



Questions and Answers on

The Tobacco Industry and Smoking Restrictions

What are the tobacco companies doing to block restrictions on smoking in bars and restaurants?

- They are mobilizing and supporting business front groups like the Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association and the Canadian Hotel Association and related provincial agencies to lobby against public health measures
- They are advancing the notion of "ventilation" as a workable remedy
- They are trying to frame concerns about second-hand smoke as issues of "Indoor Air Quality"
- They are working with Honeywell and other ventilation companies to lobby governments to accept ventilation 'solutions'

How do we know this?

- Tobacco industry documents released as a result of U.S. court actions reveal their strategies and tactics to attack regulatory science supporting smoking bans and to promote ventilation as a solution.

(See especially "Worldwide Strategy and Plan, 1996", pm docs 2060577486-2060577561)

- BCTV revealed on June 15, 2000 that the Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers Council has paid \$3.2 million (\$800,000 per year) to the Canadian Hotel Association to fight smoking bans.

Why are tobacco companies involved in the public debate about protecting workers and the public from second-hand smoke?

- They want to promote the social acceptability of smoking
- They are concerned that smoking bans will further erode the social acceptability of smoking
- They know that bans on smoking increase the number of people who successfully quit smoking (Philip Morris estimates that the quitting rate would increase 74% if all work-places were smoke-free)

How do we know this?

- Tobacco industry documents released as a result of U.S. court actions detail how the multinational companies joined forces to try to discourage public health measures.

(See especially "Operation Berkshire" - British Medical Journal, Vol 321, p. 371.)

- Philip Morris documents released as a result of U.S. court actions reveal their estimates that 100% smoke-free workplaces resulted in decreases to the number of people who smoke as well as the amount of cigarettes each smoker consumed.

What misinformation is being spread during public review of smoking restrictions?

Wrongful evidence of economic harm

- Legislators have been told (in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario) that the British Columbia hospitality sector was harmed during the period that there was a 100% smoking ban in all B.C. bars and restaurants.

In fact, the Workers Compensation Board tracking of employment insurance rolls shows that there has been no decrease in overall employment in the sector.

- Legislators have been told that bar and restaurant owners experienced losses when smoking was banned in restaurants and bars.
- In fact, California tax revenues show that sales went UP - not down after the smoking ban in bars took effect.
- Several published studies show that smoking bans have not been associated with economic loss.

Wrongful evidence regarding human health

- Canadian legislators have been told that second-hand smoke does not present a major health risk.

In fact, every publicly funded health agency (such as Health Canada, the U.S. and California Environmental Protection Agencies and the World Health Organization) has concluded that second hand smoke is a cause of death by lung cancer and heart disease.

Wrongful evidence of the potential to 'ventilate' smoking areas

- Experts from Honeywell and other ventilation firms have encouraged the view that new ventilation systems are capable of reducing the amount of cigarette smoke in a restaurant or bar to a level which is safe for patrons and workers.

In fact, none of the leading authorities on air quality or occupational health (ASHRAE, the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Engineers, ACGIH the American Conference of Governmental and Industrial Hygienists) currently support even the most advanced ventilation systems as a way of reducing second hand smoke to a level safe

enough for workplaces. In their deliberations, they support the science of other health authorities (such as NIOSH, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, EPA, Environmental Protection Agency, OSHA, Occupational Safety and Health Association, NAS, National Academy of Sciences) to establish 'safe' levels of exposure to cigarette

Do we have evidence of tobacco companies working secretly in Canada to forestall smoking bans?

YES

The Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers Association funding of Hotel and Restaurant lobbying was not volunteered by tobacco companies, but was uncovered by B.C. journalist Darlene Heideman in June 2000.

- In 1988, RJR-Macdonald (which made Export A cigarettes) covertly paid for a study to show that the levels of cigarette smoke in Canadian offices were lower than those reported elsewhere. The study was used to challenge smoking restrictions in offices, but tobacco company funding of the report was only exposed when tobacco industry documents became available in 1998.
- Tobacco industry documents reveal that in 1983, the tobacco industry worked jointly through the Toronto Restaurant and Food Services Association to forestall the development of by-laws restricting smoking.