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ARE EMPLOYERS WHO REFUSE TO HIRE SMOKERS DISCRIMINATING WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990?

Federal legislation requires that all individuals be given an equal opportunity for employment. One of the most recent legislative attempts to ensure civil rights is the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The ADA is a broad-ranging, comprehensive statute designed to prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability in the areas of employment, public services and transportation, public accommodations, and telecommunications. Its five titles address the serious and pervasive social problem of soci-

---


3 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 12111-12117 (Title I). For a brief overview of Title I of the ADA, see infra notes 24-34 and accompanying text.

4 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 12131-12165 (Title II). Title II extends and explains the regulations of § 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to all programs, activities, and services provided by state or local government regardless of whether they receive federal funding. See id.

5 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 12181-12189 (Title III). Title III affects providers of public accommodations (hotels, restaurants, theaters) and those responsible for contracting places that have a potential for employment of the disabled and is concerned with accessibility. See id.

6 47 U.S.C.A. §§ 225, 611 (West Pamph. 1992) (Title IV). Title IV ensures the provision of telecommunications services to hearing- and speech-impaired individuals. See id.
ety's neglect of and discrimination against individuals with disabilities. The basic premise underlying Title I of the ADA is that persons with disabilities should not be excluded from job opportunities unless they are unable to perform the duties entailed.

Recently, some employers have adopted a policy that refuses to hire smokers. Although Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, smokers are not a protected class under the Act. Smokers that have been aggrieved by employer off-duty restrictions on smoking have attempted to protect their rights by filing constitutional and common law claims, however, these claims have been uniformly rejected. It may now be possible, however, for smokers to protect their rights under the ADA.

This Note will consider the applicability of the ADA's anti-discrimination protections for employment applicants who are refused employment because of their tobacco use. Part I will present a brief history and overview of Title I of the ADA and its regula-

7 42 U.S.C.A. § 12101(a).
12 See Where There's Smoke, supra note 9, at 33; Mark A. Rothstein, Refusing to Employ Smokers: Good Public Health or Bad Public Policy?, 62 Notre Dame L. Rev. 940, 956 (1987).
tions. Part II will present the prima facie elements required for a cause of action under the Act, focusing primarily on the threshold issue whether or not a smoker is "disabled." It will begin with a brief discussion of nicotine addiction, and continue with statutory interpretation and case law decisions considering disability under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Additionally, possible employer defenses and policy considerations will be addressed. Finally, Part III will discuss how smokers' rights may best be protected.

I. HISTORY AND OVERVIEW

The Fess-Kenyon Act, passed in 1920,13 was the first major legislative challenge to the then prevalent notion that a "handicap" meant lifelong economic dependency.14 After decades of struggle, marked by landmark litigation15 and legislation,16 the struggle for employment rights for people with disabilities culminated in the passage of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.17 The Rehabilitation Act protects the disabled from employment discrimination by federal agencies and private employers receiving federal funding.18 The ADA of 1990 is broader in scope than the

14 Id. The inferior economic and social status of the disabled had been viewed as inevitable. See id.
Rehabilitation Act in that it attempts to address and correct public perceptions of individuals with disabilities. The purpose of the ADA is to eliminate discrimination against the forty-three million disabled Americans and to provide a place for them in American social and economic life by providing clear, strong, and consistent standards enforceable by the Federal government. The Act extends to disabled Americans the same civil rights guaranteed under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Its substantive framework is based on regulatory and case law interpretations of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, while the procedural framework borrows from the powers and remedies provided by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Title I of the ADA prohibits discrimination by a “covered entity” against a “qualified individual with a disability.”

---


21 H.R. Rep. No. 485, supra note 2, pt. 3, at 26, reprinted in 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 449. Historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate the disabled. See 42 U.S.C.A. §12101(a)(2)-(3). Discrimination against the disabled continues, particularly in areas of “employment, housing, public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting and access to public services.” Id. “[U]nlike individuals who have experienced discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, religion, or age, [the disabled] . . . have often had no legal recourse, id. § 12101(a)(4), and [as a result have been] socially, economically, and educationally disadvantaged, id. § 12101, (a)(6). The goals of the Act “are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency” for the disabled. Id. § 12101(a)(8). Denial of the opportunity to compete on an equal basis costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity. See id. § 12101(a)(9).


23 See id.

24 42 U.S.C. § 12112(b)(1)-(7). The term “discriminate” includes limiting, segregating or classifying a job applicant or employee; participating in contractual relationships that effect discrimination; using standards, criteria, and tests that screen-out individuals with disabilities (unless the test is job-related and consistent with business necessity); excluding an individual because of a known relationship with a disabled individual; and failing to make reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities who could thereby perform the essential functions of the job. See id.

ity" solely on the basis of that individual's disability, in regard to all terms, conditions, and privileges of employment. Title I specifically enumerates prohibited acts of discrimination, including the employer's use of medical examinations or inquiries in the employment screening process. Section 103, however, outlines several defenses to the denial of employment. Pursuant to section 103, discriminatory criteria may be applied to a disabled individual when they are job related and consistent with business necessity and if (1) the employer cannot accomplish reasonable accommodation for the disability; or (2) the individual poses a direct threat to the health or safety of others in the workplace. In addition, a religious entity is permitted to give employment preference to individuals of a particular religion.


26 42 U.S.C.A. § 12111(8). "Qualified individual with a disability" means one who possesses the necessary skill, experience, education and other job-related requirements and who, with or without reasonable accommodation, can perform the essential functions of the job. Id. Consideration is given to an employer's judgment as to what constitutes essential functions. Id.; see, e.g., Southeastern Community College v. Davis, 442 U.S. 397, 406-07 (1979) (holding that otherwise qualified person is one able to meet all requirements despite disability).


28 42 U.S.C.A. § 12112(a). This includes "job application procedures, the hiring, advancement, or discharge of employees, employee compensation, job training." Id.

29 42 U.S.C.A. § 12112(a),(b); see supra note 24.


31 42 U.S.C.A. § 12113(a)-(d).


33 42 U.S.C.A. § 12113(b).

34 Id. § 12113(c)(1).
II. PRIMA FACIE ELEMENTS

A cause of action under Title I of the ADA parallels the requirements for a private cause of action under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Thus, a plaintiff who is denied employment because the employer refuses to hire smokers will have the burden of proving four elements in order to set forth a prima facie case of discrimination: first, the individual must prove that he is "disabled" within the meaning of the ADA; second, that he is "otherwise qualified" for the position; third, that the employer discriminated against him solely on the basis of the disability; and finally, that the employer is a "covered entity" under Title I.

A. Is a Smoker "Disabled"?

More than twenty-five years have elapsed since the health hazards of smoking were first brought into public focus. The first official report issued by the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health in 1964 referred to tobacco use as "habituating." Fifteen years later, after considerable research, smoking

---

38 See Sullivan, 811 F.2d at 181. As the ADA incorporates the substantive requirements under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, it is reasonable to assume that under the ADA a plaintiff will face the same prima facie burden. See id.; see also supra notes 22, 35-36 and accompanying text (discussing legislative reliance on elements and structure of Rehabilitation Act).
39 See Sullivan, 811 F.2d at 182; supra note 26; see also infra note 80 and accompanying text (discussing application of statute to employer).
40 See generally Twenty-Five Years of Progress at 7-10 (noting retrospective view of smoking and health findings over past twenty-five years); Rothstein, supra note 12, at 941-46 (discussing hazards, demographics and costs of smoking).
was called the prototypical substance-abuse dependency. In 1989, scientists in the field of drug addiction concluded not only that cigarettes are addicting, but also that nicotine is the drug causing the addiction and that the psychological and pharmacologic addictions accompanying cigarette smoking are similar to cocaine and heroin addictions. The American Psychiatric Association supported the Surgeon General’s findings and included nicotine addiction in its diagnostic guide as a “substance use disorder.”

The ADA sets forth three alternative criterion in defining disability: first, a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits a major life activity; second, a record of such an impairment; or third, being regarded as having such an impairment.


Supra note 42, at 6-7. The central findings and conclusions of this report were drawn from concepts of drug dependence developed by the World Health Organization (WHO), the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), and the American Psychiatric Association. Id. The primary criteria for a finding of drug dependence are: “highly controlled or compulsive use, psychoactive effects, and drug reinforced behavior.” Id. Additional criteria include “stereotypic patterns of use, use despite harmful effects, relapse following abstinence, and recurrent drug cravings.” Id. at 7-8. Dependence producing drugs often produce “tolerance, physical dependence, and pleasant (euphoriant) effects.” Id.


For purposes of this Note, however, the second portion of the definition “[a] record of such an impairment,” is inapplicable, and thus, will not be discussed.

An individual satisfying any one of these criteria will be considered "disabled" within the meaning of the ADA. Congress, therefore, attempted to protect a large number of people in a broad range of possible situations. Indeed, the ambitious nature of such definition demands a case-by-case analysis.

1. Physical or Mental Impairment

To understand the meaning of the term disabled one must first discern what constitutes a "physical or mental impairment." The statute includes within the meaning of physical or mental impairment "any mental or psychological disorder." Both the American Psychiatric Association and the Surgeon General have vali-

(case of first impression interpreting "impairment" and "substantial limitation of major life activity" under Rehabilitation Act). But see Jasany v. United States Postal Serv., 755 F.2d 1244, 1248-51 (6th Cir. 1985) (criticizing Black analysis). The House reasoned that this definition worked well since 1973 and to provide a list of specific disabilities would restrict the comprehensiveness of the statute. See H.R. Rep. No. 485, supra note 2, pt. 3, at 27, reprinted in 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 450. The EEOC's proposed regulations contained a discussion that included a list of "Frequently Disabling Impairments." Proposed Rules for Equal Employment Opportunity for Individuals with Disabilities, 56 Fed. Reg. 8578 (1991). However, in response to concerns by various commentators, the list was deleted prior to the adoption of the final regulations. See 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g).


See 29 C.F.R. pt. 1630, app. § 1630.2(g).

See Black, 497 F. Supp. at 1098.

See 29 C.F.R. pt. 1630, app. at 405. "This case-by-case approach is essential if qualified individuals of varying abilities are to receive equal opportunities to compete for an infinitely diverse range of jobs." Id.

See id. § 1630.2(h). In particular, "Physical or mental impairment means:

1. Any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or

2. Any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities."

Id. (emphasis added). The list was taken from the regulations for Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. See Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap, 45 C.F.R. § 84.3(j)(2)(1) (1990).

29 C.F.R. pt. 1630, app. at 405; see also supra note 51.
dated nicotine addiction as a psychological substance use disorder.\footnote{\textsuperscript{53} See DSM-III-R, supra note 45, at 165-66; NICOTINE ADDICTION, supra note 42, at 248-49.}

In deciding whether or not nicotine addiction is a physical or mental impairment under the ADA, courts should first look to the language of the statute.\footnote{\textsuperscript{54} See, e.g., Jasany v. United States Postal Serv., 755 F.2d 1244, 1248 (6th Cir. 1985) (threshold requirement that individual is a “handicapped person as defined by the statute”); see also Haines, supra note 47, at 541, 551-54 (analyzing administrative and judicial interpretations of term “impairment”).} While the statute lists a number of express exceptions to the definition of disability, including transvestism, compulsive gambling, and kleptomania,\footnote{42 U.S.C.A. § 12111(b). “[D]isability’ shall not include: (1) transvestism, transsexualism, pedophilia, exhibitionism, voyeurism, gender identity disorders not resulting from physical impairments, or other sexual behavior disorders; (2) compulsive gambling, kleptomania, or pyromania; or (3) psychoactive substance use disorders resulting from current illegal use of drugs.” Id.} neither smoking nor nicotine addiction are specifically enumerated among them.\footnote{\textsuperscript{55} See 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 12208, 12211(b)(1).} Moreover, the statute explicitly excludes from protection any “psychoactive substance use disorder resulting from current illegal use of drugs.”\footnote{\textsuperscript{56} Id. § 12211(b)(3).} This exception supports the argument that Congress intended to categorize legal psychoactive substance use disorders (such as nicotine addiction) as “disabilities” and exclude only illegal drug use.

In addition, hypersensitivity to smoke was held to be a disability under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.\footnote{\textsuperscript{57} See Vickers v. Vickers v. Veterans Admin., 549 F. Supp. 85, 86-87 (W.D. Wash. 1982). The Vickers court held that an employee’s hypersensitivity to smoke limits that employee’s “capacity to work in an environment which is not completely smoke free” and thus constitutes a disability within the scope of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Id. Yet, the court acknowledged the defendant’s stated “duty ‘to strive to maintain an equitable balance between rights of smokers and nonsmokers.’” Id. at 89. The court further stated that until Congress eliminates smoking from the workplace, smokers’ rights “cannot be disregarded.” Id. But see GASP v. Mecklenburg County, 256 S.E.2d 477, 479 (N.C. Ct. App. 1979) (holding that legislature did not intend to include within meaning of “handicapped persons” those with any pulmonary problem, however minor, or all people who are harmed or irritated by to-}
that nicotine addicts should at least be entitled to the limited protections afforded reformed alcoholics and illegal drug users. Although an employer may have legitimate reasons for not extending job offers or benefits to reformed alcoholics and illegal drug users, Congress has been wary of the danger of improper discrimination if such individuals are categorically excluded from protection. It seems that such discriminatory abuses will occur with respect to nicotine addicts unless they are afforded similar protection.

In continuing the analysis, this Note will assume, based upon prior arguments, that nicotine addiction is considered an impairment under the ADA. The next, and more critical step in the analysis is to determine whether this impairment "substantially limits a major life activity."  

2. Substantially Limits a Major Life Activity

"Major life activity" has been interpreted to mean those functions that an average person can perform easily, such as walking, seeing, hearing, performing manual tasks, and working.  

---


52 See 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(j). "Major life activities means functions such as caring for oneself, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning,
substantially limits" means the inability or significantly restricted ability to perform one or more major life activity.62 Three factors are considered when determining whether an individual is substantially limited in a major life activity: (1) the nature and severity of the impairment; (2) the duration or expected duration of the impairment; and (3) the long-term impact, or expected impact of the impairment.63 It should be noted, however, that in determining whether or not a person is substantially limited, the activity of working is considered only if an individual is not restricted in any other major life activity.64 Additional factors may be considered in determining whether there is a substantial limitation on an individual’s ability to work, including any geographical limitations created by the disability and the class of jobs or broad range of jobs from which the individual would be disqualified as compared to an average person with otherwise comparable qualifications.65 An individual is not, however, substantially limited due to the mere inability to perform a particular job for a particular employer.66 Accordingly, in a case-by-case analysis as to whether an impairment substantially limits the major life activity of working, any one of these factors could potentially be dispositive. For example, it is conceivable that an individual who smokes three packs of cigarettes a day and resides in a community where the only existing industry has initiated a hiring policy of refusing to employ

62 See 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(j). Specifically, “substantially limits means: (i) Unable to perform a major life activity that the average person in the general population can perform; or (ii) [S]ignificantly restricted as to the condition, manner, or duration under which an individual can perform a major life activity . . . as compared . . . to the average person.” Id.

63 See id. §§ 1630.2(j)(2)(i)-(iii); see also id. pt. 1630, app. § 1630.2(j) (noting that impairment is “substantially limiting” if it significantly restricts duration, manner or condition under which individual can perform major life activity as compared with average individual).

64 See id. § 1630.2(j)(3), pt. 1630, app. § 1630.2(j); see also Forrisi v. Bowen, 794 F.2d 931, 933-34 (4th Cir. 1986) (analyzing whether employee’s acrophobia restricted ability to work).

65 See 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(j)(3)(ii). The factors are relevant to, but are not required elements of, a showing of a substantial limitation in working. Id.

66 See id. § 1630.2(j)(3)(ii)(A)-(C).

smokers, the first part of the ADA’s definition of disability may be conclusive, thereby affording the individual the protections of the ADA. An individual who fails to satisfy this first part of the definition may, however, be able to satisfy a second definition, which is discussed below.

3. Regarded as Having Such Impairment

Although an individual may have a condition that does not substantially limit a major life activity, the reaction of others to the condition may prove just as disabling. Hence, the ADA also protects an individual who is “regarded as” having an impairment. One is “regarded as” having an impairment when, although the impairment does not in fact substantially limit a major life activity, the individual is treated as having such a limitation. This may result from the attitudes of others towards a condition, or from the mere rumors that the individual has a condition that does not actually exist at all. A plaintiff who can show that an employer has made an employment decision based on a myth, fear, or stereotype regarding the plaintiff’s condition will have satisfied the “regarded as” definition of disability. This definition demands a
lesser burden of proof from the plaintiff; because an individual 
"regarded as" having an impairment is not required to show that 
the employer's perception is inaccurate. Instead, an inference in 
favor of the plaintiff arises, which will prevail unless the employer 
can provide a non-discriminatory explanation for its action. Consequently, given the social revolution relating to smoking and its 
negative health consequences, the third, "regarded as" definition 
for disability may provide the strongest support for an action 
brought by a smoker under the ADA.

B. Remaining Prima Facie Elements

In cases deciding if other substance abusers were disabled, 
whether the applicant was "otherwise qualified" for the position, 
was the critical element. "An otherwise qualified person is one 
who is able to meet all of a program's requirements in spite of his 
handicap." It is unlikely, however, that smoking, alone, will 
render an individual unqualified.

Additionally, the discriminatory behavior must be based solely


74 See 29 C.F.R. pt. 1630 app. § 1630.2(l); see also H.R. Rep. No. 485, supra note 2, pt. 

453.

76 See 29 C.F.R. pt. 1630, app. § 1630.2(l); see also S. Rep. No. 116, supra note 2, at 31.

77 See Twenty-Five Years of Progress, supra note 9, at 11. Smoking among adults 
has decreased from forty percent in 1965 to twenty-nine percent in 1987. Id. Social accepta-

bility of smoking is declining. Id. at 244. The public majority favors restricting smoking in 
worksites. Id. at 245.

78 See supra note 12. Smoking remains the most preventable cause of death in America. Id. 
at 11. Keep in mind, however, that over three-quarters of a million smoke related deaths 
were avoided because individuals were able to quit smoking. Id. Each year, more than 
400,000 Americans die as a result of cigarette-related disease. U.S. DEP'T OF HEALTH & 
HUMAN SERVS., SMOKING TOBACCO & HEALTH: A FACT BOOK 1 (rev. 10/89) [hereinafter SMOK-

ING TOBACCO & HEALTH].

79 See supra note 26.

80 See, e.g., Southeastern Community College v. Davis, 442 U.S. 397, 406 (1979) (semi-
nal case interpreting "otherwise qualified" as used in the Rehabilitation Act); Crewe v. 
United States Office of Personnel Management, 834 F.2d 140, 142 (8th Cir. 1987) (job appli-
cants with history of alcoholism must also be otherwise qualified); Wallace v. Veterans Ad-

min., 683 F. Supp. 758, 761-62 (D.Kan. 1988) (rehabilitated registered nurse was disabled 
and otherwise qualified under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973).


82 See DSM-III-R, supra note 45, at 182. "Since nicotine . . . rarely causes any clinically 
significant state of intoxication, there is no impairment in . . . occupational functioning as an 
immediate and direct consequence of its use." Id.
on the disability. An employment policy under which an employer refuses to hire smokers would undoubtedly satisfy this element. The final element, requiring that the employer be a "covered entity" is broadly inclusive, encompassing any employer with fifteen or more employees.

C. Possible Defenses

The ADA prohibits employers from treating individuals with disabilities differently from others solely on the basis of the employers' attitude toward the disabilities. Employers may use selection criteria that negatively affect individuals with disabilities only when the criteria are clearly job-related and consistent with business necessity. Furthermore, even if such limiting criteria are job-related and consistent with business necessity, employers may nevertheless be required to make reasonable accommodation. In order to avoid compliance, an employer may submit evidence that accommodation would cause undue hardship, but a case-by-case

---


84 See 42 U.S.C.A. § 12111(5)(A). "Employer" means a person . . . who has 15 or more employees for . . . 20 or more calendar weeks . . . ." Id. For the initial two years of the ADA, however, the number of employees is set at 25. Id.


86 See 29 C.F.R. pt. 1630, app. § 1630.15(b)-(c). Reasonable accommodation includes making facilities accessible, job restructuring, part-time or modified work schedules, reassignment, buying or modifying equipment, training materials or policies, providing qualified readers or interpreters. See 42 U.S.C.A. § 12111(9); 29 C.F.R. pt. 1630, app. § 1630.2(o); see also Nisperos, 720 F. Supp. at 1432 (burden on employer to prove reasonable accommodation not possible). See generally Lisa L.Lavelle, Note, The Duty to Accommodate: Will Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act Emancipate Individuals with Disabilities Only to Disable Small Businesses, 66 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1135 passim (1991) (exploring scope of employers' duty to accommodate disabled and what constitutes undue hardship).

87 See 42 U.S.C.A. § 12111(10)(A). "[U]ndue hardship" means an action requiring significant difficulty or expense . . . ." Id. Factors to determine undue hardship include: nature and cost of accommodation; overall financial resources of the facility, business, or operation; number of employees; effect on resources; impact on operation. See id. § 12111(10)(B); see
analysis is required to determine if additional business costs of employing the disabled individual are significant.90 Finally, compliance with another federal statute could serve as a defense, but it "may be rebutted by a showing of pretext, or by showing that the federal standard [does] not require the discriminatory action."91 Thus, while the defenses mentioned above are not exhaustive,92 it is doubtful that statutory defenses would protect an employer from a cause of action brought by a smoker, who has otherwise established a prima facie case of discrimination.

D. Policy Considerations

Policy considerations will undoubtedly weigh heavily in deciding whether or not to include nicotine addiction as a protected disability within the meaning of the ADA. The policy motivation behind the ADA is to improve the quality of life, economically and socially, for the forty-three million disabled Americans.93 The addition of more than fifty million smokers94 to the classification of "disabled" would substantially limit the effectiveness of the ADA. Moreover, as reflected in the Surgeon General's Report, the government has set a goal to eliminate tobacco use by the year 2000.95 Protecting smokers from employment discrimination would con-
flict with this public health policy. Similarly, there are enormous financial costs associated with smoking which could be avoided, including the direct medical costs of smoking-related diseases and indirect costs to businesses and health insurance providers and carriers. Nevertheless, these health and economic concerns must be weighed against the reluctance to allow employers to monitor employees' legal off-duty activities and lifestyles.

III. LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

In what appears to be a direct response to employment policies of refusing to hire smokers, a number of states have recently enacted statutes prohibiting discrimination against tobacco users. Most of these statutes protect the job rights of employees who smoke or use tobacco products off-duty; some extend protection to other undefined off-duty activities. In light of the uncertain coverage for smokers under the ADA, legislation of this kind may best protect smokers' rights.

CONCLUSION

As the number of smokers continues to decrease, it remains to

---

96 See SMOKING TOBACCO & HEALTH, supra note 78, at 9. Cigarette smoking accounts for $22 billion in medical costs each year. Id.
97 See id. Cigarette smoking costs business $43 billion in lost production. Id.
100 See, e.g., ME. REV. STAT. ANN. tit. 26, § 597 (West Supp. 1992). It is unlawful for an employer to “discriminate against any person with respect to the person's compensation, terms, conditions or privileges of employment for using tobacco products outside the course of employment as long as the employee complies with any workplace policy concerning the use of tobacco.” Id.
101 See, e.g., NEV. REV. STAT. ANN. § 613.333 (Michie 1992). “It is an unlawful employment practice . . . [to] discriminate against any employee because he engages in the lawful use . . . of any product, outside of the premises of the employer during his nonworking hours . . . .” Id.
be seen whether smokers will receive the benefits and protections of the ADA. As this Note has explained, although an addicted smoker may be considered “disabled” and able to establish the remaining prima facie elements under the ADA, the definitive outcome is uncertain. Undoubtedly, conflicting policy considerations, namely health hazards and economic costs versus infringement of employee off-duty lifestyles, will be weighed and ultimately influence a court’s analysis. Consequently, state legislation banning employment discrimination against smokers may be the best solution to this controversial issue.
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