oral quarrel

Reader opinions mixed on serving alcohol

This week's Oral Quarrel ques-tion asked our renders: How do you feel about a city probibiling you from serving your youngsters il-quor? How would you prevent par-ents from serving their children il-euro et arctice? quor at partics? Following are the responses:

I feel that the liquor served at home, it's a private party, I feel the city has nothing to say about it. When I graduat-ed, I wanted to get a little loses that night. I suggest the parents put a bas-ket, and any kid that comes in to put your keys in it, and if the parent feels they can't drive or shouldn't drive, they should call their parents and let them know. know.

I completely disagree. I think it is an intrusion in the privacy of the individu-al families. Not only that, but it is unenforceable and probably the best solution would be to just crack down on the drunk driving aspect.

Anyone serving young people liquor should get fined, and if the young per-son is involved in an accident after leaving their home, that adult serving them between the dult serving them should be prosecuted.

I am in favor of the ordinance. No adult should serve liquor to a minor.

I believe they should let them get as drunk as they want and let them have a hangover and let them see what it is like. Oral Quarrel is great

If parents were parents they would not even consider serving liquor to their kids and friends, Mr. and Miss Rowdy, an excuse to drink at a gradua-tion party. I was once there just like all these parents who are in this position

now, and we gave our folks the same song and dance. Nobody will show up if we don't have a kegger at least. Come on Dad we'll play it coal. Baloney, don't give in. If you got good cats and plenky of good music, a few dark comers, they will all show up. The bad news is the drinking done cutside the home. An ac-cident happens and who gets blamed, the parents. You just can't seem to win. Have fun and stay alive Class of '85.

The so-called under adult supervi-sion attitude is a total parental cop-out. No booze under any circumstances should be served or allowed but that decan't mean it won't happen anyway. Most parents today have their act to-gether. It only takes one of those total-ity cool parents to set the party up, and I am sure that those parents are out there reading this Oral Quarrel ques-tion today.

I am for such a law. I think It should be a law when you think of the conse-quences of drinking people, people who abuse alcohol. As far as penallius, they should be severe and the law should have some tech in it. The problem with most of our laws is that they have too many loopholes and certain people with an attorney can get out of It.

Well if you can't beat them, join 'em.

As far as the city prohibition re-questing that we not serve the young-sters, it might be unnecessary if par-ents were responsible and understood the example they set by breaking the law. They are highly detrimental to their children's emotional health.

serve anybody under 21, the police should just go and arrest them. You don't need another ordinance of ali things.

. I agree with Farmington Families in Action. I believe that parents should obey the law which says that no person is supposed to drink under the age of 21 and 1, as a parent of an 18-year-old, would not want her to go to another person's house knowing that they were serving liquor to youngsters.

I think a city ordinance is ridiculous. You already have a state law prohibit-ing the sale and serving of minors. Just to have another ordinance on the book which deals in somebody's home is ri-diculous. If people can't control their parties and children, they shouldn't be hiding behind an ordinance.

I am all in favor of bolding parents responsible if they serve alcohol to teens in their home. I disagree with Joan Dudley who feels government shouldn't gel involved. The police need more specific rules to help curb the enormous problem of teen-age drink-ing. The real problem is the parents are not home when these parties are going on.

It would be nice if parents would use their brains so that this ordinance would be unnecessary. As a member of MADD, I am all too aware of the stuhabb, I am an too aware of the sto-pldity of naive or lenicnt parents and this ordinance may be just what they need to say no to alcohol and drugs in the home. Lives are most definitely at stake here, theirs and mine.

I think it is an excellent idea. Some-thing has to be dono to wake up these parents and make them accountable. They are not going to do it on their own. I speak from experience. I lost my son at the age of 22 to an 18-year-old drunk driver.

I am against the proposed ordinance. I feel we should do everything to keep Big Brother out of our homes.

The Issue is not serving your own children liquor, the issue is serving someone else's children. No one has the right to make alcohol an approved, at-tractive, available item for somebody else's children. There should be strong and civil penalties against giving alco-bal to someone olevis children hol to someone else's children

Terrible. My husband just killed a 21-year-old boy drinking, and I have been restricted from driving the rest of my life myself. ٥

Keep the kids and the booze at home under cover because they will go out and kill someone.

It should be made a state law. The kids will only go further out of the city to get liquor. My daughter is going to three proms, and I have signed a SADD contract, I have discussed that we disapprove of her drinking. Most im-portant we have stressed ber wearing seat helis.

I would appreciate having an ordi-nance preventing liquor from being served by parents and the way I would prevent it is hopefully by education. By educating parents through the newspa-pers, but primarily by television and radio, about the dangers and problems that have developed. ۰

I don't think it is the city's responsi-bility, it is the parents responsibility.Apples don't fall to far from the tree. If parents drink, why shouldn't their teenagers. If Dad comes home under the influence of liquor driving, why shouldn't the teenager be allowed the same thing.

I think parents should be allowed to serve alcohol to their children because it is probably some people's heritage to have beer or wine. They should teach them to not overdink and not to drive when drinking. How would you stop it going to a private home? Like the Ges-tapos did? But I don't think they should be able to serve other people's children alcehol. alcobol

I feel that parents should be prohibit-ed from serving llquor to minors at parties. How many more teenage-drinking related accidents must we ex-perience before adults finally become wiser and more responsible regarding this issue. Check the April 25 issue of the Observer for recent statistics on al-cohol related accidents in our cities.

. I agree we should try to get parents

not to serve liquor at parties. How we can do that, I don't know. It is difficult but I think that at least if we start somewhere it might help to think drinking is acceptable.

Any so-called parent who serves ll-quor to a bunch of nitwil kids deserves a jail sentence. Everyone is sick and tired of these dranks tearing up neigh-borhoods and generally acting like a bunch of Neanderthals and killing peo-ple. Ignorant parents raise ignorant kids.

I am in favor of the ordinance. If it is passed legally, there should be no mi-nors drinking at any graduation party thus parents wouldn't be pressured into serving liquor. Parents, how would you feel if the drinking (see-nager leaving your party killed or maimed someone?

I feel that the city should not pass the ordinance prohibiling parents sorv-ing youngsters liquor in a privato home. I think by so doing the parents are abdicating their responsibilities. Parents should be smart enough and have enough backbone to realize the things you are supposed to do and nut do.

I would serve them a punch. I am against liquor for teen-agers.

The ordinance would be unfair be-cause sometimes youngsters smuggle booze into parties and the parents are not aware of it.

Ē



