

**Draft Smoking NI Order 2006 econsultation on-line response**

**Queens Universtity Response No.2**

Q1: YES

Q1a: Good to see inclusion of all types of cigarettes

Q2: YES

Q2a: If you wish to comment, please do so here

Q3a: YES

Q3b: YES

Q3c: YES

Q3d: YES

Q3e: No, this is about protecting the health of workers why should there be inequality.

- State prisons in California are now smoke free.
- Private clubs, Crown Buildings etc. Should NOT be exempt

Q4: NO

Q4a: Penalties should be higher and linked with inflation.  
Burden of proof should be on the defendant rather than the prosecution.

Q5: NO

Q5a: why fixed penalties? difficult to implement, need to have real deterrents. Restrictions of smoking on busses etc. worked without fixed penalties.

Q6: YES

Q6a: They have skilled staff who already enforce hygiene and other public health legislation

Q7: YES

Q7a: Raise the age in conjunction with comprehensive Smoke free Policies.

Q8: No

Q9: Yes

Q10: No

Q11: No

Q12: Benefits will accrue to staff in work places which have traditionally employed staff from lower socioeconomic groups. These staff may currently be exposed to high levels of second hand smoke and their health will benefit.

Q13: No

Q14: No

Q15: The BMJ paper by Shane Allwright re Air Quality in Irish Pubs after the ban

Q16: Good work

Q17: No

Q18: Gallaghers possible impact on R&D. I'm sure this company already use fume extraction cupboards to remove the toxic tobacco smoke from their researchers.

Q19: Production of signs at the start anyway should be centralised to ensure uniformity with no cost at the start, perhaps introducing a cost at a later date.

Q20: Yes

Q21: Yes

Q22: No

Q23: No

Q24: The rights of workers to avoid tobacco smoke should be paramount.