Honorable judges, worthy opponents, (and welcome guests). The resolution that stands before us today is of crucial importance because it questions the very nature of our legal system and society. Before giving my constructive speech, I would like to first define the resolution. Be it resolved that the use of performance-enhancing drugs should be legalized. The points I will be presenting today in support of the affirmative’s deep conviction in the truth of the resolution are the costs of the prohibition of drugs, the purpose of controlled substances, the lack of safety and education in the black market, freedom of choice on the athlete’s part, and about the exaggeration of the media. My partner will expand on my contentions and present the following points for your consideration... I will now commence my constructive speech.

The costs of merely prohibiting people from using drugs or buying and selling them is ridiculously high. In the US, about thirty billion dollars are used up in the prevention of drug-use. In order to gain an idea of how much money we truly are consuming, and what we could save, we must look back to when alcohol was prohibited. Before alcohol’s prohibition, about 4.4 million dollars were used for prohibition. When alcohol became illicit, the prohibition costs spiked up by ten million, bringing the cost of prohibition to 14 million dollars. Not only that, but we also must take into consideration the cost of the drug itself. Steroids and other performance enhancing drugs can cost between $50 to $1000 for a single bottle, because they originate from illegal markets. If they were legalized, the price could possibly drop, due to the fact that they are not as difficult to obtain.

With a huge new demand of the drug, of course as all technologies do, the drugs would be faster in upgrading and improving. More study can be poured into the drugs in order to refine it and make it safer to use. Seeing as other technologies are rapidly advancing, the advancement of sports to a whole new level is to be expected. Steroids, still, are being singled out when there are other sports technologies that enhance a player’s abilities, such as laser eye surgery, surgery to enhance a player’s bones, ligaments etc. and even protein bars or meal replacement powders. When there are so many other unnatural performance enhancing methods, why should steroids be looked down upon? With new technology, there would be control over the substance. The drugs are not for the general public to use – only for professional athletes over a specific age that actually wish to be stronger not for aesthetic appeal, but for the fact that it actually enhances their body. With control over the substance, care can be put into using the drug, with doctors prescribing specific dosages, rather than having to secretly use them. The athlete would be able to freely and safely take the steroid under supervision of an authorized individual. It is similar to having a personal trainer – only the personal trainer is a doctor.

The black market has always been unsafe. Drugs have a high chance of getting contaminated or poisoned if obtained through the black market, making them more harmful than they really are. If they were legalized, as stated before, athletes would be able to take the drugs freely and safely, under the correct supervision of a doctor. Because there is a lack of education in the black market as well, the drug handlers do not know about safety. There is no guarantee of ensuring that the drugs are safe. There are no check-ups of the item to see if it has been correctly handled, nor are there any inspections. If there was such safety measures, the drugs would be much less dangerous than they currently are.

Athletes should be able to choose what they wish to do to their own bodies. They should not be told that they cannot change their body in a certain way in order to gain optimum performance. Even if the effect of the drug is negative, smoking also has negative effects. The only difference is, smoking is just an addiction, while performance-enhancing drugs actually enhance one’s performance. And yet, smoking is the one that is legal. But this brings up the issue of any drugs used by athletes. Take the case of Romanian gymnast, Andreea Raducan, for instance. She took a simple cold medicine because she had a fever. She competed right after, and won a gold medal. But, she was tested for stimulants, and the tests came up to be positive. All because her doctor had given her a cold medicine to quell her fever. Ato Boldon, a world champion sprinter, also took a cold medicine and was tested with positive results. He was disqualified from the Mt. SAC relays and given a warning. If steroids and other substances were legal, we would not have to go through these sorts of procedures, and cause so much humiliation and injustice.

Finally, steroids themselves are not as harmful as they are perceived to be. The media has deluded many of our minds, and exaggerates the side effects of taking performance-enhancing drugs. The whole concept is looked utterly down upon, and makes every aspect of its usage negative. For example, WWE wrestler John Cena was in an interview for CNN. When asked the question about whether he used steroids, he answered, “Absolutely not,” and elaborated with a detailed explanation. CNN, for the final edit, cut off his response, and only used select parts of his explanation in order to make him sound like he did. WWE responded to this by saying: “In a country in which the news media is highly suspect, and the quality of unbiased reporting has been thrown into the trash can, CNN has stooped to new depths.”

Ladies and Gentlemen, we hope you believe as we do, that this resolution must stand. I now stand open for cross examination.