

A smoking ban

To ban, or not to ban, that is the question. While banning smoking indoors seems like a reasonable step against inhaling secondhand smoke, ~~with~~ outdoors, I am not too sure. From the non-smoker's point of view, having to inhale the smoke while you are simply trying to take a peaceful walk through the park is rather unpleasant, whereas from the smoker's point of view, if they cannot smoke indoors and also in the parks and on the beaches, there are not many places left.

In this case, I must opt for not banning smoking outdoors. Even though I personally prefer non-polluted air, I think that the amount of secondhand smoke outdoors is not large enough to prohibit the act of smoking. Albeit the article says that the levels of tobacco smoke within three feet of a smoker outside are comparable to inside levels, usually when a person is outdoors, they do not spend a prolonged period of time in one place, therefore the exposure is much shorter than it would be indoors.

good!

On the other hand, if there are fifty people in the park and forty of them are smokers, the ten non-smokers do not have much of a choice than to be exposed to secondhand smoke. Furthermore, even ~~the~~ short-term exposure can lead to temporary negative effects on the circulatory system.

fewer / count noun /
=

I think the main problem of this ban is that there will not be ~~less~~ people smoking, they will only have less space to do so, and as a result, in some places, the levels of tobacco smoke will be even higher than normally. A compromise could be achieved by banning smoking in only a part of New York parks and on chosen beaches. There could even be "no smoking" sections in parks. I feel that this solution could satisfy everyone, but since the ban forbids smoking in all the parks and on the beaches, I do not support it.

Good Language
Well-reasoned
Good development of argument...
little to add -
Thanks, P.

Excellent