

***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?

Give reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own experience or knowledge.

Model Answer

Medical studies have shown that smoking not only leads to health problems for the smoker, but also for people close by. As a result of this, many believe that smoking should not be allowed in public places. Although there are arguments on both sides, I strongly agree that a ban is the most appropriate course of action.

Opponents of such a ban argue against it for several reasons. Firstly, they say that passive smokers make the choice to breathe in other people's smoke by going to places where it is allowed. If they would prefer not to smoke passively, then they do not need to visit places where smoking is permitted. In addition, they believe a ban would possibly drive many bars and pubs out of business as smokers would not go there anymore. They also argue it is a matter of freedom of choice. Smoking is not against the law, so individuals should have the freedom to smoke where they wish.

However, there are more convincing arguments in favour of a ban. First and foremost, it has been proven that tobacco consists of carcinogenic compounds which cause serious harm to a person's health, not only the smoker. Anyone around them can develop cancers of the lungs, mouth and throat, and other sites in the body. It is simply not fair to impose this upon another person. It is also the case that people's health is more important than businesses. In any case, pubs and restaurants could adapt to a ban by, for example, allowing smoking areas .

In conclusion, it is clear that it should be made illegal to smoke in public places. This would improve the health of thousands of people, and that is most definitely a positive development.

Comments

This essay is well organized and presented.

The introduction is clear - note how it follows the ban smoking in public places essay question - it paraphrases the information in order to introduce the topic and the argument.

The argument against a ban on smoking in public places is presented first. It is made clear that it is not the authors opinion by the topic sentence:

"Opponents of such a ban argue against it for several reasons".

And also by the use of the word 'they' to refer to the opponents.

The writer then clearly shows they are moving on to the other argument which is their own (and it has clearly been stated in the thesis that this is their argument):

"However, there are more convincing arguments in favour of a ban".

In this paragraph, 'they' is dropped because it is now the writers opinion.