Subject: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by FrAM on Sat, 26 May 2007 12:33:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

talk about it...

personally as a non smoker i dislike the smoke in pubs so will like it, but at the same time i believe that the smoke it part of the uk traditional pub... therefore invading the integrity of our local drinking holes.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Ryu on Sat, 26 May 2007 13:10:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

lmfao! @ last few words.

I smoke cigarettes and I hardly go to pubs and what not so It doesn't bother me, but if I went on a night out with my bro I guess it would be a pain in the ass stepping out every 30 mins or so.

I don't mind it, But other people will surely dislike it.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by CarrierII on Sat, 26 May 2007 14:11:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Now I can go out and passive smoking won't affect me. Yay.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by sadukar09 on Sat, 26 May 2007 14:31:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

smoking=leads 2 ur premature death

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by MexPirate on Sat, 26 May 2007 14:39:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm getting pretty sick of living in a country that won't let me make my own decisions about my body, I am a responsible smoker and can understand that non-smokers don't want to breath my smoke, but pubs should be able to choose to have an indoor smoking area - the ban is fucking ridiculous.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Memphis on Sat, 26 May 2007 14:44:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Some people are actually getting substantial amounts of time off work just because they smoke those 'cancer sticks'. As a non smoker that used to be in a smoky environment you really do see (and smell) the difference. You only have to look at the ceilings in most pubs and see what a disgusting colour they have turned and just think that to some extent that could have happened to your lungs too. On another note if there are a lot less people dieing of smoking related diseases (prematurely) I think this in the long term may strain the NHS more due to people living longer lives and need more looking after in their old age. Nothing is perfect but it has worked pretty well in other areas where it was a bit of an experiment so I am for it.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by FrAM on Sat, 26 May 2007 15:03:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

as long as people arent smoking in my face i really dont care about them smoking near me, then again i am only one in my family who doesnt smoke...

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sat, 26 May 2007 15:40:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MexPirate wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 10:39I'm getting pretty sick of living in a country that won't let me make my own decisions about my body, I am a responsible smoker and can understand that non-smokers don't want to breath my smoke, but pubs should be able to choose to have an indoor smoking area - the ban is fucking ridiculous.
Exactly.

The establishment should be able to choose whether or not they want to allow smoking in their building. If the building allows for smokers, the non-smokers can either deal with it or fuck off and go to a different, non-smoking establishment. If the establishment doesn't want to allow for smokers, too bad for the smokers, and they can go smoke their cancer sticks somewhere else.

This certainly shouldn't be something the government decides. However, public (government owned) buildings should be smoke-free due to the fact that you can't always avoid going there, and smoking does have a negative impact on those who come into contact with it.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by IronWarrior on Sat, 26 May 2007 16:14:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Its bad for your health and mine and am fucking sick of being around idiots who smoke, its smalls

bad which makes me small bad, just a flithy nasty habit, should be banned.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by sadukar09 on Sat, 26 May 2007 16:21:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

my dad used 2 smoke and now i think i got asthma from 2nd hand smoke....

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by FrAM on Sat, 26 May 2007 17:26:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 18:40MexPirate wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 10:39I'm getting pretty sick of living in a country that won't let me make my own decisions about my body, I am a responsible smoker and can understand that non-smokers don't want to breath my smoke, but pubs should be able to choose to have an indoor smoking area - the ban is fucking ridiculous. Exactly.

The establishment should be able to choose whether or not they want to allow smoking in their building. If the building allows for smokers, the non-smokers can either deal with it or fuck off and go to a different, non-smoking establishment. If the establishment doesn't want to allow for smokers, too bad for the smokers, and they can go smoke their cancer sticks somewhere else.

This certainly shouldn't be something the government decides. However, public (government owned) buildings should be smoke-free due to the fact that you can't always avoid going there, and smoking does have a negative impact on those who come into contact with it.

yer but if you allow establishment to choose then they will obviously allow smoking due to loss of revenue if they dont

---

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Spoony on Sat, 26 May 2007 18:43:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

People should just open up new bars+clubs where smoking is prohibited. Surely they'll be highly successful and profitable.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by puddle_splasher on Sat, 26 May 2007 19:07:53 GMT

MexPirate wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 09:39 I am a responsible smoker and can understand that non-smokers don't want to breath my smoke, but pubs should be able to choose to have an indoor smoking area - the ban is fucking ridiculous.

To have an indoor smoking area means that I have to breathe your smoke. Do I piss in your ashtray when I need a piss? After-all I want to share the end product of my beer with you.

However, I do not get the opportunity to decide if I want the end product of your cigarette, do I? But I still have to suffer it or leave and find a non-smoking pub.

The ban works a treat in Scotland, just as it will come 1st July 2007 in England.

Every time I come home from a night out in Scotland i do not have to worry about the smell of smoke on my clothes, which also means that perhaps my lungs will last a little longer.

Pubs were originally opened to serve alcohol and not for smoking, drinking soft drinks, coffee and tea.

At last the Goverment got something right.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by puddle_splasher on Sat, 26 May 2007 19:12:04 GMT

MaidenTy1 wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 13:43People should just open up new bars+clubs where smoking is prohibited. Surely they'll be highly successful and profitable.

What do you not understand, smoking or prohibited?

It was prohibited but thankfully, now its banned. They were always "highly successful and profitable" and will continue to be. Hmmmm! smell the fresh air, but there just will not be smoking.

Why?

Its banned

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by fl00d3d on Sat, 26 May 2007 19:26:38 GMT

I don't know if your laws are similar to ours on these subjects, but two things came to mind while I was reading this:

(also, just for the records, I'm a nonsmoker)

(1) It's a health issue. It'd be one thing to prohibit wearing red socks with purple boots (lol?) but I see it as a valid health concern as statistics show 2nd hand smoke is worse for a person than 1st hand. That being said,

(2) If establishments were given the control on who to allow and who to disallow it would be a discrimination issue.

Personally, I feel that if you want to smoke that is your right and I have absolutely no complaints (other than thinking you're not too bright, at least). But it should be done responsibly and under consideration for the health of those around you. This logic extends to businesses who should follow a similar practice. In the United States you aren't allowed to smoke inside public buildings and it some businesses (such as pubs) the county may have further restrictions stating that smokers must be contained in an area at a higher elevation so the smoke doesn't affect those around them. Some counties even go as far as to say you have to have a physical barrier between sections. And I support that.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by CarrierII on Sat, 26 May 2007 19:40:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

@MexPirate, I've nothing agianst you smoking, I just don't want to inhale it.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Sat, 26 May 2007 20:35:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There is a similar smoking ban here in Calgary.

It's been quite successful and no business has gone under as a result.

It's been done in many other places and has also been quite successful.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sat, 26 May 2007 21:13:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

puddle_splasher wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 15:07MexPirate wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 09:39 I

am a responsible smoker and can understand that non-smokers don't want to breath my smoke, but pubs should be able to choose to have an indoor smoking area - the ban is fucking ridiculous.

To have an indoor smoking area means that I have to breathe your smoke. Do I piss in your ashtray when I need a piss? After-all I want to share the end product of my beer with you.

However, I do not get the opportunity to decide if I want the end product of your cigarette, do I? But I still have to suffer it or leave and find a non-smoking pub.

The ban works a treat in Scotland, just as it will come 1st July 2007 in England.

Every time I come home from a night out in Scotland i do not have to worry about the smell of smoke on my clothes, which also means that perhaps my lungs will last a little longer.

Pubs were originally opened to serve alcohol and not for smoking, drinking soft drinks, coffee and tea.

At last the Goverment got something right.
My God, you and the people who agree with you are fucking morons.

Do you have to go to the establishment if you don't want to breathe in smoke? NO! It's a fucking personal choice that YOU make to go there. Nobody's forcing you to go to a pub to drink. Nobody's forcing you to go to a restaurant to eat. Therefore, if you're not forced, you make the conscious decision to walk into an establishment with smoking being allowed. If the establishment allows smoking, smokers are given the right to smoke there and can do so as they please.

Just as server owners in Renegade have the right to ban swearing and ban cheaters or allow it, companies should hold the same rights. It's THEIR company. If THEY want to outlaw something, THEY can do so on their own. It's their business, so they should be able to do with it as they please. If government can prevent you from smoking in private businesses, what's to stop them from smoking in your own home? You'll argue that it's in the privacy of your own home, and you own the home... yeah, but don't the business owners... own their businesses? Yeah, I thought so.

If you don't want to deal with the smoking... avoid it. As I said, nobody forces you to go to the pub. That's a personal choice that YOU make. If you run a red light, and someone else hits you, is it the person's fault that they hit you? No, you're the one who made the choice to run the red light, and you suffer the consequence of being hit. It's not their fault you're an idiot.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by MexPirate on Sat, 26 May 2007 21:25:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

well, J_ball just made my point better than I ever could.

I agree, people shouldn't have to breath in my smoke - this law however is retarded, let me give some examples:

My old workplace was a seven storey building, on each floor there was a room for smokers with extractor fans etc, it didn't cause a problem - with these new laws smokers will all need to spend twice as long to leave the building and stand outside, that's a good image for a company isn't it, having all a load of people standing outside the entrance

My current work place has a bus shelter outside the back of the building for smokers, the building has three sides and ventilation at the bottom, the new law states that it is only allowed to have 2 sides, so now the company needs to either hack the thing apart or buy a new shelter.

A woman came on the radio the other day explaining that she was HR person at a small business, virtually all the other employees were smokers (imaging your average warehouse-90% of our warehouse workers smoke) this woman was then forced to put signs around the building telling all the employees that they were no longer allowed to smoke and when the completely ignored her she was obliged to force them to put cigarettes out, needless to say she was upset and it exluded her from the other people there.

My local pub is run by a husband and wife that smoke, one end of the pub allows smoking, the other is smoke free and ventilation is in place to prevent smoke travelling down - virtually everyone uses the smoking area and banning it will costs their business and mean that they are not allowed to smoke in their own pub.

I agree that many places should be non-smoking, but a blanket ban ignores individual circumstances and overrides common sense.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sat, 26 May 2007 21:36:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MexPirate wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 17:25I agree, people shouldn't have to breath in my smoke Yeah, I agree, too. It's not like we're trying to say that people have to breathe in the smoke of others. Nobody should have to suffer because of others. However, when it's clearly a choice made by non-smokers, it's incredibly ridiculous to try and stop the smokers from doing as they please because non-smokers walk into the establishment and expect to be accommodated because they don't smoke. What pompous asses are they. They need to get off of their high horses and realize that if they value their lungs enough, they'll go find an establishment that caters to their non-smoking habits rather than force others to cater to them. Fuck that selfishness.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by z310 on Sat, 26 May 2007 23:13:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Smell the freedom.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Memphis on Sun, 27 May 2007 01:30:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It is truly depressing the number of smokers that have replied here as the average age is relatively low. All of you would have known the consequences when you took the habbit up so whining about a law that could potentially make you healthier seems absurd to me.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sun, 27 May 2007 01:49:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Memphis wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 21:30It is truly depressing the number of smokers that have replied here as the average age is relatively low. All of you would have known the consequences when you took the habbit up so whining about a law that could potentially make you healthier seems absurd to me.
I'm a non-smoker.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jecht on Sun, 27 May 2007 02:24:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

A complete banning is a bit excessive. They should just tell business owners to install a proper ventilation system if they want to allow smoking. Although, the roar of fans above you would probably take away from the atmosphere

That way, at least business owners would still have the choice.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sun, 27 May 2007 02:29:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gbull wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 22:24A complete banning is a bit excessive. They should just tell business owners to install a proper ventilation system if they want to allow smoking. Although, the roar of fans above you would probably take away from the atmosphere

That way, at least business owners would still have the choice.
I say if they want that pub's alcohol, they should deal with the pub's smoky atmosphere. If the pub loses enough business, they'd probably switch to no smoking. Let the people change the business, not the government.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...

Posted by Jecht on Sun, 27 May 2007 03:10:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Right, but a health code to enforce good ventilation if they want to smoke would meet them half-way, and improve people's health slightly. Health is where I draw the line on business's rights. A resteraunt and pub should have clean dishes, unsoiled food and drink, and a healthy atmosphere.

The book "The Jungle" comes to mind if you give businesses too many rights without proper regulations. Although it was beef in that book and it's smoking here, people had the right not to eat beef then, but since all butchering plants were unsanitary, the choice was that you ate soiled beef or you weren't able to eat beef at all. I'm not an avid pub-goer, but from what I've seen, all pubs and bars allow smoking if they are able to. That kind of limits the choices for non-smokers to either go deal with the unhealthy atmosphere, or don't go to a bar at all.

Meeting a business half-way is the most fair way I can think about handling the situation.

Personally, I worked in a resteraunt for 2 years. The smoke was unbearable at times. Granted, I chose to work there, but better ventilation would have at least helped the situation.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by fl00d3d on Sun, 27 May 2007 03:14:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Anyone in the UK have a "whites only" bar? I mean, it should be their right to run their bar how they want right? If you don't like that its white only because you're black or just find the idea offensive you could go somewhere else. And that doesn't even affect innocent bystanders health and well-being.

Just separate the sections or make a "smoke shack" where smokers can loiter with their cancer sticks and carbon monoxide poison. But you can't exactly let business owners do EVERYTHING they want or health code violations and even discrimination issues come to light.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sun, 27 May 2007 03:21:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

fl00d3d wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 23:14Anyone in the UK have a "whites only" bar? I mean, it should be their right to run their bar how they want right? If you don't like that its white only because you're black or just find the idea offensive you could go somewhere else. And that doesn't even affect innocent bystanders health and well-being.

Just separate the sections or make a "smoke shack" where smokers can loiter with their cancer sticks and carbon monoxide poison. But you can't exactly let business owners do EVERYTHING they want or health code violations and even discrimination issues come to light.
Actually, the discrimination against blacks was something that couldn't be controlled by the blacks.

They didn't choose to be black. Though, I would say if a restaurant wanted to be racist, let them. Today their business would be out of business unless they shaped up, but it's their business, let them run it the way they see fit, as long as it meets health code regulations.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by z310 on Sun, 27 May 2007 05:19:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 21:49Memphis wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 21:30It is truly depressing the number of smokers that have replied here as the average age is relatively low. All of you would have known the consequences when you took the habbit up so whining about a law that could potentially make you healthier seems absurd to me.
I'm a non-smoker.

And I'm an ex-smoker.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by puddle_splasher on Sun, 27 May 2007 10:32:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

fl00d3d wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 22:14 Just separate the sections or make a "smoke shack" where smokers can loiter with their cancer sticks and carbon monoxide poison.

They have that in Scotland. The more up-market pubs are giving them mini beer gardens to sit in with overhead heating. The alternative is that they stand outside the pub on the street.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Memphis on Sun, 27 May 2007 12:51:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Don't forget that the government will actually lose out on this due to the tax paid on tobacco products. At the end of the day if you are an idiot who chooses to smoke after all of the advice and information that is around today you deserve to stay out in the cold while you contribute to your death by smoking a cigarette. This doesn't apply so much for older smokers but if you ask any of those they will say that they regret taking it up. I still think this will be a real morale booster to people that want to give up but simply do not have the will power to do so. This really isn't a freedom issue seeing as there are still plenty of places to smoke if you are determined to do so.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...

Posted by FrAM on Sun, 27 May 2007 14:37:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

just to redirect the topic... this isnt about smoking in general, it is about the smoking ban.

I think that in eating environments, to right no smoking, but as for pub... i suppose if you wanna relax after long day and have a pint then you wanna be able to have a fag as well(this is from the perspective of non-smoker).

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sun, 27 May 2007 15:21:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's funny how you idiots want freedoms unless it's something that you don't like. Hypocritical much? If you don't like what someone does... tough shit. Unless people harm others, they should be able to do whatever the fuck they please. I know the US and UK are different, but I still feel that people should have the right to do what they want with their bodies and wherever they want so as long as it's permitted there by the owners. If a company wants to allows smokers to smoke in their building, who should stop them? Certainly not the government.

Get off of your high horses and realize that just because you don't like it doesn't mean that it shouldn't be allowed. Afterall, think about what would happen if someone who disagreed with you had their way about some of your favorite activities? What if alcohol was banned like it was here during the 1920s? Alcohol is bad for the body, and drunks are nasty, so it'd be a good thing for the government to ban it, right? Wrong. STFU or GTFO.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Memphis on Sun, 27 May 2007 18:10:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 May 2007 11:21It's funny how you idiots want freedoms unless it's something that you don't like. Hypocritical much? If you don't like what someone does... tough shit. Unless people harm others, they should be able to do whatever the fuck they please. I know the US and UK are different, but I still feel that people should have the right to do what they want with their bodies and wherever they want so as long as it's permitted there by the owners. If a company wants to allows smokers to smoke in their building, who should stop them? Certainly not the government.

Get off of your high horses and realize that just because you don't like it doesn't mean that it shouldn't be allowed. Afterall, think about what would happen if someone who disagreed with you had their way about some of your favorite activities? What if alcohol was banned like it was here during the 1920s? Alcohol is bad for the body, and drunks are nasty, so it'd be a good thing for the government to ban it, right? Wrong. STFU or GTFO.

Once again it is nice to see your acceptance for something different j_ball. I'm not sure if you understood that this concept was tested on a much smaller scale before it branched out. Scotland

may not be a really small place but even so the reaction of the general public was positive. At the end of the day they have tried many different ways to warm people of the dangers of smoking for decades now and it has come to little or no affect. As it stands now before the smoking ban it surprises me that people smoke if you know the costs of the habbit. Let us say that someone smokes about 20 cigarettes a day, this will cost them about £5.50 every day. When you look at the tax on those products you already see that they are very overpriced which I personally see as one method of the Government putting people off. I agree with the ban in public places such as bars and restaurants as it really is horrible for a non smoker to be breathing in the smoke and also to eat food around smoke. I think banning it in public work places is a step too far as people are often in high stress situations where it will make a bit of a difference. There is no reason for people to smoke so why should others have to put up with people damaging their health and sometimes yours for no purpose.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sun, 27 May 2007 18:24:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You don't get it, do you? It's not about the health ramifications of smoking. It's about the freedoms of the individual and the businesses. It's not the job of the government to tell people that they can't do something that could be detrimental to their health. That's the decision of the individual to make, and if a business wants to allow that activity, then they have every right.

The point that this works in Scotland doesn't mean shit to me. Everybody would be better off abstaining from sex until marriage to prevent over-population and underage pregnancies. Everybody would be better off sober. There's a lot of things that the government could do to make sure the people stay safe and healthy. Like, for instance, banning fast food restaurants, and regulating restaurants to limited amounts of calories per portion for each meal. Just because it'd have a positive impact on the health of the country doesn't mean it should be enforced by the government. The government is supposed to protect the people from outside threats, but not from themselves.

It just boggles my mind how people can allow for the blatant disregard for peoples' freedoms under the blanket idea of "common good". What about personal freedom? Doesn't that mean anything, anymore?

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Memphis on Sun, 27 May 2007 18:43:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I know what you are looking at which is the principle of what they have done and yes you do have a point. My point is that although they do infringe some peoples freedoms to a certain degree the policy will save thousands of lives a year which I deem to be worth it.

If that is the price (minuscule in my opinion)to pay for a healthier nation I'm fine with it. As you can tell I am biased as I am a non smoker however I did live with someone that smoked and if it wasn't

for their premature death due to something unrelated I am absolutely certain they would have died of something directly connected to smoke. This person always said they regretted taking up the habbit (at this time they actually didn't know better unlike now). I feel this attitude is reflected in a large proportion of smokers today.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sun, 27 May 2007 18:55:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Memphis wrote on Sun, 27 May 2007 14:43I know what you are looking at which is the principle of what they have done and yes you do have a point. My point is that although they do infringe some peoples freedoms to a certain degree the policy will save thousands of lives a year which I deem to be worth it.

If that is the price (minuscule in my opinion)to pay for a healthier nation I'm fine with it. As you can tell I am biased as I am a non smoker however I did live with someone that smoked and if it wasn't for their premature death due to something unrelated I am absolutely certain they would have died of something directly connected to smoke. This person always said they regretted taking up the habbit (at this time they actually didn't know better unlike now). I feel this attitude is reflected in a large proportion of smokers today.
Again, it's not the government's job to decide that we have to live healthier lives. It can support the idea and support progressive movements, but no outright prohibitions and bannings.

Do you know how many lives would be saved from heart disease related deaths or illnesses if we banned McDonald's, Burger King, etc...? Certainly you support banning of this then if it saves thousands of lives a year (which it would), right?

(Edit:) While we're at it, let's ban automobiles, too! They kill an estimated 1.2 million worldwide annually. 1.2 MILLION. We're not talking thousands of lives. We're talking about over ONE MILLION lives lost PER YEAR due to automotive accidents. Wouldn't that be worthwhile to ban, then?

I'm a stern believer in personal responsibility. If a smoker regrets taking up the habit, it's their responsibility to deal with their addiction. The government has no place to step in even if the person requests it. Their choice got them addicted in the first place, now it's their responsibility to pull themselves out of the habit.

I'm a non-smoker myself, but I do enjoy the occasional cigar. What about my rights? I don't smoke enough for it to give me any chronic health problems. As little as I smoke, my lungs are perfectly capable of healing themselves.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Memphis on Sun, 27 May 2007 19:04:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You are making it sounds like this is a really sudden new law that has pounced on us all. The majority of the votes at the last General Election decided who our current Government are. We also vote for the people that represent us on a local scale. For every new law there has to be a vote and with this one the majority voted for the smoking ban. As voting citizens in the UK voted for the people that decided if this law was to go through then the voting public should be to blame and not the Government themselves.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sun, 27 May 2007 19:08:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Memphis wrote on Sun, 27 May 2007 15:04You are making it sounds like this is a really sudden new law that has pounced on us all. The majority of the votes at the last General Election decided who our current Government are. We also vote for the people that represent us on a local scale. For every new law there has to be a vote and with this one the majority voted for the smoking ban. As voting citizens in the UK voted for the people that decided if this law was to go through then the voting public should be to blame and not the Government themselves.
I don't care if it's new or not. It's still ridiculous.

Also, I do blame the people. My point still remains the same that government has no place to say anything about people smoking in privately owned businesses if the business so chooses to allow it. The people may be choosing to have the government regulate it, but it's still government regulation. If so many people want this, then they can push for the companies to change their practices by themselves and not have the government regulate people.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by MexPirate on Sun, 27 May 2007 19:15:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Smoking in resteraunts isn't nice, almost all in the UK apart from the curry houses ban smoking already - nobody, even a smoker wants to be surrounded by smoke when they eat a meal.

Bars/Pubs on the other hand is where you go to relax, socialise and drink - there are plenty of non-smokers I know that will have a cigarette when they drink and are in that atmosphere, personally as soon as alcohol passes my lips I have a strong desire to smoke, the two just go hand in hand.

It pisses me off how discrimination against some minorities is acceptable, but other not - age discrimination is a no no for example as long as its against old people, young people on the other hand get constantly discriminated against, getting paid less for doing the same job as someone else for example. Racism is another one, obviously actual racism is disgusting but lets say a white person commits a crime against a black person - the question is instantly raised "was it a racist crime?" put it the other way round an nobody lifts an eyebrow. I don't see how smokers are any different, if the majority smoked this would never even have come up, but because they are in the minority and it is socially acceptable to discriminate against smokers it's all good to take away

their freedoms.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Javaxcx on Sun, 27 May 2007 19:17:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If you have a problem with people smoking, go somewhere where they aren't smoking. Christ, sometimes you people amaze me with this high horsery. As a non-smoker, I don't care if you smoke or not. It's when you smoke someplace that others have to go to, such a public building or public washroom, that causes a problem. Most smokers I have met are extremely responsable individuals and if you ask them not to smoke in a washroom or a government building (if you're anal enough to care for the few minutes you are in either building) they will probably understand your concern and stop.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sun, 27 May 2007 19:48:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Javaxcx wrote on Sun, 27 May 2007 15:17If you have a problem with people smoking, go somewhere where they aren't smoking. Christ, sometimes you people amaze me with this high horsery. As a non-smoker, I don't care if you smoke or not. It's when you smoke someplace that others have to go to, such a public building or public washroom, that causes a problem. Most smokers I have met are extremely responsable individuals and if you ask them not to smoke in a washroom or a government building (if you're anal enough to care for the few minutes you are in either building) they will probably understand your concern and stop.
QFT

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by z310 on Sun, 27 May 2007 19:49:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 May 2007 15:48Javaxcx wrote on Sun, 27 May 2007 15:17If you have a problem with people smoking, go somewhere where they aren't smoking. Christ, sometimes you people amaze me with this high horsery. As a non-smoker, I don't care if you smoke or not. It's when you smoke someplace that others have to go to, such a public building or public washroom, that causes a problem. Most smokers I have met are extremely responsable individuals and if you ask them not to smoke in a washroom or a government building (if you're anal enough to care for the few minutes you are in either building) they will probably understand your concern and stop.
QFT

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by BlueThen on Sun, 27 May 2007 20:05:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I hope they ban smoking in USA. Most of my relatives smoke, and there is practically no way of getting away from it. I sometimes think I have lung cancer myself from being with a lot of smokers...

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Sun, 27 May 2007 20:26:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

bluethen wrote on Sun, 27 May 2007 16:05I hope they ban smoking in USA. Most of my relatives smoke, and there is practically no way of getting away from it. I sometimes think I have lung cancer myself from being with a lot of smokers...
Ask your relatives to respect you and not smoke around you. If they don't respect your wishes, avoid them.

Enough with the selfishness. You don't like it? Tough. Get over it.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by CarrierII on Sun, 27 May 2007 20:36:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Trouble with asking people to not smoke, in my experience, is they often don't, like I've said, if they want to go ahead and slowly kill themselves, I've not going to stop them (Even if they're my friends) but... not in my face?

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by FrAM on Mon, 28 May 2007 02:46:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MexPirate wrote on Sun, 27 May 2007 22:15Smoking in resteraunts isn't nice, almost all in the UK apart from the curry houses ban smoking already - nobody, even a smoker wants to be surrounded by smoke when they eat a meal.

Bars/Pubs on the other hand is where you go to relax, socialise and drink - there are plenty of non-smokers I know that will have a cigarette when they drink and are in that atmosphere, personally as soon as alcohol passes my lips I have a strong desire to smoke, the two just go hand in hand.

It pisses me off how discrimination against some minorities is acceptable, but other not - age discrimination is a no no for example as long as its against old people, young people on the other

---

hand get constantly discriminated against, getting paid less for doing the same job as someone else for example. Racism is another one, obviously actual racism is disgusting but lets say a white person commits a crime against a black person - the question is instantly raised "was it a racist crime?" put it the other way round an nobody lifts an eyebrow. I don't see how smokers are any different, if the majority smoked this would never even have come up, but because they are in the minority and it is socially acceptable to discriminate against smokers it's all good to take away their freedoms.

i like the way this guy thinks

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by BlueThen on Mon, 28 May 2007 02:49:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'd rather not watch my relatives slowly die of smoking. I don't think I can get out of a moving car if the one driving it is smoking. (I can't drive at this age)

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Mon, 28 May 2007 14:37:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 May 2007 12:24You don't get it, do you? It's not about the health ramifications of smoking. It's about the freedoms of the individual and the businesses.

I want the FREEDOM to go into any place I want and not have to put my health at risk just so someone can alleviate their addiction.

I don't like my FREEDOM to go where I please being prevented because I CHOOSE to remain healthy.

This whole "freedom of the individual" goes both ways you know.

You can't complain about your freedom of choice being put down when you are doing that exact same thing to others.

As you said...

Quote:Enough with the selfishness. You don't like it? Tough. Get over it.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Mon, 28 May 2007 15:21:55 GMT

warrantoI want the FREEDOM to go into any place I want and not have to put my health at risk just so someone can alleviate their addiction.
YOU don't own the business.

warrantoI don't like my FREEDOM to go where I please being prevented because I CHOOSE to remain healthy.
There's a thing called private property. Maybe you've heard of it? Again, YOU don't own the business.

warrantoThis whole "freedom of the individual" goes both ways you know.
I also mentioned the freedom of the business, too... this would be the third time doing so while replying to your post.

warrantoYou can't complain about your freedom of choice being put down when you are doing that exact same thing to others.
Smokers aren't passing legislation against non-smokers and forcing businesses to bide by their wishes.

warrantoAs you said...

Quote:Enough with the selfishness. You don't like it? Tough. Get over it.
Again, smokers didn't pass legislation forcing businesses to allow smoking, did they?

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Memphis on Mon, 28 May 2007 16:05:03 GMT

This freedom discussion is really tiresome as it doesn't has the same ring to it that it does over the pond. Yes in theory it does affect my freedom to take up a habbit to damage my health but I simply do not care. Smokers can still smoke in places that have been made nice for them (sitting outside with heaters to keep them comfortable is hardly severe alienation). It is against the law NOT to wear a seatbelt while driving a car here so are you saying that is affecting someones freedom if they didn't want to wear a safely belt?.

You also have to think that if someone wants to smoke at the moment when at work in most cases they already step outside regardless. Some establishments have specially built rooms but at the end of the day why should a business have to pay for something like that anyway?

The place where people will really feel it is in the pubs and clubs where they will have to go outside. You could say in really smoky pubs that smokers there are affecting the freedom of non smokers who would like to go there for a drink or something to eat but simply can't be in that smoke healthily. I feel that this whole thing is a double-edged sword but if it is going to save lives and stop people taking up a completely pointless habbit that can't be bad.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Mon, 28 May 2007 16:15:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MemphisIt is against the law NOT to wear a seatbelt while driving a car here so are you saying that is affecting someones freedom if they didn't want to wear a safely belt?
Yeah, that's what I'm saying.

MemphisYou also have to think that if someone wants to smoke at the moment when at work in most cases they already step outside regardless. Some establishments have specially built rooms but at the end of the day why should a business have to pay for something like that anyway?
They don't HAVE to. They choose to.

MemphisYou could say in really smoky pubs that smokers there are affecting the freedom of non smokers who would like to go there for a drink or something to eat but simply can't be in that smoke healthily.
The non-smokers consciously walk into a smoky pub knowing that there's going to be a smoky environment. They make the conscious decision to do that, and if the pub wants to allow for smokers, who are you, me, or the government to tell them they can't?

MemphisI feel that this whole thing is a double-edged sword but if it is going to save lives and stop people taking up a completely pointless habbit that can't be bad.
Again, as I've said to already... IT'S CALLED PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY. It's not the government's job (or the peoples' job to force regulation to be passed) to prevent people from doing what's harmful to them. It's our job as a community to help our neighbors be informed, but not to the point of having legislation be passed restricting the rights of others.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Mon, 28 May 2007 17:19:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 28 May 2007 09:21
YOU don't own the business.

That's nice, neither do the smokers.

Quote:There's a thing called private property. Maybe you've heard of it? Again, YOU don't own the business.

Oh I've heard of it. Too bad it doesn't apply to a PUBLIC building. This is why businesses have to adhere to regulations that allow for disabled people to enter, can't run a gambling area without a permit, can't serve alcohol to minor's ect. Shows that it is not completely a private property, there is that nasty little public aspect to it as well.

Quote:
I also mentioned the freedom of the business, too... this would be the third time doing so while replying to your post.

Businesses have no freedoms. They are not people. Oh, wait... you mean the people running it? They basically have no freedom's themselves. The government dictates what they can and can not sell and who they can and can not sell said items to. This is why you will never find a shop that sells Cocaine to white people only.

Quote:
Smokers aren't passing legislation against non-smokers and forcing businesses to bide by their wishes.

Point being? You are the one that is effectively saying "Screw the right to good health that non-smokers want. The "right" of people to smoke is more important!"

Quote:Again, smokers didn't pass legislation forcing businesses to allow smoking, did they?

That's nice, now please show me how that negates my comment?

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by jnz on Mon, 28 May 2007 17:48:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

One thing to think about is both sides of the argument. It seems a bit biased.

Smokers want the freedom to be able to smoke their cigarettes anywhere.
Non-smokers want the freedom to not passive smoke.

Then, look at the motives, the smokers want to smoke to fuel their addiction.
Non-smokers don't want to passive smoke to stay healthy.

Which one is more important? To have total freedom, or help others stay healthy?

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Renerage on Mon, 28 May 2007 23:12:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I totally agree with this law.
If they wanna smoke so much, go outside. Its completly rude to smell smoke while your eating.
You have the choice to eat in that restaurant, Most of the owners dont really care all that much.
Pubs with smoking- The owner thinks this will defer his business.
Pubs without smoking- The owner doesnt really care, since it was never a topic of interest.

Why are smokers so determined to ruin the lives of non-smokers? And smoke in areas where non-smokers dont wanna be in.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Tue, 29 May 2007 00:23:09 GMT

Quote:Again, as I've said to already... IT'S CALLED PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY. It's not the government's job (or the peoples' job to force regulation to be passed) to prevent people from doing what's harmful to them. It's our job as a community to help our neighbors be informed, but not to the point of having legislation be passed restricting the rights of others.

Something came to mind about this.

I highly doubt that if a friend or family member were threatening suicide, you'd come up with this argument as to why they should be allowed to kill themselves.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Tue, 29 May 2007 01:13:28 GMT

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 May 2007 20:23Quote:Again, as I've said to already... IT'S CALLED PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY. It's not the government's job (or the peoples' job to force regulation to be passed) to prevent people from doing what's harmful to them. It's our job as a community to help our neighbors be informed, but not to the point of having legislation be passed restricting the rights of others.

Something came to mind about this.

I highly doubt that if a friend or family member were threatening suicide, you'd come up with this argument as to why they should be allowed to kill themselves.
How can you pass legislation to make it illegal for one to kill themselves? If you hang yourself inside of your home, there's nothing the government can do.

However, it's the family and friends' responsibility to intervene. So, yes, I would come up with the same argument that the government has no place to say this or that. It's the people's responsibility to see that their community thrives.

gamemoddingWhich one is more important? To have total freedom, or help others stay healthy? Total freedom. Like, for instance, gun control in America. I'd rather die from someone shooting me on the street and know that I had the ability to defend myself, and the rest of the people do, than to live my life in fear. Why be paranoid? We're all going to die, and we can't control it.

My whole argument had been summed up by Java earlier in this thread, but nobody ever seems to listen to common sense. I'll say it again...

If the restaurant wants to allow smoking, they should be allowed to. It's their business, and they have every right to run it as they see fit (within food regulations).

If a smoker wants to go into a pub with smoking allowed, they should be allowed to do so. The non-smokers are not being forced to walk into the pub to drink, are they? No. If smokers were complaining that they can't smoke in smoke-free pubs, I'd say the same thing about them. Too bad. It's not their business to run.

Also, if we ban everything that's potentially dangerous, we couldn't function as a society. Knives/sharp objects would be banned, automobiles would be banned, fast food would be banned, alcohol would be banned, smoking would be banned, etc...

I trust that if people are FORCED (by having no other choice, not through legislation) to be responsible for themselves and their community (without having to pass regulation to do so), this wouldn't be an issue, but people are on their high horses and are too self-important to be responsible for themselves. It's about time that we stop running to our government to fix issues that need to be addressed by the communities, not by the government. If you don't want smoking to be allowed in pubs, start up interest groups (or join existing ones) and petition that pubs help make their businesses more non-smoker friendly. Things work better when you work together as a community rather than whine and moan to politicians to get legislation passed restricting the rights of others because you feel that it's your right to be self-important.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Renerage on Tue, 29 May 2007 02:12:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 28 May 2007 21:13warranto wrote on Mon, 28 May 2007 20:23Quote:Again, as I've said to already... IT'S CALLED PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY. It's not the government's job (or the peoples' job to force regulation to be passed) to prevent people from doing what's harmful to them. It's our job as a community to help our neighbors be informed, but not to the point of having legislation be passed restricting the rights of others.

Something came to mind about this.

I highly doubt that if a friend or family member were threatening suicide, you'd come up with this argument as to why they should be allowed to kill themselves.
How can you pass legislation to make it illegal for one to kill themselves? If you hang yourself inside of your home, there's nothing the government can do.

However, it's the family and friends' responsibility to intervene. So, yes, I would come up with the same argument that the government has no place to say this or that. It's the people's responsibility to see that their community thrives.

gamemoddingWhich one is more important? To have total freedom, or help others stay healthy? Total freedom. Like, for instance, gun control in America. I'd rather die from someone shooting me on the street and know that I had the ability to defend myself, and the rest of the people do, than to live my life in fear. Why be paranoid? We're all going to die, and we can't control it.

My whole argument had been summed up by Java earlier in this thread, but nobody ever seems to listen to common sense. I'll say it again...

If the restaurant wants to allow smoking, they should be allowed to. It's their business, and they have every right to run it as they see fit (within food regulations).

If a smoker wants to go into a pub with smoking allowed, they should be allowed to do so. The non-smokers are not being forced to walk into the pub to drink, are they? No. If smokers were complaining that they can't smoke in smoke-free pubs, I'd say the same thing about them. Too bad. It's not their business to run.

Also, if we ban everything that's potentially dangerous, we couldn't function as a society. Knives/sharp objects would be banned, automobiles would be banned, fast food would be banned, alcohol would be banned, smoking would be banned, etc...

I trust that if people are FORCED (by having no other choice, not through legislation) to be responsible for themselves and their community (without having to pass regulation to do so), this wouldn't be an issue, but people are on their high horses and are too self-important to be responsible for themselves. It's about time that we stop running to our government to fix issues that need to be addressed by the communities, not by the government. If you don't want smoking to be allowed in pubs, start up interest groups (or join existing ones) and petition that pubs help make their businesses more non-smoker friendly. Things work better when you work together as a community rather than whine and moan to politicians to get legislation passed restricting the rights of others because you feel that it's your right to be self-important.

I think they controlled this one

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by 3663Nixon on Tue, 29 May 2007 11:56:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I must admit I am not looking forward to the ban. I went into a non-smoking club once. Sure the air was smoke free but that place stank of sour sweat and crap perfume/aftershave. It was like hugging a chav.

I am also looking forward to some other pleasant effects:

Workers in company cars who can't smoke, and get stuck on the M6 in heavy traffic. Incoming road rage.
The piles of smoking shelters that get fly-tipped as they now count as "enclosed spaces".
People who live near pubs that now have to put up with even more noise (As more people will be outside on the street).
More drunken brawls - at least where I go out the streets are fairly quiet although the bars are rammed. If loads of people are smoking outside, there's more opportunity for drunkards fighting.
Drinking on the street might happen more. After all, if you're having a ciggie outside, you'll usually

want a beer too.
Nice arguments with club/bar bouncers after someone goes out for a fag, then tries to get back in.
The litter on the streets from smoking material will increase.

Whilst I appreciate that some people will be healthier, the cost implications of shoving smokers outside could be considerable.

I think maybe the smoking and non-smoking approach would be better (i.e. different types of establishments).

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Tue, 29 May 2007 12:45:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

regardless, I still find it enjoyable to see people argue about these made-up rights, just so they can make themselves look, well, "right".

I have to admit I'm a bit ignorant on American rights, but after looking through your Constitution and Bill of Rights, I couldn't find anything relating to this "right" you say exists. Perhaps I missed it though...

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by 3663Nixon on Tue, 29 May 2007 13:14:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ours (in the UK) are in the Health Act 2006, chapter 28

http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2006/ukpga_20060028_en.pdf

Its really easy to read :/

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by AoBfrost on Tue, 29 May 2007 15:25:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The state I live in in the USA bans smoking in all buildings, but allows it outside/in your car, I dont smoke, but hwere I work...just about everyone does and I stay away from them for 15 minutes or so so the smokey smell wears off, I'm allergic to smoke only, not fire smoke, but the fragrance from ciggerette smoke, just has that strong sharp scent that makes me sneeze non stop. I'm happy it's banned inside buildings, people cant say were taking away their freedom, they took

away my freedom for all these years by not allowing me to have peace when I go out to eat, go shopping, everywhere, and now I do.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Tue, 29 May 2007 16:20:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Heh, and I thought I was the only one.

Though you got off easy. I almost stop breathing if I get too much.

Coughing leads to gasping. Given enough smoke I throw up and can't breath, it's only gotten that close once. Someone was smoking outside a building and exhaled as soon as I stepped outside. I was on the ground after that.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Tue, 29 May 2007 16:23:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

warranto wrote on Tue, 29 May 2007 08:45regardless, I still find it enjoyable to see people argue about these made-up rights, just so they can make themselves look, well, "right".

I have to admit I'm a bit ignorant on American rights, but after looking through your Constitution and Bill of Rights, I couldn't find anything relating to this "right" you say exists. Perhaps I missed it though...
What "made up" rights? My right to live my life as I see fit? Ninth Amendment.

As for you people who still argue that it's against your rights for people to smoke in buildings where you are present (especially the Americans)... GET THIS THROUGH YOUR HEADS: YOU ARE NOT BEING FORCED TO GO INTO THOSE ESTABLISHMENTS. THEREFORE, YOU ARE CONSCIOUSLY GOING THERE KNOWING THAT IT IS A SMOKY ENVIRONMENT. IN DOING SO, YOU TAKE FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR YOUR ACTIONS.

How hard is it understand that if you're not forced to go somewhere that is "unhealthy", but you choose to anyway, you're at fault for any health complications that arise?

I'm not being an advocate for smokers. I think it's a horrible habit to get into, but it's not a decision I am to make for individuals or businesses. I understand that there are differences in countries and governments, but I feel that the right to live your life the way you see fit as long as you don't impede on the rights of others should be an inalienable right. However, the rights of others are only under protection when they're on their own, private property or on government-owned property (streets, government buildings, state/national parks, etc...).

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by CarrierII on Tue, 29 May 2007 16:33:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Tue, 29 May 2007 11:23

As for you people who still argue that it's against your rights for people to smoke in buildings where you are present (especially the Americans)... GET THIS THROUGH YOUR HEADS: YOU ARE NOT BEING FORCED TO GO INTO THOSE ESTABLISHMENTS. THEREFORE, YOU ARE CONSCIOUSLY GOING THERE KNOWING THAT IT IS A SMOKY ENVIRONMENT. IN DOING SO, YOU TAKE FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR YOUR ACTIONS.

I don't choose to stand at the bus stop, I have to, the bus won't stop elsewhere. (People smoke there)

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Tue, 29 May 2007 16:39:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Tue, 29 May 2007 12:23However, the rights of others are only under protection when they're on their own, private property or on government-owned property (streets, government buildings, state/national parks, etc...).
I agree with you, then. You're on government property, using a public service, so you shouldn't have to deal with smoking, as it has been proving to have adverse effects to your health, which would be impeding on your rights.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Tue, 29 May 2007 17:45:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You mean this one?

Quote:
Amendment IX
The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people

So we shall go to the Constitution:

Quote:We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish

Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare (health, happiness, or prosperity; well-being - warranto), and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Perhaps you could be a little more specific?

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Tue, 29 May 2007 18:02:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

warranto wrote on Tue, 29 May 2007 13:45You mean this one?

Quote:
Amendment IX
The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people

So we shall go to the Constitution:

Quote:We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare (health, happiness, or prosperity; well-being - warranto), and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Perhaps you could be a little more specific?
Keyword is "promote":

1. to help or encourage to exist or flourish; further.

Encouraging the people to go one way doesn't mean to regulate it. They didn't say "ensure" the general Welfare or anything else relating to legislation.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Tue, 29 May 2007 19:52:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

True, but to act against that by allowing innately bad substances to be tolerated does nothing to promote health.

And before you bring up that fast food, alcohol, etc. stuff being bad for you, I said INNATELY bad substances. There is no benefit for smoking as even one cigarette begins the process of poor health whereas fast food and alcohol are not innately bad for you. Only in excess do they become

that way (hence the reason trans fat is currently in the process of being eliminated).

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Tue, 29 May 2007 20:14:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

warranto wrote on Tue, 29 May 2007 15:52True, but to act against that by allowing innately bad substances to be tolerated does nothing to promote health.

And before you bring up that fast food, alcohol, etc. stuff being bad for you, I said INNATELY bad substances. There is no benefit for smoking as even one cigarette begins the process of poor health whereas fast food and alcohol are not innately bad for you. Only in excess do they become that way (hence the reason trans fat is currently in the process of being eliminated).
Who says the government has to be partial smoking, either? I mean, I want Gay Marriage to be legal. That doesn't mean I'm promoting Homosexuality, but outrightly banning it hasn't solved anything... Allowing for Gay Marriage to be legal doesn't mean that the government is against heterosexual marriages, either. Just supporting the right of the people to love and marry who they wish, whether or not it's what the politicians support for their own, personal morals.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by MexPirate on Tue, 29 May 2007 20:34:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

warranto wrote on Tue, 29 May 2007 14:52And before you bring up that fast food, alcohol, etc. stuff being bad for you, I said INNATELY bad substances. There is no benefit for smoking as even one cigarette begins the process of poor health whereas fast food and alcohol are not innately bad for you. Only in excess do they become that way (hence the reason trans fat is currently in the process of being eliminated).

Bullshit, alcohol is a poison and eating shitty food is not good for you. Eat one burger, drink one drink, smoke one cigarette and you will never notice any long term affect, drink lots, eat lots or smoke lots and you will.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Tue, 29 May 2007 20:50:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Alcohol, in small doses, provides health benefits such as a decrease in the risk of heart disease.

Fast food contains all the things regular food does and is a valid source of "stuff" the body uses.

Excess of either is what causes the harmful effect you are relating them to.

From http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0876/is_2002_Fall/ai_95147896

Quote:Smoking just one cigarette can affect your heart - Brief Article
Nutrition Health Review, Fall, 2002
Smoking a single cigarette can significantly and abruptly change the performance of the heart in young adults, a new study shows. The research, released by the American Society of Echocardiography, suggests that nicotine alone is not the trigger for this change in cardiac performance, since researchers did not see similar cardiac responses in participants who simply chewed nicotine gum.

Quote:Allowing for Gay Marriage to be legal doesn't mean that the government is against heterosexual marriages,

Pick a more relevant comparison and we'll talk. As it is now, that comparison is ridiculous. When two choices can exist at the same time, of course there is no reason to side with one or the other. However, smoking or not smoking does not fall under this category as one must be limited in some way (even simply setting a separate room for one group qualifies as not existing at the same time as they are now separate).

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Tue, 29 May 2007 20:59:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

warranto wrote on Tue, 29 May 2007 16:50Pick a more relevant comparison and we'll talk. As it is now, that comparison is ridiculous. When two choices can exist at the same time, of course there is no reason to side with one or the other. However, smoking or not smoking does not fall under this category as one must be limited in some way (even simply setting a separate room for one group qualifies as not existing at the same time as they are now separate).
How must one be limited? Because some pompous, self-important assholes want businesses and individuals to be regulated because they can't handle having to actively avoid a smoky environment? Boo-hoo.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Tue, 29 May 2007 21:40:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

By 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.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by CarrierII on Tue, 29 May 2007 21:47:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Why 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?

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.

CarrierII 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.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jecht on Wed, 30 May 2007 11:25:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I have a Theory:

I'm not so sure the owners of establishments want smoking. Maybe they only have it in their restaurant because if they don't, then the business from the smoking populace will go somewhere that allows smoking. Just a theory though...

At any rate, I hope something like this happens in our state. If it comes in a ballot I'll vote in favor of it. My future father-in-law can't go to restaurants because he has large allergic reactions to smoke. He sneezes and gets migraines and gasps when hes near it. Regardless of smoking and non-smoking sections in restaurants, smoke always reaches the non-smoking section. He's not the type to make a huge deal out of something like this but it doesn't seem like it's fair that he can't go somewhere because of something someone else is doing. I know that if I was in a restaurant and disrupted someone's meal that I'd be thrown out, but he doesn't get the same favor. It's too bad, I feel sorry for him

---

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Goztow on Wed, 30 May 2007 12:02:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just happened here in Belgium from the 1st of Jan. Best law ever made: now I don't need to eat while my mother in law blows her cigaret smoke over me.

When u go to a restaurant where smoking is allowed, about 3-4 out of 10 people smoke. The others are there because the ones who smoke want to go there so all the non smokers need to follow them (yes, it would be rude to ask for a different table).

Strange thing as well: it seems like people can now not smoke for 1-2 hours straight while eating, whereas they smoked their cig every half an hour (or even more frequent!) when they could smoke inside. This is especially true during cold winters .

At workplace: I know companies that oblige smokers to 'point' (donno how to say it otherwise) their card when they leave to smoke because otherwise they took a 5-10 minute break every half an hour. Now they actually need to work those 5-10 minutes longer everytime they go for a smoke. Great system! Suddenly a lot of people smoke way less at work.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by warranto on Wed, 30 May 2007 12:27:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_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 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.

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.

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 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.

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.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by z310 on Thu, 31 May 2007 01:00:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

j_ball430 wrote on Wed, 30 May 2007 09:35Yes, well... stupid over-bearing federal government

---

can lay off.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by w0dka on Wed, 06 Jun 2007 08:46:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In Germany they want to ban smoking from pubs to....

I like it... fresh air and fresh beer uhmm.....

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jonty on Wed, 06 Jun 2007 19:40:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If people want to commit suicide I don't have a problem with it. Thankfull all the people I know that smoke have the decency to go outside to do it anyway, so I don't get killed along with them.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Aprime on Mon, 11 Jun 2007 06:06:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

z310 wrote on Wed, 30 May 2007 21:00j_ball430 wrote on Wed, 30 May 2007 09:35Yes, well... stupid over-bearing federal government can lay off.

You always know what to say.

... Or not.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by CarrierII on Wed, 04 Jul 2007 19:47:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

(I know this is a bump)

The ban is now in force. Discuss.

Cheesesoda, over here, "stupid overbearing federal government" has to pay for hellishly expensive public health service, so anything that might help the general health of the population is

a good thing.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jonty on Thu, 05 Jul 2007 06:36:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm happy.

Although they've stuck those signs everywhere.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jamie or NuneGa on Thu, 05 Jul 2007 16:49:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i went down pub on the sunday, it was weird, on first impressions empty pub almost...
20 people outside... had pool table just for me and my bro.
I like it... happy freaking days

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by puddle_splasher on Thu, 05 Jul 2007 18:27:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No more smelly clothes

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by DarkKnight on Thu, 05 Jul 2007 23:37:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Interesting topic.

Personally I don't smoke. Tried it when i was 17 and hated it, never picked up the habit.

Now with that said privately owned business should have the freedom to allow smoking. They should put a big neon sign up blinking saying we allow smoking.

That way you can choose to go in or choose not to. You have the freedom. No one is sticking a gun to your head and saying you have to go here to eat or drink. You have the freedom to move along to the next place that doesn't allow smoking. If you choose to take your freedom loving ass into a place that allows smoking then thats your fault for whatever happens to you.

A smoker should have the freedom to go eat or drink somewhere and enjoy a good smoke in a

---

business that allows smoking and shouldn't be discriminated against because you think its bad for them.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Nightma12 on Fri, 06 Jul 2007 01:18:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:A smoker should have the freedom to go eat or drink somewhere and enjoy a good smoke in a business that allows smoking and shouldn't be discriminated against because you think its bad for them.

a drug addict should have the freedom to go eat or drink somewhere and enjoy a good smoke of crack/herroin in a business that allows drugs and shouldn't be discrimated against because you think its bad for them

---

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Fri, 06 Jul 2007 04:02:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Nightma12 wrote on Thu, 05 July 2007 21:18Quote:A smoker should have the freedom to go eat or drink somewhere and enjoy a good smoke in a business that allows smoking and shouldn't be discriminated against because you think its bad for them.

a drug addict should have the freedom to go eat or drink somewhere and enjoy a good smoke of crack/herroin in a business that allows drugs and shouldn't be discrimated against because you think its bad for them
Bingo.

Edit: I'm serious, too. I'm all for that.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by jnz on Fri, 06 Jul 2007 04:09:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I aggree completly, however, if it affects others then yes.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Fri, 06 Jul 2007 04:16:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If a business wants to allow that recklessness, they should be able to. However, I know we can all agree that we don't want people doing illicit drugs inside of a restaurant. How would we remedy this without getting the government involved, you ask? Stop going to the restaurant. If the restaurant loses enough business, they'll put an end to it. Capitalism works wonders.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by jnz on Fri, 06 Jul 2007 04:19:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, sorry, i should of posted more on my opinion. I completely agree, however, if it's a public place that everyone has to go to then i think the health of everyone there should be accommodated. In pubs and such then i would leave it, i don't think the government has any right messing with someone's business.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Fri, 06 Jul 2007 04:27:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

RoShamBo wrote on Fri, 06 July 2007 00:19Yes, sorry, i should of posted more on my opinion. I completely agree, however, if it's a public place that everyone has to go to then i think the health of everyone there should be accommodated. In pubs and such then i would leave it, i don't think the government has any right messing with someone's business.
Right, as I and Java said towards the beginning of the thread, if it's a public place (as in, government-owned), it shouldn't be allowed. If it's a business or a house, the government should have no say.

Why some people think that they should be able to control businesses' policies, I have no idea. It's just pointless high-horsery.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jamie or NuneGa on Fri, 06 Jul 2007 14:32:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Why some people think that they should be able to control businesses' policies, I have no idea. It's just pointless high-horsery.[/quote]

it is owned by a person, therefore surely they can allow smoking if they want...

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Fri, 06 Jul 2007 14:51:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

NuNeGa wrote on Fri, 06 July 2007 10:32
cheesesodaWhy some people think that they should be able to control businesses' policies, I have no idea. It's just pointless high-horsery.

it is owned by a person, therefore surely they can allow smoking if they want...
That's what I just said. In fact, that's what I've been saying this entire thread...

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jamie or NuneGa on Sat, 07 Jul 2007 17:43:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 06 July 2007 09:51NuNeGa wrote on Fri, 06 July 2007 10:32 cheesesodaWhy some people think that they should be able to control businesses' policies, I have no idea. It's just pointless high-horsery.

it is owned by a person, therefore surely they can allow smoking if they want...
That's what I just said. In fact, that's what I've been saying this entire thread...

good, btw im not gonna read all the way so somethings prob will be repeated

---

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by DarkKnight on Sun, 08 Jul 2007 05:54:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Nightma12 wrote on Fri, 06 July 2007 09:18Quote:A smoker should have the freedom to go eat or drink somewhere and enjoy a good smoke in a business that allows smoking and shouldn't be discriminated against because you think its bad for them.

a drug addict should have the freedom to go eat or drink somewhere and enjoy a good smoke of crack/herroin in a business that allows drugs and shouldn't be discrimated against because you think its bad for them

drugs are illegal, cigarettes are not

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Nightma12 on Sun, 08 Jul 2007 07:40:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

although ciggerettes are now slowly being made illigal....

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...

Posted by [Jamie or NuneGa](#) on Sun, 08 Jul 2007 11:10:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nicotine is as addictive as heroine

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by [renohol](#) on Mon, 09 Jul 2007 02:26:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm all for the unfairness to end!

Just because wealthy tabaco profiteers have politicians in their back pockets doesn't mean Canabis should be banned!

You first heard it here on the "Official Renegade Forums" that "Second Lung Smoke" sucks hardcore if its tobaco.

Legalize freedumb, ban tabaco and legalize hemp!

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by [PlayMp1](#) on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 05:02:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sadukar09 wrote on Sat, 26 May 2007 11:21my dad used 2 smoke and now i think i got asthma from 2nd hand smoke....

Yeah, me too. In my county(Thurston County, WA, USA), they recently banned smoking in ALL establishments. No smoking in bars(as we call it in the US), stores, restaurants, community centres(I like spelling it that way... >_>), anything. You have to go 25 feet away from it, which as a non-smoker(I'm 15 for christs sake!), like. The poll for this was a LANDSLIDE, there was no chance that it would have a year 2000 type election(which sucked... got us in 2 wars...). So no one really cared that it was passed, there's hardly that many smokers in my area any way .

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by [PlayMp1](#) on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 05:03:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

renohol wrote on Sun, 08 July 2007 21:26I'm all for the unfairness to end!

Just because wealthy tabaco profiteers have politicians in their back pockets doesn't mean Canabis should be banned!

You first heard it here on the "Official Renegade Forums" that "Second Lung Smoke" sucks

---

hardcore if its tobaco.

Legalize freedumb, ban tabaco and legalize hemp!

Looks like you're on some wacky tobacco right now anyway >_>...

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by ron paul on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 11:48:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

NuNeGa wrote on Sun, 08 July 2007 06:10nicotine is as addictive as heroine

Not quite. But works in a similar way to a heroin addiction (using 'similar' very loosely).

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Deamond11 on Wed, 15 Aug 2007 11:41:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

im glad about it as an exsmoker i hate breathing in other peoples poison.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by OWA on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 12:31:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ban it all and get some common sense.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 18:37:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

GET. OFF. OF. YOUR. HIGH. HORSES.

Is it really that fucking hard to understand the concept of liberty? Apparently it is.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jecht on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 20:00:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, liberty allows us the ability to vote for, or against bans things like...well, smoking. Democracy

---

is grand.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Starbuzz on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 20:16:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Jecht wrote on Mon, 20 August 2007 15:00Yes, liberty allows us the ability to vote for, or against bans things like...well, smoking. Democracy is grand.

That's hypocrisy...using liberty/democracy to vote against what someone else can do or not do. Atleast I can smoke in my home...I hope they don't come against that anytime soon.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 20:36:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Jecht wrote on Mon, 20 August 2007 16:00Yes, liberty allows us the ability to vote for, or against bans things like...well, smoking. Democracy is grand.
So you're wanting to pervert the purpose of liberty for your own, selfish desires? Okay, so let me buy a gun for personal protection and then use it to kill someone. Bad analogy? Not true!

Voting to take away someone's right to smoking is impeding on their rights. Shooting someone with your gun is impeding on their rights.

Also, America is NOT a democracy for a reason. Democracies imply mob rule. Republics prevent this. This is why America is a REPUBLIC. It baffles my mind how many people try and refer to the USA's form of government as a democracy. Even our own President... the amount of ignorance in the world is amazing.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by PlastoJoe on Tue, 21 Aug 2007 12:54:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 20 August 2007 15:16Jecht wrote on Mon, 20 August 2007 15:00Yes, liberty allows us the ability to vote for, or against bans things like...well, smoking. Democracy is grand.

That's hypocrisy...using liberty/democracy to vote against what someone else can do or not do. Atleast I can smoke in my home...I hope they don't come against that anytime soon.
That's the point of democracy/republic-whatever. It's called dissenting opinion. No matter how messed up you "think" something is, it should be represented in voting. If people don't support it, fine. If they do, either they'll see how bad it is and not support it again for a while or they'll see how good it is and keep it around.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jecht on Tue, 21 Aug 2007 13:55:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 20 August 2007 15:36Jecht wrote on Mon, 20 August 2007 16:00Yes, liberty allows us the ability to vote for, or against bans things like...well, smoking. Democracy is grand.
So you're wanting to pervert the purpose of liberty for your own, selfish desires? Okay, so let me buy a gun for personal protection and then use it to kill someone. Bad analogy? Not true!

Voting to take away someone's right to smoking is impeding on their rights. Shooting someone with your gun is impeding on their rights.

Also, America is NOT a democracy for a reason. Democracies imply mob rule. Republics prevent this. This is why America is a REPUBLIC. It baffles my mind how many people try and refer to the USA's form of government as a democracy. Even our own President... the amount of ignorance in the world is amazing.

Republic: a state in which the supreme power rests in the body of citizens entitled to vote and is exercised by representatives chosen directly or indirectly by them.

Are you sure you know what a republic is? I was just making a statement based on the definition.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by cheesesoda on Tue, 21 Aug 2007 14:24:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Not everybody in power is elected directly by the citizens, so we could not possibly have a democracy.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by AmunRa on Wed, 22 Aug 2007 08:07:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i did some research, and discovered that, in fact, smoking is GOOD for you!

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Starbuzz on Wed, 22 Aug 2007 18:35:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AmunRa wrote on Wed, 22 August 2007 03:07i did some research, and discovered that, in fact, smoking is GOOD for you!

Yes...if it is used conservatively. My grandfather started smoking when he was 10. He is now 86

and still smokes...he never had any lung or any bullshit health problems like that. Go figure!

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by OWA on Thu, 23 Aug 2007 01:20:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 20 August 2007 21:36
Voting to take away someone's right to smoking is impeding on their rights. Shooting someone with your gun is impeding on their rights.
The Human Rights Act fails. It needs rewriting.

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by Jecht on Thu, 23 Aug 2007 12:36:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AmunRa wrote on Wed, 22 August 2007 03:07i did some research, and discovered that, in fact, smoking is GOOD for you!

Well of course it is, who wouldn't want emphysema? Not to mention you're a hero if you survive the cancer!

Subject: Re: smoking ban in uk...
Posted by AmunRa on Thu, 23 Aug 2007 20:18:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Jecht wrote on Thu, 23 August 2007 08:36AmunRa wrote on Wed, 22 August 2007 03:07i did some research, and discovered that, in fact, smoking is GOOD for you!

Well of course it is, who wouldn't want emphysema? Not to mention you're a hero if you survive the cancer!
I totally agree with that statement, and I'm not even being sarcastic!