

No smoking
employees



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

No Smoking Employees I think that an employer have the right to require non-smoking as a condition of employment. The assumption that it is no longer the business of an employer what the employee does when he is “ off the job” is acceptable, provided that the employee’s conduct does not result to a loss to the employer. There are several reasons why an employer may legally refuse to hire smokers. Foremost among these is that “ hiring smokers imposes an unreasonable economic burden upon employers, non-smoking employees and taxpayers” (ASH, par. 3). Some employers claim that their company’s output declines because the performance of employees who smoke drop due to smoking-related illnesses. Furthermore, a smoking employee’s health plan and insurance premiums are higher compared to non-smokers. This means higher health care and medical costs for the employers. Moreover, employers are also concerned about the risk of second hand smoke on their non-smoking employees. This could also result in higher medical costs for them, so they would not like to expose their other employees to the health hazards of second hand smoke. Employers perceive hiring smokers as going against their clean indoor air policy. In most areas, refusal to hire smokers does not constitute unlawful discrimination. Federal law prohibits employers from discriminating against any individual in hiring because of that individual’s race, color, religion, sex, national origin, citizenship status, age, and disability. In addition, state law also prohibits discrimination in hiring based on height, weight, and marital status. This means that employers can discriminate against smokers because they do not belong to the “ protected group”. Other employers do not hire smokers because they believe that employment requires a high level of physical fitness which means that good health is an essential asset for any job (ASH, <https://assignbuster.com/no-smoking-employees/>

par. 12). For other companies though, their concern for the smokers is their reason for not hiring them. This is because in some manufacturing plants, employees might be exposed to hazardous substances like asbestos which could result to a higher health risk for smokers more than to non-smokers. In conclusion, I think that employers have every right not to hire smokers because it is their right to have a smoke-free workplace. This movement is being done to protect the health of all workers from second-hand smoke exposure. Moreover, it is the right of every employer to find ways to reduce their expenses to make the company more profitable. Employers should be allowed to discriminate against hiring smokers because they are subjected to higher health insurance premiums, which results to increased health care cost for the employer. Bringing their nicotine addiction to the workplace not only reduces their productivity but also imposes substantial cost to their employers and to other employees. The increase in health care expenses will adversely affect the company's profitability. Work Cited Action on Smoking and Health (ASH). " Employment Policies Against Hiring Smokers." ash. org. n. d. Web. 7 June 2011. <http://ash.org/papers/h220.htm>