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**This house would ban the sale of alcohol**

The opposition must understand the real-world impact of alcohol abuse reaches far beyond the financial costs. When a loved one has a problem with alcohol, it can affect their marriage and their extended family. There's also the larger impact on the community, schools, the workplace, the healthcare system and on society as a whole. Children who grow up in a home with a loved one dealing with alcohol addiction may be affected as well; they are at significant risk to develop alcohol use disorders themselves. Growing up in a home where at least one parent has a severe alcohol use disorder can increase a child's chances of developing psychological and emotional problems. Considering these problems that persist in the society, this house believes that the sale on alcohol must ban. Now the proposition clearly defines the basic motto that is to reduce the consumption of alcohol on the society to resolve these issues. It is very important to understand the fact that people consuming alcohol are not the only ones being affected rather it is the society around them that gets hugely affected and has to a lot of times pay consequences.

Stating the numbers in India, more than 50 percent are under influence of alcohol. As alcohol leads to loss of inhibitory effect, a person loses his mind about what not to do. Domestic violence, rapes, murders etc., maximum are done under influence of alcohol. Even the accused of Nirbhaya case did this crime under alcohol. If u visit a medical emergency room you will really come to know what alcohol has done. About 99 percent road traffic accidents happen due to alcohol. Especially in occasions like new year, some festival people take alcohol and do rash driving. A drunk person driving at high speeds crashing against a young man and taking an innocent life. Was that man even at fault? no! Another benefit of banning liquor is the large amounts of money which the government as well as people will save which they spend on curing diseases arising due to consumption of liquor.

The proposition believes that banning alcohol would not just drastically reduce the consumption of alcohol but if we look into the near future, the problem of alcoholism will reduce. What I am trying to imply here is that dues to the unavailability of alcohol, the growing generations will hardly be exposed to drinking and the chances of becoming addicts decreases. Thus, banning the sale of alcohol will help us to create a society with hardly anyone addicted to alcohol in the near future. Doesn’t the idea sound plausible? Overall not only would the domestic crimes decrease but we are ensuring something for a better future as well.

I would like to highlight that total ban on Alcohol in ‘Lakshadweep’ is a big success. And it’s so simple then – you go to a party and the bar clearly disagrees to serve you wine or beer etc. It is important to ponder on how big impact that will have on the consumption. The fact is that widely availability of the alcohol is the major issue here.   
Now the opposition speaker raised a point of the economic impact of the ban on sales. But the fact is that we must clearly know that no country entirely depends on the sale of alcohols and we must set our priorities clearly. The proposition’s priorities are to reduce the consumption of alcohol to as minimal as possible and we believe that small concessions can be managed because again no country’s wealth entirely depends on the sale of this commodity.

I would like to raise the point that Tobacco has been banned in a lot more countries and is condemned way more than alcohol. My point is, I think alcohol hasn’t been banned because the mere idea seems authoritarian and unthinkable, all because alcohol is so ingrained in societies around the world. But if people actually compare the two they will see that there isn’t really much of a difference between the two, and that accepting one and rejecting the other is baseless Maybe in the future, just as we look down on people who take up smoking, we will look down on people who take up drinking. The proposition believes that bringing a change in people’s mindsets is when alcohol become unpopular, and from there is when the banning will be affective too.

**Opposition believes that people are sensible enough to set their limits if drinking but the**

Proposition believes prohibition would have a much greater chance of success in the 21st century than it did before. I do really think prohibition would be successful and the positive contribution of prohibition to society would be an overnight breath of fresh air to the government and the economy. Alcohol testing at jobs including residual testing of Alcohol in the body would be the greatest way to enforce the ban a. If you want to work you have to stop drinking. If you don’t work you can’t afford the liquor.

Sure, there would be ways to circumvent the law but it would make it much more difficult to get alcohol and most law-abiding citizens would comply.

Alcohol is a plague that has affected mankind since Noah made the first wine. It ruins societies. This is a proven fact as it contributed to the destruction of the Native American cultures and thus I rest my case here.