Regulation promotes drug tourism.

- There is some evidence to suggest that the regulation of cannabis markets attracts tourists. Although not systematically collected, data from the Netherlands has indicated that 25% of tourists who visit Amsterdam visit a coffee shop, and 10% say that this was their reason for visiting the city (Kilmer, 2010). Early evidence from Colorado indicates that 44% percent of revenue from cannabis sales in metropolitan areas, and 90% of sales in rural communities, occurred from buyers residing out of state (Light et al., 2014).

- The potential for cannabis tourism is related to the size and distance of neighboring populations where recreational cannabis use has not been regulated (Caulkins et al., 2015), meaning that regulation in certain jurisdictions is likely to see more drug tourists compared with other settings. This also means that cannabis tourism diminishes as an issue of concern the more jurisdictions legally regulate the cannabis market.

- Importantly, drug tourism is by no means an inevitable consequence of a regulated recreational cannabis market (i.e., evidence does not suggest regulation in and of itself promotes drug tourism). By allowing governments to control the conditions under which cannabis is sold, regulatory models that do not permit drug tourism can be employed. Restricting sales of cannabis to home country residents is one example of a possible regulatory control to reduce drug tourism. Uruguay is an example of this, as the law permits only residents to grow and purchase cannabis (Gutierrez & Pardo, 2015).

- Given the significant economic benefits of all types of tourism, drug tourism is not necessarily a negative side effect of regulation (Caulkins et al., 2015). However, drug tourism may also have drawbacks, such as in the form of public disorder. Overall, there is little evidence suggesting that drug tourism has contributed to widespread negative health or social outcomes.
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