

Arguments in Favour of Ventilation: Let's Take a Closer Look

The following quotations have been taken directly from the Fair Air Association of Canada (FAAC) and the Pub and Bar Coalition of Canada (PUBCO) websites. Upon close inspection we found their logic on second-hand smoke and ventilation to be hazy and hazardous to our health.

“If a municipality is going to create a so-called level playing field, they need to level it on every front. Some bars have parking, some don't. Some pubs have better signs than others. Some have better locations. Some have better food or better selections of draught beer. But if creating a level playing field is what's driving your local representative, they need to go all the way.” (FAAC)

- A level playing field allows for all hospitality workers in all venues to be equally protected from second-hand smoke.
- When governments regulate, for whatever reason, they must ensure that they don't unintentionally skew competition against one type of business.
- Experience has shown that when a by-law allows for designated smoking rooms (DSRs), it is usually the larger chains that have both the space and the resources to install a DSR. Smaller independent businesses, such as the “mom and pop” type establishments, can be left at a disadvantage.

“The health effects of environmental tobacco smoke are still very much up for debate. For example, a British Medical Journal study concluded that there was no link between exposure to second hand smoke and disease.” (FAAC)

- This is ridiculous! There is absolutely no scientific controversy over the health effects of second-hand smoke. The message from a sea of authoritative reports is clear, consistent and unanimous: all exposure to tobacco smoke is harmful and involuntary exposure should be eliminated.
- For the FAAC to focus on one study in isolation and to ignore the scientific body of evidence as a whole is irresponsible and misleading. The study referred to above¹ patently misused data from the American Cancer Society and is riddled with methodological errors. It was also authored by two tobacco industry consultants and was funded by US tobacco companies. A lot of money is at stake. Philip Morris and other tobacco companies have acknowledged, in previously secret documents, that smoking bans seriously harm their bottom lines. They'll go to extreme measures to try and convince society that second-hand smoke is not harmful.

“You cannot eliminate exposure to ETS in the outdoors. You cannot eliminate exposure to ETS even if you ban smoking. ETS components are everywhere. They are in food courts and on the street.” (FAAC)

¹ Enstrom, J. E. & Kabat, G. C. Environmental tobacco smoke and tobacco related mortality in a prospective study of Californians, 1960-98. *BMJ* 2003; 326: 1057-66.

- Using the FAAC's same logic, one could argue that we cannot eliminate the risk of dying in car accidents, therefore we should stop wasting money on seatbelts and airbags in cars.
- One hundred per cent smoke-free by-laws DO significantly reduce exposure to the toxic chemicals found in second-hand smoke. Many studies have been done to measure second-hand smoke concentrations in hospitality venues, both before and after smoking bans.
- One such study by James Repace, world-renown second-hand smoke expert and health physicist, measured respirable particle air pollution (RSP) and particulate polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PPAH), pollutants found in SHS that are known to increase risk of respiratory disease, cancer, heart disease and stroke.² Using post-ban indoor air concentrations as the referent, the study concluded that 90% of the RSP and 95% of the PPAH carcinogens were attributed to tobacco smoke.

“Tobacco is a legal product and roughly a quarter of Canada's adult population chooses to use it.” (FAAC)

- Alcohol is a legal product, but you can't drink and drive. Bicycles are legal products, but you can't ride them on the sidewalk. Fireworks are legal products, but you can't set them off any old place you feel like.
- If you want to get technical, we would argue that roughly one fifth of Canada's population is *addicted* to tobacco and can't stop using it. Furthermore, we would like to point out that over 80% of Canadian smokers wish they had never started smoking in the first place.³

“Ventilation protects mine workers a kilometer underground from lethal chemicals; surely it can work to clear the air of ETS in your local pub.” (FAAC)

- Ventilation in mines is a necessity, as lethal chemicals are produced from drilling and blasting, and diesel fumes are produced from the mining machinery. Lung diseases are very common amongst miners, and if anyone could think of a way to eliminate all these types of exposure, regulators would require it immediately.
- Why on earth would we accept ventilation in bars and pubs as a second-rate band-aid solution when we actually have the ability to eliminate a known human health hazard right at the source?

“Members of the hospitality industry know their business. It's what they do. If 100% bans made economic sense, they'd do it... and some do... on their own. If a great business opportunity was available in creating smoke-free venues, every anti-tobacco lobbyist would have started up their own establishment long ago.” (FAAC)

² Repace, J. Respirable particles and carcinogens in the air of Delaware hospitality venues before and after a smoking ban. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 2004; **46**: 887-905.

³ Canadian Cancer Society press release. More than half of smokers made unsuccessful attempt to quit however most still try to go alone. 2004. www.cancer.ca/ccs/internet/mediareleaselist/0,3208,3172_210504871__langId-en,00.html

- There's a big difference between the economic impact of a 100% ban that applies to all businesses in a geographic area, and a business plan for a single establishment that goes smoke-free of its own accord. Unless you spend a lot of money advertising that your bar is smoke-free, you likely won't be able to attract the majority of non-smokers who avoid smoky bars.
- The evidence to date indicates that 100% bans do not harm businesses in the long run, and may even provide a positive economic effect.⁴ The *raison d'être* of a smoking ban is workplace health and safety, not economics. That's why having a by-law with a level-playing field is so crucial to the economic viability of the hospitality sector.
- ***“Evidence of the negative economic consequences of a ban is overwhelming. FAAC research shows 76% of Ontario's licensed establishments believe a ban will have a negative impact on business. 46% believe it will result in layoffs. Brewers of Ontario numbers show that licensed beer sales - the backbone of pub and bar sales - fall off dramatically after a ban. Owners and managers of bars in New York say that business is off by as much as 40% and that they have been forced to lay off employees.” (FAAC)***
- What people believe and say is not objective scientific research. The best measures of economic hardship are data collected routinely by independent agencies pre and post by-law, and include such things as tax receipts and employment figures. If licensed beer sales have fallen dramatically, that would translate into tax and employment data. A recent review of 90 studies found that negative economic effects were associated with subjective outcome measures like self-report polls and interviews, and with funding from the tobacco industry.⁵
- A one-year review of the New York City smoke-free ordinance was recently produced by the New York City Departments of Finance, Small Business Services, Health and Mental Hygiene, as well as the Economic Development Corporation. We quote, “since the law went into effect, business receipts for restaurants and bars have increased, employment has risen, virtually all establishments are complying with the law, and the number of new liquor licenses issued has increased – all signs that New York City bars and restaurants are prospering.”⁶
- Other economic impact studies from California⁷, Massachusetts⁸, Delaware⁹ and El Paso, Texas¹⁰ all concur that smoking bans have not hurt business in the long run.

⁴ **Scollo, M.**, et al. Review of the quality of studies on the economic effects of smoke-free policies on the hospitality industry. *Tobacco Control* 2003; **12**: 13-20.

⁵ *ibid*

⁶ **New York City Department of Finance**, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, New York City Department of Small Business Services, New York City Economic Development Corporation. *The state of smoke-free New York City: A one-year review, 2004*. www.nyc.gov/html/doh/pdf/smoke/sfaa-2004report.pdf.

⁷ **Glantz, S. A.** Effect of smokefree bar law on bar revenues in California. *Tobacco Control* 2000; **9**: 111-113.

⁸ **Bartosch, W.J., & Pope, G.C.** Economic effect of restaurant smoking restrictions on restaurant business in Massachusetts, 1992 to 1998. *Tobacco Control* 2002; **11**(Suppl II): ii38-ii42.

⁹ **Delaware Division of Public Health & Delaware Division of Revenue.** *Delaware's clean indoor air act: The 1st anniversary story*. 2004.

¹⁰ **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.** Impact of a smoking ban on restaurant and bar revenues- El Paso,

“Banning smoking in the hospitality sector costs business and puts people out of work. The anti-smoking lobby says those devastating effects don't matter - that they're short term. They're wrong. In Ottawa, 60 out of 210 bars have gone out of business since a smoke ban was enacted there.” (FAAC)

- It is true that some bars and pubs closed after the Ottawa smoke-free by-law came into effect on August 1st, 2001. However, what the FAAC fails to also communicate is that many establishments opened after the by-law came into force.
- Data from a 2002 economic impact analysis¹¹ indicate that in December 2000 there were 122 bars, night clubs and taverns in operation. One year later (4 months after the ban) there were 127. Other statistics for restaurants, bars and pubs show that there were a total of 90 closings after the ban and 123 openings. Furthermore, a 2003 city staff report¹² indicates that a total of 181 new and expanded bars and restaurants have opened since the by-law was passed.

“By merely living in a city we inhale chemicals that are the equivalent to smoking up to two packs of cigarettes a day. This apparently is quite alright, yet we are told that smoking must be banned in pubs and bars because of the dangers of Second Hand Smoke.” (PUBCO)

- It is not quite all right that we live in polluted cities, and there are many dedicated people and organizations working to fix this serious problem. We question where PUBCO got its data. Smoking two packs of cigarettes per day shortens the average life expectancy by approximately 10-15 years. If PUBCO's claim is true, life expectancy in rural areas would be much higher than in our big cities. However, the opposite is true.¹³
- The majority of people spend approximately 90% of their time indoors, and it doesn't take rocket science to figure out that pollutants in an enclosed space hang around and build up in concentration. Even with advanced ventilation technology, second-hand smoke is not completely eliminated.
- A recent study that compared second-hand smoke to diesel car exhaust¹⁴ found that cigarettes produced particulate matter (PM) pollution ten times greater than diesel car exhaust. A garage was used to assess PM emissions over a 30 minute period from three smouldering cigarettes (lit sequentially) as well as from an idling 2002 2.0 litre Ford Mondeo. Thanks to advanced technology in both car engines and gasoline, fuels burn much cleaner than they did in the past.

Texas, 2002. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* February 27, 2004/53(07);150-152.

http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/research_data/environmental/mmwr5307_intro.htm

¹¹ **KPMG.** *Economic impact analysis of the smoke free by-laws on the hospitality industry in Ottawa, 2002.*
<http://www.ptcc-cfc.on.ca/rds/rds-search-results.cfm?TopicArea=3&TargetPop=5>

¹² **City of Ottawa.** *181 new/expanded bars and restaurants since smoke-free bylaws: city report*
<http://www.smokefreeottawa.com/english/article-e22.htm>

¹³ **Health Canada** http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/pphb-dgspsp/ccdpc-cpcmc/topics/rural_e.html

¹⁴ **Invernizzi, G., et al.** Particulate matter from tobacco versus diesel car exhaust: an educational perspective. *Tobacco Control* 2004; **13**: 219-221.

"When up to 60% of a bar's clientele consists of smokers, once a smoking ban is introduced the majority of them stop going out, and for many bars it's game over within a few months." (PUBCO)

- Eighty percent of adult Canadians don't smoke. Amongst the 20% of Canadians who do, over 80% of these smokers would like to quit, and may see smoke-free bars and restaurants as enabling environments to help them quit. Based on the fact that no high quality economic impact study to date has found a negative outcome, one can assume that either smokers are still going out and spending money, non-smokers are going out more, or smokers themselves are spending more money. To settle this once and for all, we challenge PUBCO members to participate in future economic impact studies such as the one by KPMG mentioned earlier. All these predictions of doom and gloom are starting to sound like a broken record.

"Such by-laws are discriminatory, targeting as they do mostly blue collar workers, who traditionally use the local pub as a focal point for their social activities." (PUBCO)

- Smoke-free by-laws target employees in the hospitality industry. Until recently, it was these very people who were discriminated against, treated differently from other employees in the workforce who were already protected from second-hand smoke under workplace by-laws.

"You would have thought that between SARS and the looming return of West Nile that Toronto's Medical Officer of Health would have a fairly full plate. But the good doctor appears to never let real health risks get in the way of the important work of her unit -- using junk science to stamp out phantom risks." (PUBCO)

- It's very useful for PUBCO to group SARS and West Nile together with tobacco, because they are all epidemics.
- Let's look at the numbers. Total number of SARS deaths to date in Canada: 43.¹⁵ Total number of West Nile deaths to date: 14.¹⁶ Total number of second-hand smoke-related deaths: approximately 1000 **every year** (700 coronary heart disease, 300 lung cancer).¹⁷
- As for the issue of "junk science," the tobacco industry and its front groups have launched a massive smear campaign on science in an effort to downplay the real health hazards of second-hand smoke. We encourage readers to visit our website and take a look at our fact sheet on the tobacco industry and "junk science."

"The experiment at Toronto's Black Dog Pub was designed and carried out by the U.S. government's Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the Center for Toxicology and Environmental Health. The 1999 results were dramatic. They found that properly designed ventilation produced air quality in Black Dog's

¹⁵ Health Canada http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/pphb-dgspsp/sars-sras/cn-cc/20030903_e.html#tab1

¹⁶ Health Canada http://dsol-smed.hc-sc.gc.ca/wmv3/map_e.phtml?appname=human

¹⁷ Health Canada <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hecs-sesc/tobacco/facts/blueribbon/heather.html>

non-smoking area comparable to that in a completely smoke-free establishment. Equally important in terms of health gains for both non-smokers and smokers, the study found that ventilation systems like those used in the pub provided a 'substantial improvement in overall indoor air quality'." (PUBCO)

- The now-infamous Black Dog Study was funded by the Hotel Association of Canada (HAC), which in turn received funds from the Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers Council (CTMC). Reviews of the published study agreed that *"there were flaws in methodology, misrepresentation of findings, and that many aspects of the findings had no relevance to the conclusions."*¹⁸ The study was written by a long-time tobacco industry consultant and a technical advisor to the CTMC, and was published in the journal *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, which is funded in part by the American tobacco company, RJ Reynolds.
- Health Canada refused to test the ventilation system, stating in a memo that, *"the problem with ventilation as an exposure reduction strategy is that exposure, even if the system is operating at maximum efficiency, is never zero. In other words, in the best-case scenario, there is an explicit acceptance of some level of exposure to non-smokers. In the worst-case scenario, where the ventilation system is never maintained and becomes inoperative, exposure of non-smokers to tobacco smoke is maximized. Since no ventilation system will protect everybody, and might even delude non-smokers into a false sense of protection, it is concluded that such systems are not as good as a total ban."*¹⁹

The Non-Smokers' Rights Association advocates for 100% clean indoor air by-laws that protect the health and safety of all employees, including those in the hospitality industry. Designated smoking rooms (DSRs) do not offer adequate protection and are no solution to the problem of second-hand smoke. We encourage readers to learn more about the issue by visiting our website and reading the fact sheet entitled, "Ventilation and Designated Smoking Rooms."

¹⁸ Ontario Campaign for Action on Tobacco <http://www.ocat.org/ventilation/solution.html>

¹⁹ *ibid*