
Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 30 May 2007 13:35:03 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Wed, 30 May 2007 08:27j_ball430 wrote on Tue, 29 May 2007 18:03warrantoBy 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 do 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.

And how many times do I have to say PUBLIC AREA. There is a REASON businesses MUST serve people regardless of religion, colour, sex, etc.

There is a reason you do not have to do the same thing when letting people into your house. It is not a PUBLIC AREA.

Yes, well... stupid over-bearing federal government can lay off.
