really go far enough by just banning smoking in restaurants the environment for people is not greatly improved as smoking is allowed in other places. I think that there should either be a complete ban or no ban at all. if there was a complete ban it means that the environment would improve for every one including smokers.

23/09/2005 13:42:00

wilson

smoking legal

I agree with you entirely I think that you know what is right and smoking should stay legal

23/09/2005 13:42:00

sherdan

smoking and the environment

I agree with purchase because when the ban is in place the government is just being greedy, also people are not all the people are not going to stop smoking just take speeding a lot of people still do that and keep on doing that after a fine

23/09/2005 13:46:00

wilson

smoking

smoking has become a habit in the UK and there will be great disappointment if smoking should be banned

23/09/2005 13:48:00

sherdan

smoking and the environment

if smoking is going to be banned, there should be a complete ban in the country, but if that comes to it, there will be more pressure on customs because most people will try and bring back fags from other countries to sell

23/09/2005 13:49:00

wilson

smoking

banning smoking in public places is fair enough such as cafe's, restaurants E.T.C but banning smoking all together is wrong

23/09/2005 13:53:00

sherdan

smoking and the environment

if the government ban smoking in public places, there will be no more peace until smoking is legal again, because smoking is a habit mostly to adults and children, also a lot of people will be protesting over the ban of smoking in public places

23/09/2005 13:55:00

sherdan

smoking and the environment

if smoking should be banned anywhere it should only be banned in food industries not anywhere else, due to the is more harm done to the environment by burning fuel and running factory, not forgetting littering

23/09/2005 14:00:00

sherdan

smoking and the environment

if smoking is banned, some people are on about breathing in smoke free atmosphere, but that is true is some state of minds but not really, the atmosphere might be some free, but not pollution free, so what didn't banning smoking going to do

23/09/2005 14:02:00

chloem

all places

i think if the ban is enforced instead of people wanting smoking to be allowed in public places (serving food) again people will want smoking to be banned entirely in ALL public places.

23/09/2005 15:28:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Passive smoking - what I think!

I am quite conscious of passive smoking, as I love playing sport I am conscious of my health and ability. From passive smoke your lungs can be damaged and you can find it difficult to breathe during exercise and it definitely affects your cardio-vascular fitness (aerobic fitness) as I play a lot of sport I am conscious of this! Not all smokers are inconsiderate to people that are conscious of passive smoking but all should be! If this ban helps enforce this behaviour, I give it the thumbs up! What do the rest of you think about this?

23/09/2005 15:35:00

fightingforlesbianrights

litter (addition to last comment)

Litter is a problem in any shape or form. On the streets there are many fag butts left on the ground and cigarette packets and the plastic seal that covers the packets, just float in the wind in the suburbs of the towns and cities. Looking at pros and cons of smoking, is the only pro freeing the addiction?

23/09/2005 16:19:00

Levitica

A complete ban?!

To the people who talked about a complete ban: A complete ban on smoking is one of the worst ideas ever. It would cause endless crime and horror - so many people would still want to smoke, drug dealers would sell tobacco at ridiculous prices and there would be a lot of violence over it. Personally, I'd agree with legalisation of all drugs, but surely anybody can see the reasons against a complete ban on tobacco?

23/09/2005 16:28:00

fightingforlesbianrights

RE: above

i agree that a complete ban is a bad idea for some of those reasons above, if that ban was in place for PUBLIC AREAS the hobby/addiction wont be banned it can be carried out at home/in private

23/09/2005 16:50:00

fightingforlesbianrights

GLOBAL WARMING

You may be wondering what the hell am i going on about this for?

although smoking may SEEM insignificant to global warming but; worldwide 2.6 billion kg of CO2 and 5.2 billion kg of methane from smoking is given off every year!! tabacco smoke also contains over 4000 different chemical compounds which are all harmful in their own right!

23/09/2005 21:33:00

Levitica

Reply

"if that ban was in place for PUBLIC AREAS the hobby/addiction wont be banned it can be carried out at home/in private" ... and in the street, in schools, in shopping centres, outside pubs and resteraunts, in clubs, in parks, in sports centres, in bowling alleys...

26/09/2005 16:42:00

biged

story so far...

There has been some impressive discussion taking place on the Forum. To sum up in a nutshell, your thoughts on the environmental impact of the ban are that...

* The government should lead on environmental issues to make it easier for the British people to follow their example, and come to the same decisions

* The tricky question of conflicting freedoms was raised, that is the freedom to smoke versus the freedom to breathe clean air

Anyone else got something to throw into the mix?

26/09/2005 18:36:00

dipsy

there is still hope for the world

As u might no, global warming is effecting, and shortening the worlds duration every year. In 30 years time the world will b alot diferent from 2day. Global warming is mostly caused by poisoning smoke. If that is cut down then there still might be hope 4 the worlld 2 go on.

26/09/2005 19:13:00

fightingforlesbianrights

Re Levitica

What is your point from your last entry? i dont understand your veiw!

30/09/2005 13:33:00

chloem

RE dipsy

i dont think that smoking causes very much pollution infact it probbba;y causes more to the person smoking than to the environment around them. just by banning smoking in public you arnt going to have an impact on global warming.

30/09/2005 13:40:00

smashingpumpkin256

Pollution

The truth is that planes, road vehicles, and polluting factories contribute far more to air pollution than smoking. There has been a story in the news recently about how much planes, being the fastest growing travel industry, are contributing to the carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere. If it continues growing at this rate, the Government's target for reducing carbon emissions won't be met and it will actually be worse than it is now. Should we ban air travel because of the pollution?

30/09/2005 13:40:00

connie

chloe

just one smoker does not really affect the atmosphere much, but if you think about it all the smokers in the country put together creates quite a lot of pollution. As well as this regular smokers

have a cigarette several times a day. If smoking was banned altogether it would be one small step closer to decreasing pollution.

30/09/2005 13:43:00

fightingforlesbianrights

RE:chloem

if you look at my post about global warming and how much pollution is released into the atmosphere then you maybe suprised

30/09/2005 13:45:00

smashingpumpkin256

Connie

Yes, all the smokers would cause a lot of smoke and pollution so maybe we should have special designated smoking areas that can be filtered. I have seen this idea in airports in the Middle East, where after you come off the plane you can have a smoke in these big see-through plastic areas. Perhaps we can put all public smokers in these sort of areas and then purify the air?

30/09/2005 13:45:00

chloem

RE connie

i dissagre the uk is only a small country i think if there was to be any impact on the world as a whole then every single country would have to ban smoking completly. otherwise you are just wasting time saying that banning smoking in resteraunts only in the UK will decrease global warming

30/09/2005 13:53:00

fairy

hmmm

If we were banning smoking for global warming reasons, products such as aerosols would have to be banned too, also all across the world...although this would benefit the world it would open up alot more problems, and cause alot more arguments

30/09/2005 13:53:00

smashingpumpkin256

Myself

Sorry, I'd just like to clarify that it wouldn't be practical to remove the CARBON DIOXIDE from the smoke, and instead we should remove at least some of the thousands of chemicals in smoke.

30/09/2005 13:56:00

connie

smashingpumpkin reply

this is a good idea, but it restricts smokers and may make them feel caged up. Maybe filters could be installed in public places, would that reduce the likely-hood of passive smoking?

30/09/2005 17:49:00

Levitica

Smashing pumpkin

"Perhaps we can put all public smokers in these sort of areas and then purify the air?"

...That sounds extremely scary. Especially as you said "put all smokers in."

I can't agree with forcing smokers into little see through prisons, sadly enough.

07/10/2005 13:23:00

chloem

smoking rooms

putting people in special ventilated rooms would solve the problem of pollution but it would be really humiliating for every one in the see through room, i think an all out bann would be better and less humiliating.

07/10/2005 13:31:00

smashingpumpkin256

Boxing people in

It would be scary I agree, but I didn't mean that if you smoke you would be forced in to it

automatically, I meant that if you wished to smoke in public then maybe these sorts of areas could be provided as a compromise?

07/10/2005 13:31:00

sherdan

what i think

i think the goverment haves more inportant things to think about not smoking in public places, but i do believe smoking should be banned in food industrys

07/10/2005 13:38:00

sherdan

what i think

the government cant really put people who are smoking on the streets into prison because its a waste of time and also its going to cost the public money to keep them in prison also the people who makes up the government proberbly own shares in company which make and sells fags

07/10/2005 13:39:00

sherdan

smoking rooms

if they are going to put places around the cityies and towns there should be places like they have in airports

07/10/2005 13:39:00

connie

smoking rooms

this is basically the same idea as having different rooms for smoking and non-smoking but a bit more extreme. i think the idea is good behind it, it doesn't have to be a glass room tho?! that would also be quite expensive

07/10/2005 13:48:00

smashingpumpkin256

Putting smokers in jail.

I agree that putting public smokers in jail wouldn't be practical in the same way that putting litterers in jail wouldn't work because it would cost the tax-payer too much money and it would be difficult to imprison them anyway. On the spot fines would work a lot better.

07/10/2005 13:50:00

sherdan

what i think

banning smoking in the uk in public places is not worth it because there are other contrys in this world who will not have the ban of peolpe not smoking in public place, so just banning it just in the uk will not do the world any good anyway

07/10/2005 13:51:00

chloem

rooms

i think that non see through rooms would be good as every one would be happy people that dont wnat to smoke just avoid the rooma nd people that do can use the room to sociallise and smoke. also the environment would be protected. the rooms would have to be filltered though to make sure that the smoke doesn't get into the outside world

07/10/2005 13:51:00

stjimmy27

I AGREE!

i agree with smashingpumpkin, we should have smoking rooms such as the kind he saw on his holiday. this will stop cigarette smoke annoying non=-smokers.

07/10/2005 16:06:00

justice

Thank you

It seems a shame to close this Forum but that's the way it goes unfortunately.

But what a debate it has been!

You should all be proud of yourselves. You made your points, used evidence, asked questions, tried different viewpoints and came up with practical solutions - all around a set of very difficult and controversial issues. That's no small achievement!

Those MPs who agreed to provide feedback afterwards have certainly got a lot to chew over.

Watch this space!

The next Forum is on the subject of Anti-social behaviour which begins on November 21st.

Hope to see you there.
