

Comparisons of Tobacco Control Spending between Selected Jurisdictions

Prepared for the Ministry of Health by Dr Nick Wilson, public health physician, Wellington

Published in December 2003 by the
Ministry of Health
PO Box 5013, Wellington, New Zealand

ISBN 0-478-25886-0

This document is available on the National Drug Policy website:
<http://www.ndp.govt.nz>

Introduction

The material in this document was part of a larger paper produced in late 2002 to inform the discussion around the development of the Ministry's five-year plan for tobacco control. To obtain details on the current Ministry policy, readers are directed to the final version of the Ministry's five-year plan for tobacco control.

Expenditure comparisons

The following table compares current expenditure by American states on tobacco control programmes with New Zealand (CDC 2002). It shows that the state of Hawaii spends over five times more per capita and 24 states spend more per capita than New Zealand. Also New Zealand tobacco control mass media campaign expenditure at under \$US 0.40 per capita (ie, \$2.6 million in the 2002/03 financial year) is also low compared to some states (eg, with Massachusetts spending an average of \$US 2.16 per capita annually on anti-smoking advertising (Pechmann and Reibling 2000)).

Even in the New Zealand context the mass media campaign expenditure relating to tobacco control has been small. For example road safety mass media campaigns in New Zealand currently involve the expenditure of \$13 million per year [Personal Communication, Paul Graham of Land Transport Safety Authority (14 October

2002)]. Indeed, the overall tobacco control budget in New Zealand is a small fraction of the total spending on road safety (at \$180 million per year).

Table 1: Tobacco control expenditure on a per capita basis for US states and New Zealand

Jurisdiction	Per capita expenditure on tobacco control in 2002 (\$US)
Hawaii	19.16
Vermont	12.67
<i>CDC best practice recommendations (midpoint in the range of \$6 to \$17 per capita that is recommended for medium-sized states (population 3 to 7 million)) (CDC 1999)</i>	11.50
Maine	10.96
Ohio	10.67
Massachusetts (2001 data)	10.22
Mississippi	7.87
Delaware	7.85
Alaska	7.72
Arizona (2001 data)	7.32
Maryland	6.04
South Dakota	5.90
Arkansas	5.30
North Dakota	5.27
Nebraska	5.01
West Virginia	4.41
Rhode Island	4.27
Missouri	4.17
Wyoming	4.16
Illinois	4.06
California	4.02
New Jersey	3.83
Iowa	3.78
New Mexico	3.75
Oregon	3.75
<i>New Zealand (at \$NZ 28M / year for 3.8M people)</i>	3.53
New Hampshire	3.53

Jurisdiction	Per capita expenditure on tobacco control in 2002 (\$US)
Pennsylvania	3.50
Washington	3.44
Colorado	3.39
Georgia, Nevada, New York, Virginia, Montana, Idaho	In range: 2.0 – 2.9
Florida, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Indiana, Oklahoma, District of Columbia, Kansas, South Carolina, Texas, Connecticut, Utah, Minnesota, Michigan, Louisiana, Alabama, North Carolina, Tennessee	Under 2.0

References

- CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). 1999. *Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs—August 1999*. Atlanta GA: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, August 1999. [http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/research_data/stat_nat_data/bestprac-execsummay.htm]
- CDC. 2002. State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation System. [http://www2.cdc.gov/nccdphp/osh/state/epi_files/funding_recommended.asp?state=CA&year=1999&chk=state] [Accessed 30 November 2002]
- Pechmann C, Reibling ET. 2000. Anti-smoking advertising campaigns targeting youth: case studies from USA and Canada. *Tob Control* 9(Suppl II): ii18-ii31.