

---

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 30 May 2007 00:03:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warrantoBy allowing smoking indoors, you exclude those who do not wish to be around it (they are unable to be in the same place - personal choice or not- as the smokers). By not allowing it you exclude those who wish to smoke indoors.

Of course, I can always play the democracy card (as a fake argument, don't take this seriously unless you really want to)

Ultimately, though, you elected the person to represent your interests. Don't like it, elect someone who won't enforce it.

How many times to I have to state PRIVATE PROPERTY? Shall I give an example, since the concept seems to escape you?

Say you DO smoke. You invite some friends over who don't smoke, and they absolutely hate the fact that your house is smoky. However, regardless of the fact that they know you smoke and they hate it, they choose to visit you. Upon doing so, they're so overwhelmed with the smoke that they then manage to get legislation passed saying that even though it's your house, you are forced to install new ventilation in your house if you have non-smoker friends, and you're also forced to smoke outside. You wouldn't like the government telling you what to do, would you? I understand, as a friend, you would avoid smoking and make sure you air out the house before your friends came over, but that's not the point I'm trying to make. Whether or not you accommodate your friends should be YOUR decision to make (just like the business'), not the government and not your friends.

Carrierll wrote on Tue, 29 May 2007 17:47Why should a non-smoker be forced to actively avoid a health risk? Surely the person wanting to make a choice (Smoking) should take responsibility (You like that word) for thier decision and be responsible for the health risk -they- pose, and negate it for others, who do not want to experience it?

Sure, they could be courteous, but they're not the ones complaining about the environment in the restaurant, are they? If the business wants to allow their habit inside of their doors, why does the government get a say?

I'm not saying smokers shouldn't be courteous and not smoke when around non-smokers. I'm saying that they shouldn't be forced to. It should be a conscious decision that they make to avoid non-smokers. If a business wants to allow smoking within its doors, then I see no reason why the government should have a say otherwise.

Are you going to tell me that if you want to go to the beach, but the closest is a nude beach, that you're going to force regulation on that nude beach stating that they have to force their visitors to clothed because you don't want to see or your children to see naked people because you don't want to have to travel farther to a beach with no allowed nudity? If you can say "yes" to this and not see how I'm calling that self-importance, then there's no hope for you. If you'd say no, then the only difference between this scenario and the smoking is that there is a health risk involved which has no weight on the principle that I'm arguing.

---