

COMMITTEE FOR COMMON COURTESY

I. PURPOSE:

\* To put forth the stand that common courtesy can be used to solve problems between smokers and non-smokers and that restrictive smoking legislation is unnecessary, unfair, unenforceable, and economically destructive.

\* To demonstrate that leading organizations and concerned citizens in New York City are opposed to a proposed restrictive smoking bill.

\* To create awareness with the public, the press, and legislators of the reasons why this bill should not be enacted.

\* To pool the resources of concerned New Yorkers in order to mount an effective campaign to defeat this bill.

II. MEMBERSHIP:

It is expected that major businesses and citizen organizations, top New York businesspeople and civic leaders, and other important and well-known New Yorkers will lend their names to this umbrella group.

III. ACTIVITIES:

It is expected that committee members will vary greatly in the amount of time and effort they can lend to this group. However, among the activities which may be performed are:

\* being listed on official Committee for Common Courtesy stationery as a member. This would be distributed to officials, legislators, organizations and media.

\* writing individual letters and memorandums in opposition on organization or personal letterhead to express arguments against this proposal to appropriate officials, legislators, organizations and media.

\* appearing before groups to express the mandate of the Common Courtesy Committee and gain support.

\* making media appearances (this would be limited to the Committee Chairperson and designated spokespeople) to express the view of the Committee.

IV. BASIC THEMES:

Economic Impact: Our economic impact study shows that the cost to the city and, thus, to the citizens, would be substantial. Costs to private industry would also be enormous. Estimated costs of imposing these restrictions is \$265.6 million.

Unnecessary: Extensive polling has proven that government control is not the answer to the public smoking issue. The answer lies in courtesy by smokers and tolerance by non-smokers. Such an ordinance would seek to establish by legal fiat what can be handled by common sense and courtesy.

Unenforceable: Laws that attempt to restrict or segregate smokers in public places or places of employment are of such low priority to the police that they receive little or no attention.

If nuisance laws of this type were strictly enforced they would siphon off the limited resources of health and police departments available for serious threats to public safety.

Unfair: The ordinance is written in such a way as to give a single nonsmoker dictatorial power over smokers in the workplace. Smoking laws of this sort set up a natural confrontation. Common sense and courtesy toward others is the time-honored way to settle such minor disputes over personal custom.

2025876665