



# City of Cambridge

17.  
 AMENDED ORDER  
 CALENDAR ITEM # 3  
 IN CITY COUNCIL

February 8, 1993  
 February 22, 1993

COUNCILLOR DUEHAY

WHEREAS: The Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that smoking is a serious and substantial health risk for non-smokers in a report issued in January of 1993; and

WHEREAS: In 1986, two of the nation's most prestigious health authorities, The National Academy of Sciences and the Surgeon-General, concluded that fumes generated by smokers can cause lung cancer in adult non-smokers and respiratory problems in the children of smokers; and

WHEREAS: Smoking resulted in one of every five deaths of Massachusetts residents aged thirty-five and older in 1988, more than eleven thousand deaths for the year, and costs more than \$1.5 billion annually; and

WHEREAS: The City of Cambridge wishes to take every precaution to protect the health of its employees and of its residents; now therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the City Council declares all public buildings in Cambridge to be smoke free zones and requests the City Manager to take forthwith whatever steps are necessary to implement this directive, including whatever revision is required in the City's No Smoking Ordinance; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to institute stop smoking programs as well as to consult and obtain advise from private companies which have made their establishments smoke free.

In City Council February 22, 1993.

Adopted as amended by the affirmative vote of seven members.

Attest:- D. Margaret Drury, City Clerk.

A true copy;  
 ATTEST:-

*D. Margaret Drury*

D. Margaret Drury  
 City Clerk

**MAYOR REEVES AND COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN RECORDED IN THE  
 NEGATIVE ON THIS MATTER.**



# City of Cambridge

17.  
ORIGINAL ORDER  
CALENDAR ITEM # 3  
IN CITY COUNCIL

February 8, 1993  
February 22, 1993

COUNCILLOR DUEHAY

WHEREAS: The Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that smoking is a serious and substantial health risk for non-smokers in a report issued in January of 1993; and

WHEREAS: In 1986, two of the nation's most prestigious health authorities, The National Academy of Sciences and the Surgeon-General, concluded that fumes generated by smokers can cause lung cancer in adult non-smokers and respiratory problems in the children of smokers; and

WHEREAS: Smoking resulted in one of every five deaths of Massachusetts residents aged thirty-five and older in 1988, more than eleven thousand deaths for the year, and costs more than \$1.5 billion annually; and

WHEREAS: The City of Cambridge wishes to take every precaution to protect the health of its employees and of its residents; now therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the City Council declares all public buildings in Cambridge to be smoke free zones and requests the City Manager to take forthwith whatever steps are necessary to implement this directive, including whatever revision is required in the City's No Smoking Ordinance.



# City of Cambridge

17.

IN CITY COUNCIL

February 8, 1993

COUNCILLOR DUEHAY

WHEREAS: The Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that smoking is a serious and substantial health risk for non-smokers in a report issued in January of 1993; and

WHEREAS: In 1986, two of the nation's most prestigious health authorities, The National Academy of Sciences and the Surgeon-General, concluded that fumes generated by smokers can cause lung cancer in adult non-smokers and respiratory problems in the children of smokers; and

WHEREAS: Smoking resulted in one of every five deaths of Massachusetts residents aged thirty-five and older in 1988, more than eleven thousand deaths for the year, and costs more than \$1.5 billion annually; and

WHEREAS: The City of Cambridge wishes to take every precaution to protect the health of its employees and of its residents; now therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the City Council declares all public buildings in Cambridge to be smoke free zones and requests the City Manager to take forthwith whatever steps are necessary to implement this directive, including whatever revision is required in the City's No Smoking Ordinance.



# City of Cambridge

17.

IN CITY COUNCIL

February 8, 1993

COUNCILLOR DUEHAY

WHEREAS: The Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that smoking is a serious and substantial health risk for non-smokers in a report issued in January of 1993; and

WHEREAS: In 1986, two of the nation's most prestigious health authorities, The National Academy of Sciences and the Surgeon-General, concluded that fumes generated by smokers can cause lung cancer in adult non-smokers and respiratory problems in the children of smokers; and

WHEREAS: Smoking resulted in one of every five deaths of Massachusetts residents aged thirty-five and older in 1988, more than eleven thousand deaths for the year, and costs more than \$1.5 billion annually; and

WHEREAS: The City of Cambridge wishes to take every precaution to protect the health of its employees and of its residents; now therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the City Council declares all public buildings in Cambridge to be smoke free zones and requests the City Manager to take forthwith whatever steps are necessary to implement this directive, including whatever revision is required in the City's No Smoking Ordinance.

## No Right to Cause Death

The rationale for granting smokers the "right" to spread their toxic fumes around has disappeared. Diehard smokers, egged on by the tobacco companies that supply them, have long tried to cast their habit as a civil liberties issue, claiming they should be free to engage in a practice that harms no one but themselves.

But the evidence is now overwhelming that smokers endanger all those forced to inhale the lethal clouds they generate. That makes smokers at least a small hazard to virtually all Americans — and a fitting target for tighter restrictions.

Evidence that smoking can harm nonsmokers has been accumulating for the last decade. In 1986, two of the nation's most prestigious health authorities — the National Academy of Sciences and the Surgeon General — concluded that fumes generated by smokers can cause lung cancer in adult nonsmokers and respiratory problems in the children of smokers.

Now, in a comprehensive study covering more than twice the data available in 1986, the Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that smoking is indeed a serious and substantial health risk for nonsmokers, particularly children.

Each year environmental tobacco smoke probably causes some 3,000 lung cancer deaths in the U.S., 150,000 to 300,000 cases of respiratory infections in infants and young children, and a worsening of symptoms in 200,000 to 1 million asthmatic children. And that's just the start of it.

Maternal smoking seems to be implicated in Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, a frightening condition in which babies die inexplicably in their cribs at night. And other studies not assessed by the E.P.A. have suggested that environmental tobacco smoke may cause heart disease and cancers at sites other than the lung.

The E.P.A. marshals an enormous array of evidence to build an overwhelming case that tobacco smoke is hazardous to innocent bystanders. The smoke that emanates from a smoldering cigarette contains virtually the same cancer-causing compounds as the smoke inhaled by the smokers. The inhaled smoke is known to cause cancer; it would be astonishing if the environmental smoke were not carcinogenic as well.

The main difference is that bystanders take in

a more diluted mixture — and they have no choice in the matter. Smoking does, therefore, involve the violation of rights, and it is the smokers who are the violators.

The clinching evidence that environmental smoke causes lung cancer comes from studies of the health damage suffered by nonsmoking spouses of smokers. Seventeen of those studies were able to distinguish which spouses got the biggest doses of environmental smoke. In every study, the highest exposure group had an increased risk of lung cancer, and in nine the increase was statistically significant, or almost certainly meaningful. The odds of this happening by chance are less than 1 in 10 million, the E.P.A. says.

The Tobacco Institute, the trade group for the industry, has countered with sophistry. It contends that two-thirds of 30 or more studies reviewed by the E.P.A. show no "statistically significant" increase in lung cancer risk. That is true, but one-third of the studies do show significance, and the combined results are persuasive.

The Institute also complains that the E.P.A. has loosened its statistical standards so that it is only 90 percent confident of its conclusions instead of 95 percent confident, the standard often used. That, too, is true. But a panel of distinguished scientists endorsed the approach as appropriate given the enormous array of data on tobacco smoke and the certainty that the smoke is not beneficial. The continued effort of the Tobacco Institute to get Americans to ignore the best available science represents corporate irresponsibility of the rankest sort.

The only real issue is how serious one should consider the environmental hazard. The spouses of people who smoke at home might face a 1-in-500 chance of developing lung cancer, the E.P.A. suggests. That is far less than the 1-in-10 to 1-in-20 chance faced by the smokers themselves. But it is far more than society tolerates for exposure to other cancer-causing chemicals.

No one would grant his neighbor the right to blow tiny amounts of asbestos into a room or sprinkle traces of pesticide onto food. By the same logic, smokers have no right to spew even more noxious clouds into the air around them. The next step has to be a searching examination of how to tighten restrictions on smoking in all public places, and the workplace as well.

whereas the Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that smoking is a serious and substantial health risk for non-smokers in a report issued in January of 1993;

whereas in 1986, two of the nation's most prestigious health authorities - the National Academy of Sciences and the Surgeon-General - concluded that fumes generated by smokers can cause lung cancer in adult non-smokers and respiratory problems in the children of smokers;

whereas smoking resulted in one of every five deaths of Massachusetts residents aged 35 and older in 1988, more than 11,000 deaths for the year, and costs more than <sup>B</sup>1.5 billion annually;

whereas, the City of Cambridge wishes to take every precaution to protect the health of its employees and of its residents;

### Resolved

that the City Council declares all public buildings in Cambridge to be smoke-free zones and requests the City Manager to take forthwith whatever steps are necessary to implement this

- Over -

directive, including whatever revision is needed  
is required in the city's no smoking ordinance.

SUNDAY, JANUARY 10, 1993

22 E

THE NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL

## No Right to Cause Death

The rationale for granting smokers the "right" to spread their toxic fumes around has disappeared. Diehard smokers, egged on by the tobacco companies that supply them, have long tried to cast their habit as a civil liberties issue, claiming they should be free to engage in a practice that harms no one but themselves.

But the evidence is now overwhelming that smokers endanger all those forced to inhale the lethal clouds they generate. That makes smokers at least a small hazard to virtually all Americans — and a fitting target for tighter restrictions.

Evidence that smoking can harm nonsmokers has been accumulating for the last decade. In 1986, two of the nation's most prestigious health authorities — the National Academy of Sciences and the Surgeon General — concluded that fumes generated by smokers can cause lung cancer in adult nonsmokers and respiratory problems in the children of smokers.

Now, in a comprehensive study covering more than twice the data available in 1986, the Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that smoking is indeed a serious and substantial health risk for nonsmokers, particularly children.

Each year environmental tobacco smoke probably causes some 3,000 lung cancer deaths in the U.S., 150,000 to 300,000 cases of respiratory infections in infants and young children, and a worsening of symptoms in 200,000 to 1 million asthmatic children. And that's just the start of it.

Maternal smoking seems to be implicated in Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, a frightening condition in which babies die inexplicably in their cribs at night. And other studies not assessed by the E.P.A. have suggested that environmental tobacco smoke may cause heart disease and cancers at sites other than the lung.

The E.P.A. marshals an enormous array of evidence to build an overwhelming case that tobacco smoke is hazardous to innocent bystanders. The smoke that emanates from a smoldering cigarette contains virtually the same cancer-causing compounds as the smoke inhaled by the smokers. The inhaled smoke is known to cause cancer; it would be astonishing if the environmental smoke were not carcinogenic as well.

The main difference is that bystanders take in

a more diluted mixture — and they have no choice in the matter. Smoking does, therefore, involve the violation of rights, and it is the smokers who are the violators.

The clinching evidence that environmental smoke causes lung cancer comes from studies of the health damage suffered by nonsmoking spouses of smokers. Seventeen of those studies were able to distinguish which spouses got the biggest doses of environmental smoke. In every study, the highest exposure group had an increased risk of lung cancer, and in nine the increase was statistically significant, or almost certainly meaningful. The odds of this happening by chance are less than 1 in 10 million, the E.P.A. says.

The Tobacco Institute, the trade group for the industry, has countered with sophistry. It contends that two-thirds of 30 or more studies reviewed by the E.P.A. show no "statistically significant" increase in lung cancer risk. That is true, but one-third of the studies do show significance, and the combined results are persuasive.

The Institute also complains that the E.P.A. has loosened its statistical standards so that it is only 90 percent confident of its conclusions instead of 95 percent confident, the standard often used. That, too, is true. But a panel of distinguished scientists endorsed the approach as appropriate given the enormous array of data on tobacco smoke and the certainty that the smoke is not beneficial. The continued effort of the Tobacco Institute to get Americans to ignore the best available science represents corporate irresponsibility of the rankest sort.

The only real issue is how serious one should consider the environmental hazard. The spouses of people who smoke at home might face a 1-in-500 chance of developing lung cancer, the E.P.A. suggests. That is far less than the 1-in-10 to 1-in-20 chance faced by the smokers themselves. But it is far more than society tolerates for exposure to other cancer-causing chemicals.

No one would grant his neighbor the right to blow tiny amounts of asbestos into a room or sprinkle traces of pesticide onto food. By the same logic, smokers have no right to spew even more noxious clouds into the air around them. The next step has to be a searching examination of how to tighten restrictions on smoking in all public places, and the workplace as well.



# City of Cambridge

17.

IN CITY COUNCIL

February 8, 1993

- WHEREAS:** The Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that smoking is a serious and substantial health risk for non-smokers in a report issued in January of 1993; and
- WHEREAS:** In 1986, two of the nation's most prestigious health authorities, The National Academy of Sciences and the Surgeon-General, concluded that fumes generated by smokers can cause lung cancer in adult non-smokers and respiratory problems in the children of smokers; and
- WHEREAS:** Smoking resulted in one of every five deaths of Massachusetts residents aged thirty-five and older in 1988, more than eleven thousand deaths for the year, and costs more than \$1.5 billion annually; and
- WHEREAS:** The City of Cambridge wishes to take every precaution to protect the health of its employees and of its residents; now therefore be it
- RESOLVED:** That the City Council declares all public buildings in Cambridge to be smoke free zones and requests the City Manager to take forthwith whatever steps are necessary to implement this directive, including whatever revision is required in the City's No Smoking Ordinance.

CM. 34

Councillor Duehay re: Designation of all  
public buildings in Cambridge as smoke  
free zones.

In City Council,

February 8, 1993

*Charter Right exercised  
by Councillor Walsh  
2/22/93 Order adopted  
as amended*