

Smoking Prohibition (Children in Motor Vehicles) (Scotland) Bill

FOREST (Freedom Organisation for the Right to Enjoy Smoking Tobacco)

About us: FOREST (Freedom Organisation for the Right to Enjoy Smoking Tobacco) was founded in 1979 to represent adults who choose to consume tobacco in full knowledge of the health risks associated with tobacco products. We also represent non-smoking adults who are tolerant of other people's enjoyment of tobacco.

Forest's mission is to protect the interests of adults who choose to smoke or consume tobacco and highlight the increasingly intrusive nature of government in the lives of private individuals.

Declaration

FOREST receives donations from the following tobacco companies: British American Tobacco, Imperial Tobacco Limited, Gallaher Limited (part of the Japan Tobacco Group of Companies). However, the views expressed in this document or any Forest-associated website or publication are those of Forest alone.

1. Our position

1.1 FOREST does not support the introduction of a ban on smoking in cars carrying children. We would encourage adults not to smoke in cars carrying children because, in our view, children should not be exposed to cigarette smoke in a small confined space like a car. It is inconsiderate, at best. In our opinion however there is no justification for government to ban smoking in ANY private vehicle, with or without children.

To summarise:

1.2 FOREST neither encourages nor condones smoking in cars carrying children but a ban is out of all proportion to the problem.

1.3 In practice very few adults still light up in cars carrying children. The vast majority have changed their behaviour voluntarily without government intervention and should be applauded, not demonised with unnecessary legislation that even its supporters accept will be difficult to enforce. Education, we believe, is better than coercion.

1.4 If smoking is prohibited in cars carrying children FOREST expects a gradual but persistent clamour for smoking to be banned in every private vehicle. The British Medical Association, for example, wants a ban on smoking in all cars, regardless of who is in them. This could lead to the situation whereby a driver, lighting a cigarette in his own vehicle with no-one else present, could be prosecuted and fined for smoking in his own private space.

1.5 Action on Smoking and Health (London) subsequently joined the British Medical Association in calling for a comprehensive ban on smoking in private

vehicles. According to CEO Deborah Arnott (Daily Mirror, 17 December 2014):

"We are delighted that the (Westminster) Government is to press ahead with regulations to prohibit smoking in cars containing children. As with the smoke-free public places law, this is a popular measure that will largely be self-enforcing. However, secondhand smoke is just as harmful to adults as children and it makes it more difficult to enforce if it only applies to some cars, not all. Seatbelt laws don't just apply to children, why should smokefree car laws?"

1.6 This comment is significant because it demonstrates the fallacy that campaigners only want to ban smoking in cars with children and there is no 'slippery slope'. Clearly, banning smoking in cars carrying children is part of a wider, more illiberal plan to control the behaviour of adult smokers to the point where they can no longer smoke in their own private vehicles even when they are on their own.

1.7 In its most recent report (Smoking Still Kills), published on Wednesday 10th June 2015, ASH called for a review of the evidence and a consultation on the prohibition of smoking in all cars and motor vehicles. The inference is clear.

1.8 Some anti-smoking campaigners also argue that smoking whilst driving is a threat to other road users. Major international studies show that smoking whilst driving is one of the least distracting activities a driver can do. Far more distracting are chatting with passengers, activity outside the vehicle, changing a CD or retuning the radio. Should we ban those as well?

1.9 Banning smoking in a private vehicle, with or without children, represents a serious invasion of a citizen's private space. For many people this is a worryingly illiberal step. What next – a ban on smoking in the home if children are present?

1.10 We believe education is generally better than legislation and we would welcome the opportunity to work with the Scottish Government to encourage the small number of adults who still smoke in cars carrying children to change their behaviour without the need for heavy-handed legislation that a hard-pressed police force (or other agency) would find very difficult to enforce.

2. Why the Bill is unnecessary

2.1 Even if one accepts that smoking in a car carrying children is at best inconsiderate (which we do), the idea that large numbers of children are exposed to tobacco smoke in cars is as outdated as black and white television.

2.2 Today very few adults smoke in a car when children are present. According to the results of a survey conducted in July 2011 using an online panel of 1000 adult (18+) smokers established by Holden Pearmain for the Tobacco Manufacturers' Association:

- 45% of smokers never smoke in their cars
- 76% would never smoke if children were present (a further 11% would ask for permission)
- 51% thought that a ban would be 'very difficult' or 'impossible' to enforce
- Only 13.6% of smokers would smoke as normal if children were present in a car [1]

2.3 A study by the UCD School of Public Health, published in the Irish Medical Journal, found an even lower prevalence of smoking in cars carrying children, albeit in Dublin. According to the Irish Independent (10 April 2013):

Plans to ban smoking in cars carrying children would be "labour intensive" and have little effect, according to a new study.

The study, which involved observing 2,230 drivers, found they were more likely to be using their mobile phones than smoking.

The study by the UCD School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population – which involved observing cars over three time periods in two Dublin locations – found the prevalence of mobile telephone use was 2.56pc while it was 1.39pc for smoking.

The more expensive the car the less likely the driver was to be smoking, according to the researchers.

"It was low for both. Eight adult passengers and just one child were observed as being exposed to a smoking adult driver," the findings, published in the Irish Medical Journal, said.

It suggested that the "resources required for a ban in vehicles may be labour intensive for the yield in detection or prevention." [2]

2.4 Responding to the report, Forest's spokesman in Ireland John Mallon said the study had vindicated our stance that a ban on smoking in cars with children would prove difficult to enforce and unnecessary to introduce.

"Very few parents light up in a car carrying children. It's inconsiderate and most adults recognise that," Mallon said.

"We would encourage parents not to smoke in cars when children are present but so few people do it that legislation is clearly unnecessary.

"It would be a huge waste of taxpayers' money and would be almost impossible enforce. Education has to be better than coercion." [3]

Although the research was in Dublin, the culture is not unlike many cities in Scotland and we believe that if the same research was carried out here there would be a very similar result.

3. The health argument (protecting children from the effects of secondhand smoke)

3.1 As we have repeatedly stated, FOREST does not condone smoking in cars carrying children. We believe it is inconsiderate at best and adults should err on the side of caution when it comes to small children in particular.

3.2 However, just as it is extremely difficult if not impossible to prove that someone has become ill as a result of 'passive' smoking (when there are so many factors that must be taken into consideration), it is also very difficult to prove that the health of a child has been damaged or put at serious risk through exposure to tobacco smoke in a car.

3.3 A reasonable defence would point out that evidence of direct harm caused by exposure to tobacco smoke in a car is very hard to find. For example, a claim often repeated is that second-hand smoke is "23 times more toxic in a vehicle than in a home [or smoky pub]". Yet in 2010 an article by respected Australian public health researchers in the Canadian Medical Association Journal argued there is no scientific evidence to support this argument.

3.4 Factors that would have to be taken into consideration include the length of time a child had been exposed to tobacco smoke in a car; the frequency; was the window open or closed etc etc. A reasonable defence would focus on these factors, the disproportionate nature of the law, and the penalties it would trigger.

3.5 Despite this we are told that regulations are justified because of the alleged harm caused by 'passive smoking'. However, according to a paper by CR Consulting, commissioned in 2011 by the Tobacco Manufacturers Association [4]:

A number of studies have been undertaken especially in North America to identify the level of contamination in cars. These have typically involved a cigarette being consumed in the front of the car as it is driven at a variety of speeds with ventilation and windows at various settings – with usually a nicotine or particle monitor at breathing height on the back seat.

The issue here is the size of the space – clearly a small car has very little volume and so the concentration of contaminants is likely to be high. This especially so when a cigarette is smoked and the windows are shut and the vehicle is stationary.

This is the worst case from which these calculations arise. However car users can, and do, regulate the environment by opening windows and or using mechanical ventilation to create a comfortable environment.

To quote from the same studies that are used to highlight concerns:

- Even small adjustments make a considerable difference - 'Opening a

single window by 3” increased the vehicle’s air change rate by about tenfold, ranging from 8 to 12 times for various speeds and ventilation settings’ – this means that all of the air in the car is replaced every 5 to 7.5 minutes.

- These adjustments can be highly effective at reducing concentrations - in one study in two vehicles the nicotine levels were below the level of detection (one large SUV with ventilation and one driving with the window more than half open) although one driver had smoked 3 cigarettes in 40 minutes and the other 5 in 110 minutes.
- 79% of people who took part in the test and smoked in cars claimed to ban smoking when carrying passengers, or without ventilation, or both.
- This style of air management has not been adequately investigated – ‘Further research is required to understand whether drivers manipulate ventilation to reduce SHS, either by use of open windows or internal vehicle ventilation systems’.

Specific claims based on the air quality research:

Cigarette smoke particle exposure in a closed car is comparable to the exposure a firefighter might receive over four to eight hours fighting a California wildfire

- This originally comes from the California Environmental Protection Agency and confuses peak levels when a cigarette is being smoked in a car, with sustained contamination averaged over 4 or 8 hours for the firefighters.

One smoker emits five times more fine particles into a car than are emitted per-mile by the car’s exhaust pipe

- This appears to be true for petrol engine cars – however the particulate from traffic comes from diesel and not petrol engines.

Secondhand smoke in cars can be ten times more concentrated than the level considered “unhealthy” by the US Environmental Protection Agency

- The EPA’s much-cited outdoor daily standard for small particle air pollution (PM_{2.5}) is 35 µg/m³. This is an average over 24 hours. Even the (supportive) research for this claim it would require a person to smoke continuously for 2 hours in a car with the windows partially open to achieve a similar level of exposure as the EPA standard.

Smoking in a car exposes children to the same levels of smoke in a busy smoke filled pub

- This again confuses the momentary peak exposure to smoke in a

sealed up car with continual exposure over a period in a bar.

Opening a window does not reduce the levels of secondhand smoke in a car to a safe level as the smoke simply blows back into the vehicle, often lingering for hours

- Ventilation is clearly effective at diluting the smoke, as every one of the studies cited (Ott, Klepeis et al 2007) shows. The '8-12 times' noted above means that all of the air in the car is replaced every 5 to 7.5 minutes.

The health argument is based upon the most extreme instances – very heavy smoking in stationary cars with no natural or mechanical ventilation.

In reality many smokers choose NOT to smoke in cars and the considerable majority have rules about not smoking with passengers in the car and/or using ventilation.

Even opening the windows just 3" has a dramatic effect on the air quality in the car.

3.6 Unfortunately there is no arguing with anti-smoking campaigners who are determined to force more legislation on smokers. Speaking at the BMA conference in Cardiff in 2011, Douglas Noble, a public health doctor, even argued: "It would be safer to have your exhaust pipe on the inside of your car." [5]

Sadly, this is typical of the hyperbole we have come to expect from more militant tobacco control campaigners.

4. How reliable is the 'evidence' for a ban?

4.1 A claim, often repeated, is that second-hand smoke is "23 times more toxic in a vehicle than in a home [or smoky bar]". Yet according to Ross MacKenzie of the School of Public Health at Sydney University, writing in the Canadian Medical Association Journal:

"In [an] exhaustive search of the relevant literature, we failed to locate any scientific source for this comparison." [6]

4.2 On Wednesday 16 November 2011 it was very widely reported in the British media and around the world that the British Medical Association wanted to ban smoking in ALL cars, not just those with children present.

The BMA was keen to highlight the 'fact' that "studies demonstrate that the concentration of toxins in a smoke-filled vehicle is 23 times greater than that of a smoky bar". The following day the BMA was forced to issue another, less well-reported, press release:

CORRECTION TO BMA BRIEFING PAPER:
Smoking in vehicles – press release issued on Tuesday 15 November 2011 (publication date – 16 November 2011)

Please note, there is an error in the BMA briefing paper: Smoking in vehicles. On page 4, in the 3rd paragraph, the following sentence is incorrect:

“Further studies demonstrate that the concentration of toxins in a smoke-filled vehicle is 23 times greater than that of a smoky bar, even under realistic ventilation conditions”. a, 17, 18, 19

This was replaced with: "Further studies demonstrate that the concentration of toxins in a smoke-filled vehicle could be up to 11 times greater than that of a smoky bar".

We apologise for this error. [7]

4.3 In October 2012 it was reported that researchers from Aberdeen University "have backed a proposal to ban smoking in private cars after they found that the habit produces pollutants which could be harmful to passengers". In fact, researchers had examined just 17 drivers, 14 of them smokers. [8]

4.4 According to the British Lung Foundation, in its submission supporting the amendment to the Children and Families Bill:

- 19% of children aged 11 to 15 reported often being exposed to second-hand smoke in cars (survey of 6971 boys and girls aged 11 to 15, conducted in 2010 on behalf of the NHS Information Centre) [9]

In addition:

- 51% of children aged 8 to 15 reported that they had at some point been exposed to cigarette smoke in a car [10]

The research also showed that 86 per cent of children across the UK want people to stop smoking when they are in the car.

4.5 How seriously should we take these results? Announcing its new tobacco control strategy in March 2013, the Scottish Government press release included a note about NHS Fife's anti-smoking initiative. It featured the following statement:

The I-Don't project surveyed 1500 students and showed that while students thought 75% of their peers smoked, in reality the number who smoked was less than 30%. [11]

In other words, surveys of students (and children) cannot be relied upon for accuracy. If a child says he (or she) has been in a car when someone has been smoking it doesn't mean they have. The reality is probably very different and the true figure very much lower.

5. The road safety argument

5.1 Apart from the issue of health, the main argument for further legislation rests on the argument that smoking is a potential distraction to drivers and

could cause accidents. In fact, smoking is an insignificant factor in car crashes.

5.2 Research in this area is limited but the few studies that exist show that smoking while driving is one of the least distracting activities for a driver. Things that are considered more distracting include chatting with passengers, outside activity, changing a CD or tuning the radio. Should they be banned as well?

5.3 According to CR Consulting, the US research (on which the claim that smoking leads to more accidents was based) classed driver distractions as follows as factors in car crashes:

<i>Specific Distraction</i>	<i>% of drivers</i>
Outside person, object or event	29.4
Adjusting radio, cassette, CD	11.4
Other occupant in vehicle	10.9
Moving object in vehicle	4.3
Other device/object brought into vehicle	2.9
Adjusting vehicle/climate controls	2.8
Eating or drinking	1.7
Using/dialing cell phone	1.5
Smoking related	0.9
Other distraction	25.6
Unknown distraction	8.6
Total	100%

In other words, the distraction from another person inside the car is over 30 times as likely to cause an accident as smoking a cigarette. [12]

6. The slippery slope – what next?

6.1 The slippery slope argument is a valid one. Significantly many anti-smoking campaigners are not satisfied with banning smoking in cars with children. Just as smoking is banned in every pub and private members' club in the country, the British Medical Association wants a ban on smoking in ALL cars, including private vehicles, regardless of who is in them.

6.2 Action on Smoking and Health (London) subsequently joined the BMA in calling for a comprehensive ban on smoking in private vehicles. According to CEO Deborah Arnott (Daily Mirror, 17 December 2014):

"We are delighted that the (Westminster) Government is to press ahead with regulations to prohibit smoking in cars containing children. As with the smoke-free public places law, this is a popular measure that will largely be self-enforcing. However, secondhand smoke is just as harmful to adults as children and it makes it more difficult to enforce if it only applies to some cars, not all. Seatbelt laws don't just apply to children, why should smokefree car laws?"

6.3 This comment is significant because it demonstrates the fallacy that

campaigners only want to ban smoking in cars with children and there is no 'slippery slope'. Clearly, banning smoking in cars carrying children is part of a wider, more illiberal plan to control the behaviour of adult smokers to the point where they can no longer smoke in their own private vehicles even when they are on their own.

6.4 In its most recent report (Smoking Still Kills), published on Wednesday 10th June 2015, ASH called for a review of the evidence and a consultation on the prohibition of smoking in all cars and motor vehicles. [13] If this were to happen adults would be prohibited from smoking in their own family cars even if they were the only person in the vehicle. How can that be justified?

6.5 Others have described smoking in a car with children as child abuse. Entrepreneur Duncan Bannatyne wants children to be able to report parents who smoke in a car to the police. He also believes it should be illegal to smoke at home in front of children. [14]

The only way this could be enforced is by encouraging neighbours, family members or even the children themselves to go to the police or social services. Is that the type of over-regulated, curtain-twitching society politicians want Scotland to become?

7. Enforcement

7.1 FOREST does not support the introduction of a ban on smoking in cars carrying children but if legislation is introduced we believe enforcement should be a matter for environmental health officers not the police who, in our opinion, have far more important things to do fighting genuine crime.

7.2 Frankly, so few adults smoke in cars with children these days it will be like looking for a needle in a haystack and a complete waste of police time and money. Currently the overwhelming majority of adult smokers self regulate when it comes to smoking in cars with children. With or without a law they will continue to self regulate, hence we believe legislation is a gross overreaction to a very small problem.

7.3 The police have enough on their hands already without having to investigate and possibly prosecute drivers who might be smoking in a car carrying children. According to CR Consulting (November 2011):

The closest parallel to the issue of enforcement of smoking bans in private cars is perhaps the use of handheld mobile phones. There is a perceived threat to the occupants (in terms of safety) and yet self-enforcement is low and enforcement from external authorities is limited.

In the UK in December 2003 the law banned the use of hand-held mobile devices in or on vehicles. The penalties were strengthened in 2007 to a £1000 court fine for a private motorist and £2500 for a commercial vehicle or public service vehicle driver.

According to the Green Flag/Brake Report 'Driven to Distraction' (2006) awareness and understanding of the law was high:

- 64% of drivers were aware of the law and a further 25% thought all mobile phone usage was banned.
- 69% agreed that 'it is dangerous to drive using any type of mobile phone' despite this understanding of, and sympathy with, the law.
- 36% admitted illegally using a hand-held phone whilst driving (15% of these at least once a month) presumably as fears of effective detection or prosecution were low
- 75% believe that there is either no chance (17%) or less than a one-in-four chance of being caught (8%)

The result has been a persistent level of offending throughout the country that dipped with the introduction of the initial law and again with the increase in penalties, but [by 2009 was] at a very similar level to the period before the ban was put in place. [15]

It is not unreasonable to think that regulations to ban smoking in cars with children would generate a similar reaction – a small initial drop in the number of people offending, followed by a gradual increase to pre-ban levels, as if the legislation had never happened.

The time and money required to achieve this non-result would be better spent, in our view, on education not coercion (ie legislation). How much better would it be if government worked with smokers not against them? FOREST would happily back an education campaign.

8. Opinion evidence

8.1 FOREST is not alone in expressing concern at the prospect of a ban on smoking in cars, with or without children.

8.2 Others who have expressed worries about a ban on smoking in cars include Matthew Wright, TV presenter and ex-smoker. Writing in the Daily Star Sunday (20 November 2011), Wright commented [16]:

I used to enjoy driving and smoking ... The two went together like fags and beer. But my car never smelled of smoke because I'd only light up with the window open or the roof down.

People do say holding a ciggie impairs your driving. I'm sure it does ... but it can't be any worse than changing the CD or winding down the window, can it?

I'm told talking to a passenger is more dangerous still. Are we going to ban them from our cars too?

But what about those parents who smoke while their kids are in the back, Wrighty? We need laws to stop them poisoning their sprogs!

Well, I've spent the past few days wandering about London looking for them. I've seen them in the past. The sight of them feeding their kids

second-hand smoke made me feel physically sick.

But after four days of searching I didn't see one person smoking in a car with kids on board. Not one – and I live in the heart of the capital.

8.3 Writing in the Sunday Times in the wake of the BMA's call for a ban on smoking in all cars, columnist Rod Liddle, former editor of BBC Radio 4's Today programme, described it as a "grotesque infringement of personal liberty", adding [17]:

The BMA was palpably wrong last week when it called for the ban on smoking in cars. I don't mean simply that it was being fascistic and overstepping its remit: that, after all, is a given. I mean that it got all of its figures wrong and was forced to retract. But only after it had been on every news programme across the country, being self-righteous.

8.4 Writing in the Observer Catherine Bennett observed [18]:

Like the BMA's initial figures on toxins, my anecdotal research must lack any credibility but, as hard as I peered into cars while driving around north London last week, I saw no one smoking in them at all. Of course, there were endless drivers doing the routine, homicidal things that cry out for cruel and unusual punishment – talking on mobiles, monsterring cyclists, tailgating, driving at 40mph in 20mph zones, the scamps.

But not one smoker could be seen subjecting children to a toxic cloud of carcinogens that is either 23 times stronger than a smoky bar or 11 times stronger: the BMA offered both figures last week.

8.5 Philip Hensher, writing in the Independent, commented [19]:

The desire to protect children from smoke is laudable. But how many people, seriously, smoke in their cars with the windows shut with children in the back seat?

8.6 For Graeme Archer, writing in the Daily Telegraph (17 November 2011), the smoking ban still rankled and the proposal for a ban on smoking in cars was the final straw [20]:

Few political acts have made me so angry, since few others seemed so obviously driven by malice ... And now, the campaigners are back: some people, they've noticed, have been smoking in their cars. And other people might be in the car with them! So we need a new law, and a new set of criminals to prosecute – because, honestly, there's nothing more important for either the political class or the medical establishment to be thinking about just now, right?

8.7 Strong words, too, from Dr Phil Hammond, GP, journalist, comedian and broadcaster, in The Times (17 November 2011) [21]

It's impossible to justify smoking with children in the car, home or womb. But that doesn't mean a leap to legislation. We have to go through the

traditional cycle of patronising health promotion campaigns and doctors with big livers telling us how to live our lives. Only when that fails should we send in the police.

8.8 Ian Dent, editor of politics.co.uk (29 January 2014) wrote [22]:

This is as pure an example of state over-reach as can be imagined. This is the state coming onto your private property and telling you how to live. Smoking in cars with children is bad. It shouldn't happen. There should certainly be public information campaigns shaming those parents who do it into stopping. But the question is not whether people should smoke in cars with their children. The question is what we sacrifice if we use the law to stop it. In this case the sacrifice is too big.

9. Conclusion

9.1 FOREST neither encourages nor condones smoking in cars carrying children but a ban is out of all proportion to the problem.

9.2 In practice, as research suggests, very few adults light up in a car with children present. The vast majority of adults don't need to be threatened with fines or other penalties to behave in a sensible and considerate fashion.

9.3 The vast majority of smokers have clearly changed their behaviour voluntarily, without government intervention, so why do we need another law that even its supporters accept would be difficult to enforce? Education must be better than coercion.

9.4 Legislation is justified, so we are told, because of the serious harm caused by 'passive smoking'. Speaking at the British Medical Association conference in Cardiff in 2011, public health doctor Douglas Noble argued that "It would be safer to have your exhaust pipe on the inside of your car". Nonsense.

9.5 Another claim, often repeated, is that second-hand smoke is "23 times more toxic in a vehicle than in a home [or smoky pub]". Yet in 2010 an article by Australian researchers in the Canadian Medical Association Journal suggested there is no scientific evidence to support this argument.

9.6 Significantly, campaigners aren't satisfied with banning smoking in cars with children. Just as smoking is banned in every pub and private members' club, the BMA wants a ban on smoking in all cars, regardless of who is in them. If smoking is banned in cars carrying children expect a gradual but persistent clamour for smoking to be banned in all cars. In the world of tobacco control it's called 'the next logical step'.

9.7 Grasping at straws, campaigners argue that smoking while driving is a threat to other road users. Major international studies show that smoking while driving is one of the least distracting activities for a driver. Far more distracting are chatting with passengers, outside activity, changing a CD or retuning the radio. Should we ban those as well?

9.8 While smoking in cars carrying children may be neither sensible nor considerate, the state should not make it a crime to smoke in a private vehicle punishable with fines and other penalties. Banning smoking in a private vehicle, with or without children, is not only an unnecessary attack on smokers, effectively taking away parental responsibility, it represents a serious invasion of a citizen's private space. For many people this is a worryingly illiberal step. What next? A ban on smoking in the home if children are present?

9.9 Far better that the small number of smokers who still smoke in cars carrying children are educated to be more considerate to their young passengers. If the Scottish Government was to launch such a campaign FOREST would happily endorse it in an effort to change those people's behavior.

10. REFERENCES

- [1] Smokers Panel, Holden Pearmain, July 2011
- [2] [Ban on smoking in cars would have little impact, says study](#) (Irish Independent)
- [3] [Smokers' group welcomes study showing low level of smoking in cars](#) (Journal.ie)
- [4] [Smoking in cars briefing](#) (CR Consulting)
- [5] [Smoking in your car 'more damaging to health than breathing in exhaust fumes'](#) (Daily Mail, 29 June 2011)
- [6] [BMA's 'facts' prove to be all smoke and mirrors](#) (Scotsman)
- [7] [BMA press releases archive](#) (16 November 2011)
- [8] [Should smoking in your own car be banned?](#) (Huffington Post)
- [9] 19% in survey of 6971 boys and girls aged 11-15. Smoking, drinking and drug use among young people in England in 2010. NHS Information Centre, 2010
- [10] BLF/TNS survey of 1,000+ children aged 8-15, 20-27 January 2011
- [11] [What children think is not reliable evidence](#) (Taking Liberties)
- [12] [Smoking in cars briefing](#) (CR Consulting)
- [13] Smoking Still Kills (ASH, June 2015)
- [14] [Den star in car cig kids row](#) (The Sun, 8 August 2010)
- [15] [Smoking in cars briefing](#) (CR Consulting)
- [16] I'm fumin' at car cigs 'ban' (Daily Star Sunday, 20 November 2011)
- [17] [Stand back, I'm going to send the BMA's claims up in smoke](#) (Sunday Times, 20 November 2011)
- [18] [The ban that was guaranteed to have people fuming](#) (Observer, 20 November 2011)
- [19] [The state wants to know what you're up to. But why do we let it?](#) (Independent, 17 November 2011)
- [20] [All these smoking bans have left me fuming](#) (Daily Telegraph, 17 November 2011)
- [21] [I wouldn't get in a car with a smoker. But a ban is silly](#) (The Times, 17 November 2011)
- [22] [Banning smoking in cars with children is an abuse of state power](#) (Politics.co.uk, 29 January 2014)

11. ADDITIONAL READING

[Smoking in cars: the BMA's dodgy dossier](#) (Spiked, 17 November 2011)

[Forest says no to ban on smoking in cars with children](#) (Forest, 6 February 2012)

[Smokers' group welcomes study showing low level of smoking in cars](#)

(TheJournal.ie, 10 April 2013)

[Stop treating parents as polluters](#) (Spiked, 11 February 2014)

[Car smoke ban "excessive" and "unnecessary"](#) (Forest, 18 December 2014)

[Smoking in cars with children: "education better than big stick"](#) (Forest, 25 March 2015)