
TOBACCO CONTROL STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 2005:

Economic Impact of Smoke-Free Policies

This fact sheet provides basic information only. It must not take the place of medical advice, diagnosis or treatment. Always talk to a healthcare professional about any health concerns you have, and before you make any changes to your diet, lifestyle or treatment.

- Economic studies in Ontario and internationally show that smoke-free policies do not adversely affect aggregate sales or employment in restaurants and bars; in some cases these policies have had a positive impact. Initial impacts, if any, may be reversed over time.
- In 2003, U.S. and Australian researchers conducted an international, comprehensive review of all 97 English-language published and unpublished studies claiming to assess the economic impact of smoke-free policies on sales and employment in the hospitality industry. Almost all of the studies that found a negative economic impact of smoke-free policies had been funded by the tobacco industry. In addition, these studies were more likely to have used a subjective outcome measure (e.g., bar owners' opinions) rather than an objective one (sales data), and the studies were less likely to have been peer-reviewed. All of the best-designed studies that were not funded by the tobacco industry found that smoke-free restaurant and bars laws had no negative impact on revenue or jobs¹.
- evidence that the smoke-free bylaw adversely affected restaurant and bar sales².
- New York City implemented smoke-free legislation in 2003. This law bans smoking in public places and workplaces, including bars and restaurants, and designated smoking rooms are not permitted. A one-year review by the city found that the bar and restaurant industry is thriving. Business tax receipts in restaurants and bars increased by 8.7% compared to the same period the year before and employment increased by 2,800 jobs³.
- A study in Massachusetts compared the meals tax data collected from restaurants that were in communities with highly restrictive smoking policies with restaurants in communities without such policies. Researchers looked at data from 1992 to 1998. They found that there was no aggregate effect of smoke-free policies on businesses during this period⁴.
- In July 2004, Massachusetts implemented a state-wide smoke-free workplace law. Designated smoking rooms are not permitted. An evaluation of the impact of this law was recently reported by the Harvard School of Public Health.

Examples from other jurisdictions

- The City of Ottawa implemented a 100% smoke-free workplace and public places bylaw in 2001, with no designated smoking rooms. After accounting for trends, seasonal variations, and general economic conditions, the Ontario Tobacco Research Unit found no

- Researchers found that patronage at restaurants and bars remained the same after the law came into force, as compared to before the law. Inflation-adjusted meals sales tax collections were unchanged with the implementation of the law (comparisons were made on a month-by-month basis with tax collections from the prior five years). Similarly, no changes were observed in alcoholic beverages excise tax collections. Finally, no change was found in the number of workers employed in restaurants and bars⁵.
4. Bartosch, W.J. & Pope, G.C. (2002). Economic effect of restaurant smoking restrictions on restaurant business in Massachusetts, 1992 to 1998. *Tobacco Control*, 11(Suppl II), ii38-ii42). (Web:http://tc.bmjournals.com/cgi/reprint/11/suppl_2/ii38?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&author1=bartosch&andorexactfulltext=and&searchid=1113829090862_286&stored_search=&FIRSTINDEX=0&sortspec=relevance&resourcetype=1&journalcode=tobaccocontrol)
 5. Connolly, G.N., Carpenter, C., Alpert, H.R., Skeer, M., & Travers, M. *Evaluation of the Massachusetts Smoke-free workplace law: A preliminary report*. April, 2005.

References

1. Scollo, M., Lal, A., Hyland, A., & Glantz, S. (2003). Review of the quality of studies on the economic effects of smoke-free policies on the hospitality industry. *Tobacco Control*, 12; 13-20. (Web:http://tc.bmjournals.com/cgi/reprint/12/1/13?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&author1=scollo&andorexactfulltext=and&searchid=1113661487642_412&stored_search=&FIRSTINDEX=0&sortspec=relevance&resourcetype=1&journalcode=tobaccocontrol)
2. Ontario Tobacco Research Unit. The economic impact of a smoke-free bylaw on restaurant and bar sales in Ottawa, Canada. *Ontario Tobacco Research Unit Research Update*, June 2003. (Web: http://www.otru.org/pdf/updates/update_june_2003.pdf)
3. New York City Departments of Finance, Health & Mental Hygiene, Small Business Services, and Economic Development Corporation. *The state of smoke-free New York City: A one-year review*, March 2004. (Web:<http://www.nyc.gov/html/doh/pdf/smo ke/sfaa-2004report.pdf>.)