

Smoking not only harms the smoker, but also those who are nearby. Therefore, smoking should be banned in public places.

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Such a staggering number of smokers motivates officials to introduce restrictions for smoking in publicly used places. While these regulations would restrict individuals' freedom, I would argue that the merits of this trend-practice far outweigh the demerits.

That cigarettes would adversely affect individuals' well-being is an undeniable fact. Those who smoke are more likely to suffer from severe and fatal illnesses ranging from respiratory ones to lung cancer, hence the importance of taking pragmatic and viable steps to disincentive-discourage/dissuade smokers. Banning smoking in offices and public places could benefit the prospective smokers and other members of society on several grounds. To start with, it could serve as a deterrent since consumers has-have to refrain and procrastinate smoking to find a proper and legal place. Postponing is a well-known method for rehabilitation of any patient/habit. In addition, it protects other citizens who are exposed d to cigarette's smoke, albeit reluctantly. Not only does the cigarette harm/hurt~~damage~~ the smoker, but also it endangers other citizens in the immediate surrounding.

Apart from the aforementioned plus points, many a person have-has found this legislation intrusive which curtails their freedom. They claim that using public places should be equally free for all citizens regardless of smoking habits. When it comes to this notion, I firmly believe that in situations wherewhereby smoking negatively affects others' health specially children and those who suffers from chronic diseases the government should put a halt on-to it.

In conclusion, passive smoking could have detrimental effects on individuals' health. Thus, banning smoking, the government could provide a safety net for citizens and lessen their health risks.