Tobacco Industry Litigation and the Role of Government: A Public Health Perspective

Roberta Ferrence, PhD,^{1,3} Mary Jane Ashley, MD,^{1,3}
Joanna Cohen, PhD,^{1,3} Thomas Stephens, PhD^{1,3,4}

We welcome this opportunity to comment on issues raised by our colleagues on the role of government in tobacco industry litigation. Fischer and Rehm (pp. 7-8, this issue) argue that it is hypocritical and may be inappropriate for the state to initiate litigation against the tobacco industry. We propose a different 'tobacco logic': starting to smoke is rarely the rational act of informed adults, tobacco is not comparable to other consumer products, the government does not profit from tobacco, and litigation is a key component of a comprehensive tobacco control strategy.

Tobacco is a highly addictive drug, which most smokers begin to use as children or adolescents.¹ Most beginners believe they will not become addicted, yet many quickly do,^{2,3} and most who continue to smoke as adults are addicted. While we agree that the public is much better informed than it used to be about the dangers of smoking, we do not believe that most beginners are well informed about their own susceptibility to addiction.

No other consumer product (including vehicles, and certainly skis) kills half its long-term users, when used exactly as intended by the manufacturer. Just as industrial polluters are held responsible for the environmental damage they cause, tobacco manufacturers should be held responsible for the societal damage they

knowingly cause, as manifested by at least 34,000 deaths, 194,000 hospital admissions, and \$2.68 billion in health care costs annually in Canada.^{4,5}

The misperception persists that governments profit from tobacco. In fact, conservative estimates of health costs are at least double provincial government tax revenues for tobacco.⁶

Litigation can be viewed as one reinforcing component of a comprehensive strategy to control tobacco use that could provide a number of benefits to public health.⁶ Successful litigation would likely lead to price increases by the industry to cover costs, ultimately resulting in reduced smoking and health care costs. Litigation is a public health measure that, like water treatment, is not generally practicable at the individual level.

Tobacco litigation also helps to denormalize the tobacco industry and its products, a key element (along with prevention, protection, and cessation) in Canada's National Tobacco Strategy. One of the major benefits of litigation in the United States has been the release of industry documents. Through the discovery process, we have learned about industry efforts to mislead the public, suppress research, and target youth and potential quitters.

Although the federal government and several provincial health ministries have made significant advances in tobacco control – including bans on advertising and promotion, protection from second-hand smoke, and graphic health warnings – we agree with Fischer and Rehm that other actions by government are not only warranted, but are urgently needed. The most critical of these, tax increases, can only be undertaken by government. The tax

increases that were implemented in the 1980s resulted in a substantial decrease in the prevalence and level of smoking, particularly among youth. The illegal activities of the tobacco industry in orchestrating the smuggling that ensued have now been brought to light. Lack of progress on cigarette taxes and other key tobacco control measures, such as increased restrictions on smoking in public places and workplaces, is due to industry lobbying, lack of public concern, political ideology, and other political factors.

While the role of the state in public health and some of the concerns raised by Fischer and Rehm are worthy of further debate, we hope that such debate will not delay the implementation of measures that are known to be effective. Litigation can play an important role in holding the tobacco industry accountable for its contribution to the continuing epidemic of tobacco-related disease and death.

The opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and not of their respective institutions.

REFERENCES

1. Ontario Tobacco Research Unit, Toronto, ON
2. Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto
3. Department of Public Health Sciences, University of Toronto
4. Faculty of Administration, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON

Correspondence: Dr. Roberta Ferrence, Ontario Tobacco Research Unit, 33 Russell St., Toronto, ON M5S 2S1.

1. Hobbs FM, Pickett W, Ferrence RG, et al. Youth smoking in Ontario 1981-1997: A cause for concern. *Can J Public Health* 1999;90:80-82.
2. DiFranza JR, Rigotti NA, McNeill AD, et al. Initial symptoms of nicotine dependence in adolescents. *Tobacco Control* 2000;9:313-19.
3. Colby SM, Tiffany ST, Shiffman S, Niaura RS. Are adolescent smokers dependent on nicotine? A review of the evidence. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 2000;59 (Suppl 1):S83-S95.
4. Single E, Rehm J, Robson L, Truong MV. The relative risks and etiologic fractions of different causes of death and disease attributable to alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use in Canada. *CMAJ* 2000;162:1669-75.
5. Single E, Robson L, Xie X, Rehm J. The economic costs of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drugs in Canada, 2000. *Addiction* 1998;93:991-1006.
6. Ashley MJ, Boadway T, Cameron R, et al. Actions will speak louder than words: Getting serious about tobacco control in Ontario. A Report to the Minister of Health from her Expert Panel on the Renewal of the Ontario Tobacco Strategy. /Les actes sont plus éloquentes que les mots : un plan d'attaque au tabagisme en Ontario. Rapport présenté à la ministre de la santé par son comité d'experts sur la relance de la stratégie antitabac de l'Ontario. Toronto, Canada: Expert Panel on the Renewal of the Ontario Tobacco Strategy: February 1999. ISBN 0-9686913-0-7 (<http://www.camh.net/otru>).