

Smoking indoors, that is in restaurants, bars and other public venues, has successfully been banned in many countries around the world. But the topic of banning smoking outside, for example in public parks, is a much more controversial one. Is this almost extreme measure reasonable and beneficial? In his column titled *A Smoking Ban Too Far*, Michael B. Siegel suggests that no, it is not. And I cannot but agree.

// nice usage!

Mr. Siegel's main argument is the lack of convincing scientific evidence on the subject. There ~~is~~ ^{is} in fact is no evidence showing that the level of exposure is high enough to be a significant health risk. It is true that further research may potentially show otherwise. In that case, a ban can and should be considered, but so far it has not. It is also true that, no matter the health risks or the lack thereof, it is still an inconvenience for non-smokers. However, a ban always means the limitation of someone's freedom. As such, it shouldn't be taken lightly and should only be enacted if there are good enough reasons for doing so. And while endangering public health surely is sufficiently serious, causing mild discomfort is not.

| clear, concise argument

// nice!

Mr. Siegel further argues that passing the ban might make its supporters lose face, so to ^{say} ~~say~~. Even if they mean well, purposefully misinterpreting scientific findings and conflating unrelated things for the purpose of supporting their side of the argument is never a fair thing to do. Moreover, such a reputation could hinder the process of passing similar bans in the future, ones that are actually legitimate and beneficial.

say

This is too condensed and doesn't work. Better might be "...the effect upon their reputation (their impartiality) could hinder..."

the phrase is "so to say"

In the end, creating the law is a matter of balancing different people's rights and freedoms. To do it right, it is crucial not to let ourselves be blinded by hatred and ^{to} ~~to~~ always base our opinions on proven facts. And in this case, the facts speak in favor of the smokers.

The "to" here stresses a new + separate act.
'not to be blinded'
and
'to base...'

Excellent!!
Rich language,
Excellent structures + collocations
well reasoned

Thanks, J -

Excellent.