

McDonald, David S

From: Bustin, Merryl <m.bustin@seasidehighspeed.com>
Sent: November-02-14 6:11 PM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Subject: Re: Request to present at Committee
Attachments: Presentation on Bill 60 to Law Amendments Committee.docx; Presentation on Bill 60 to Law Amendments Committee.pdf

Please consider the attached files as my written presentation to the Law Amendments Committee on Bill 60. You may print and copy as you choose. I have attached the presentation as both Word and PDF formats. Both are the same. Thank you.

Merryl Bustin
Skye Glen, NS

On 10/31/2014 11:45 AM, Office of the Legislative Counsel wrote:

> Hi Mr. Bustin,
>
> Thank you for letting us know that you will be unable to appear in person before the Law Amendments Committee. Yes, you may make a written representation to the Committee. Since the Committee is meeting on Bill 60 on Monday, November 3, it would be preferable to receive a written submission by 1:00 p.m. on Monday.
>
> If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.
>
> Office of the Legislative Counsel
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Bustin, Merryl [<mailto:m.bustin@seasidehighspeed.com>]
> Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 5:46 PM
> To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
> Subject: Re: Request to present at Committee
>
> Thank you for your call today, indicating a 2:30pm time slot on
> Monday, Nov 3. Unfortunately, due to work commitments, I will be
> unable to attend. Can I submit a written presentation? If so, please
> provide an address and deadline. Thanks
>
> Merryl Bustin

> On 10/27/2014 2:04 PM, Office wrote:

>> Good day Mr. Bustin,
>>

>> Thank you for your e-mail. We have added your name to our list of presenters on Bill 60. You will get a call from our office once the Law Amendments Committee decides to meet on that Bill.

>>
>> Office of the Legislative Counsel
>> 902-424-8941
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Bustin, Merryl [<mailto:m.bustin@seasidehighspeed.com>]
>> Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 6:23 PM
>> To: Office
>> Subject: Request to present at Committee
>>
>> Hello,
>> I wish to make a presentation to the Law Amendments Committee on Bill 60. Please notify me at your convenience.
>>
>> Merryl Bustin

>>
>> Thank you.
>>
>> Merryl Bustin
>>
>

Personally Written Presentation on Bill 60 to Law Amendments Committee, NS Legislative Counsel

November 3, 2014

Dear Committee,

I truly appreciate the opportunity to forward a written presentation to the Committee on Bill 60, as I am unable to provide one in person, as I had anticipated.

My personal experience with what is called "vaping"(use of Personal Vaporizers) began in November of 2013. I purchased a kit from a Nova Scotia shop, and began to use it as an alternative to smoking tobacco. I can attest to the fact that using these devices enabled me to leave behind a 37 year addiction. Previously I had tried most of the available smoking cessation therapies (patches, gums, lozenges, sprays, prescribed medication and even hypnosis), to which none were successful at keeping me smoke free. Since I began vaping, I have not had any tobacco.

My family physician, along with my Dietician and Diabetes Nurse are delighted at this effort and the results. They noted great improvements in several aspects of my overall health. I personally feel much better, have much greater lung capacity and no longer any hacking cough! Family members and co-workers all commented positively on the changes they have seen.

The scientific evidence on this technology being a much safer alternative to smoking continues to mount. The world over has seen a growing number of medical doctors, university professors, and other professionals in Public Health testing and validating their data and conclusions through peer reviews. Given these scientific reports, why does the Dept of Health and Wellness and the Gov't continue to ignore what the experts are saying?

Earlier this year, some 53 experts in these fields expressed their concerns to the WHO (World Health Org.) The communication states these products could be among the most significant health innovations of the 21st century and could save hundreds of millions of lives. Published May 2014. A brief abstract of their statement:

1. If regulators treat low risk nicotine products(vaporizers) as traditional tobacco products and seek to reduce their use without recognizing their potential as low risk alternatives to smoking, they are improperly defining them as part of the problem.

2. Tobacco harm reduction policies should be evidence based and proportionate to risk, and give due weight to the significant reductions in risk that are achieved when a smoker switches to a low risk nicotine product.

3. On a precautionary basis, regulators should avoid support for measures that could have the perverse effect of prolonging cigarette consumption.

4. It is counterproductive to ban the advertising of ecigarettes and other low risk alternatives to smoking.

5. It is inappropriate to apply legislation designed to protect bystanders or workers to vapour products. There is no evidence at present of material risk to health from vapour emitted from ecigarettes.

6. The tax regime for nicotine products should reflect risk and be organised to create incentives for users to switch from smoking to low risk harm reduction products. Excessive taxation of low risk products relative to combustible tobacco deters smokers from switching and will cause more smoking and harm than there otherwise would be.

In another report commissioned by Public Health England, the authors state they could not identify any evidence to suggest that non smoking children who tried e-cigarettes were more likely to then try tobacco. Published May 2014.

A systematic review by several experts states currently available evidence indicates electronic cigarettes are by far a less harmful alternative to smoking and significant health benefits are expected in smokers who make the switch from tobacco to ecigs. Published April 2014.

An ASH(Action on Smoking and Health – UK) survey shows electronic cigarette use among adults in Britain has tripled over the past two years and according to the associated study's lead author, there is no evidence to suggest ecigarettes are renormalizing smoking. Published April 2014.

A study by researchers from University College London has found the use of ecigarettes by those who have never smoked is negligible. Evidence also indicates ecigs are not 'renormalizing' smoking - and they may be contributing to a reduction in smoking prevalence. Published April 2014.

Switching completely from tobacco to e-cigarettes achieves much the same with regard to health as does quitting smoking and all nicotine use completely says the Royal College Of Physicians. The body goes on to say even in the absence of regulation, the risks to ecig users and others is low. Published March 2014.

In an open letter published on The Montreal Gazette; the medical director of the Smoking Cessation Clinic at the Montreal Chest Institute and other health professionals have voiced their support for the authorization of the sale of ecigs in Canada. In his letter, Dr. Gaston Ostiguy mentions states there is a "moral and ethical duty to provide these products to addicted smokers."

According to the American Council On Science And Health "Electronic cigarette vapor appears chemically incapable of causing cancer as cigarette smoke has done." The report, Nicotine And Health, was published in January 2014.

A study headed by Dr. Konstantinos Farsalinos finds flavours play a major role in the overall experience of dedicated vapers and support the hypothesis that flavoured e-liquids are important contributors in reducing or eliminating the smoking of tobacco cigarettes. Published December 2013. (Emphasis added by writer, as banning flavoured e-liquid is contained in Bill 60.)

A study by Professor Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health, based on a review of available data has confirmed chemicals generally found in ecig e-liquids pose no health concerns. Published August 2013.

And now we come to the elephant in the room. Why is the gov't so insistent on regulating these devices to the point they would no longer be attractive to current vapers(no flavours) and extremely difficult to access by current smokers(hidden from view, no adverts) ?

It is easy for non-smokers to get caught up in the need to support the negative imagery that supports the general world of antismoking psychology. But greater than this is the undeniable strong lobby from the Pharmaceutical firms responsible for the various smoking cessation products. So too, the ever-increasing reduction in tobacco sales. No doubt those counting up the tobacco tax revenues are noticing a considerable difference over the past 24 months.

"Aside from the psychological aspects of course there's also the practical end of things. Successfully labeling e-cigarettes as either "tobacco" or "medical" immediately puts them under a level of government control that will allow them to be heavily limited or taxed, thereby removing them from the reach of smokers who might like to switch to them or from people who might simply try them and enjoy them. For many Antismokers, the mere idea of people *looking* like they're doing something that resembles smoking sets off a wave of frantic concern, even if the activity is fairly or totally harmless and absent of annoying side effects for others. And the threat that their money streams could dry up as people avoid tobacco taxes in making such a switch is a profound threat for many of these so-called "activists" who depend on millions of dollars of grant money as well." Michael J. McFadden, author of "Dissecting Antismokers' Brains"

One proposed regulation that vapers, vendors and the gov't actually agree on is the banning of sales to minors. Also, personally as a vaper I have no issue with further controls on tobacco. However, I cannot agree with the proposed definition changes to include vaporizers, e-liquid and associated equipment as tobacco products. There is no combustion of tobacco plant material in these devices. The technology of delivering nicotine by means of vapour is light-years different from burning leaves. Vaporizers cannot, in any sensible regard, be considered a tobacco product. The clause in Bill 60 suggesting this should be removed.

We have sufficient scientific evidence this technology is magnitudes of order safer than tobacco smoking. It is good for public health to have smokers switch to vaping, allowing them a much easier transition to becoming non-smokers. We know through research and personal admissions that the

variety of flavours available in e-liquids is one of the main reasons this alternative works. Since sales to minors (and even entry to shops) will be illegal, it is reasonable to question why adults in Nova Scotia would not have the privileges (rights) to purchase well made Canadian sourced e-liquids with flavours. I strongly urge the Committee to reconsider this clause in Bill 60 as well.

Once again, thank you for this opportunity to engage with our government on this noteworthy topic. Changes to the present version of Bill 60 are not only warranted, but are deserved in light of the science.

“SMOKING IS DEAD. VAPING IS THE FUTURE, AND THE FUTURE IS NOW!” R. Trippers, Vaping Advocate

Sincerely,

Merryl Bustin

Skye Glen, Nova Scotia

Personally Written Presentation on Bill 60 to Law Amendments Committee, NS Legislative Counsel

November 3, 2014

Dear Committee,

I truly appreciate the opportunity to forward a written presentation to the Committee on Bill 60, as I am unable to provide one in person, as I had anticipated.

My personal experience with what is called "vaping"(use of Personal Vaporizers) began in November of 2013. I purchased a kit from a Nova Scotia shop, and began to use it as an alternative to smoking tobacco. I can attest to the fact that using these devices enabled me to leave behind a 37 year addiction. Previously I had tried most of the available smoking cessation therapies (patches, gums, lozenges, sprays, prescribed medication and even hypnosis), to which none were successful at keeping me smoke free. Since I began vaping, I have not had any tobacco.

My family physician, along with my Dietician and Diabetes Nurse are delighted at this effort and the results. They noted great improvements in several aspects of my overall health. I personally feel much better, have much greater lung capacity and no longer any hacking cough! Family members and co-workers all commented positively on the changes they have seen.

The scientific evidence on this technology being a much safer alternative to smoking continues to mount. The world over has seen a growing number of medical doctors, university professors, and other professionals in Public Health testing and validating their data and conclusions through peer reviews. Given these scientific reports, why does the Dept of Health and Wellness and the Gov't continue to ignore what the experts are saying?

Earlier this year, some 53 experts in these fields expressed their concerns to the WHO (World Health Org.) The communication states these products could be among the most significant health innovations of the 21st century and could save hundreds of millions of lives. Published May 2014. A brief abstract of their statement:

1. If regulators treat low risk nicotine products(vaporizers) as traditional tobacco products and seek to reduce their use without recognizing their potential as low risk alternatives to smoking, they are improperly defining them as part of the problem.

2. Tobacco harm reduction policies should be evidence based and proportionate to risk, and give due weight to the significant reductions in risk that are achieved when a smoker switches to a low risk nicotine product.

3. On a precautionary basis, regulators should avoid support for measures that could have the perverse effect of prolonging cigarette consumption.

4. It is counterproductive to ban the advertising of ecigarettes and other low risk alternatives to smoking.

5. It is inappropriate to apply legislation designed to protect bystanders or workers to vapour products. There is no evidence at present of material risk to health from vapour emitted from ecigarettes.

6. The tax regime for nicotine products should reflect risk and be organised to create incentives for users to switch from smoking to low risk harm reduction products. Excessive taxation of low risk products relative to combustible tobacco deters smokers from switching and will cause more smoking and harm than there otherwise would be.

In another report commissioned by Public Health England, the authors state they could not identify any evidence to suggest that non smoking children who tried e-cigarettes were more likely to then try tobacco. Published May 2014.

A systematic review by several experts states currently available evidence indicates electronic cigarettes are by far a less harmful alternative to smoking and significant health benefits are expected in smokers who make the switch from tobacco to ecigs. Published April 2014.

An ASH(Action on Smoking and Health – UK) survey shows electronic cigarette use among adults in Britain has tripled over the past two years and according to the associated study's lead author, there is no evidence to suggest ecigarettes are renormalizing smoking. Published April 2014.

A study by researchers from University College London has found the use of ecigarettes by those who have never smoked is negligible. Evidence also indicates ecigs are not 'renormalizing' smoking - and they may be contributing to a reduction in smoking prevalence. Published April 2014.

Switching completely from tobacco to e-cigarettes achieves much the same with regard to health as does quitting smoking and all nicotine use completely says the Royal College Of Physicians. The body goes on to say even in the absence of regulation, the risks to ecig users and others is low. Published March 2014.

In an open letter published on The Montreal Gazette; the medical director of the Smoking Cessation Clinic at the Montreal Chest Institute and other health professionals have voiced their support for the authorization of the sale of ecigs in Canada. In his letter, Dr. Gaston Ostiguy mentions states there is a "moral and ethical duty to provide these products to addicted smokers."

According to the American Council On Science And Health "Electronic cigarette vapor appears chemically incapable of causing cancer as cigarette smoke has done." The report, Nicotine And Health, was published in January 2014.

A study headed by Dr. Konstantinos Farsalinos finds flavours play a major role in the overall experience of dedicated vapers and support the hypothesis that flavoured e-liquids are important contributors in reducing or eliminating the smoking of tobacco cigarettes. Published December 2013. (Emphasis added by writer, as banning flavoured e-liquid is contained in Bill 60.)

A study by Professor Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health, based on a review of available data has confirmed chemicals generally found in ecig e-liquids pose no health concerns. Published August 2013.

And now we come to the elephant in the room. Why is the gov't so insistent on regulating these devices to the point they would no longer be attractive to current vapers(no flavours) and extremely difficult to access by current smokers(hidden from view, no adverts) ?

It is easy for non-smokers to get caught up in the need to support the negative imagery that supports the general world of antismoking psychology. But greater than this is the undeniable strong lobby from the Pharmaceutical firms responsible for the various smoking cessation products. So too, the ever-increasing reduction in tobacco sales. No doubt those counting up the tobacco tax revenues are noticing a considerable difference over the past 24 months.

“Aside from the psychological aspects of course there's also the practical end of things. Successfully labeling e-cigarettes as either "tobacco" or "medical" immediately puts them under a level of government control that will allow them to be heavily limited or taxed, thereby removing them from the reach of smokers who might like to switch to them or from people who might simply try them and enjoy them. For many Antismokers, the mere idea of people *looking* like they're doing something that resembles smoking sets off a wave of frantic concern, even if the activity is fairly or totally harmless and absent of annoying side effects for others. And the threat that their money streams could dry up as people avoid tobacco taxes in making such a switch is a profound threat for many of these so-called "activists" who depend on millions of dollars of grant money as well.” Michael J. McFadden, author of “Dissecting Antismokers’ Brains”

One proposed regulation that vapers, vendors and the gov't actually agree on is the banning of sales to minors. Also, personally as a vaper I have no issue with further controls on tobacco. However, I cannot agree with the proposed definition changes to include vaporizers, e-liquid and associated equipment as tobacco products. There is no combustion of tobacco plant material in these devices. The technology of delivering nicotine by means of vapour is light-years different from burning leaves. Vaporizers cannot, in any sensible regard, be considered a tobacco product. The clause in Bill 60 suggesting this should be removed.

We have sufficient scientific evidence this technology is magnitudes of order safer than tobacco smoking. It is good for public health to have smokers switch to vaping, allowing them a much easier transition to becoming non-smokers. We know through research and personal admissions that the

variety of flavours available in e-liquids is one of the main reasons this alternative works. Since sales to minors (and even entry to shops) will be illegal, it is reasonable to question why adults in Nova Scotia would not have the privileges (rights) to purchase well made Canadian sourced e-liquids with flavours. I strongly urge the Committee to reconsider this clause in Bill 60 as well.

Once again, thank you for this opportunity to engage with our government on this noteworthy topic. Changes to the present version of Bill 60 are not only warranted, but are deserved in light of the science.

“SMOKING IS DEAD. VAPING IS THE FUTURE, AND THE FUTURE IS NOW!” R. Trippers, Vaping Advocate

Sincerely,

Merryl Bustin

Skye Glen, Nova Scotia