**78. The following appeared in a memo from the vice president of a food distribution company with food storage warehouses in several cities. “Recently, we signed a contract with the Fly-Away Pest Control Company to provide pest control services at our fast-food warehouse in Palm City, but last month we discovered that over $20,000 worth of food there had been destroyed by pest damage. Meanwhile, the Buzzoff Pest Control Company, which we have used for many years, continued to service our warehouse in Wintervale, and last month only $10,000 worth of the food stored there had been destroyed by pest damage. Even though the price charged by Fly-Away is considerably lower, our best means of saving money is to return to Buzzoff for all our pest control services.”**

*Write a response in which you discuss what specific evidence is needed to evaluate the arguement and explain how the evidence would weaken or strengthen the argument.*

The vice president suggested returning to Buzzoff, the pest control company that they have used for many years, for providing their services comprehensively. The vice president also indicated that returning to Buzzoff is the most transcendent approach in terms of saving budget. The evidence throughout the argument, however, is irrelevant and hence fails to corroborate the conclusion.

To begin with, the author assumed that the Fly-Away Pest Control Company, their latest cooperative firm, which caused over $20,000 worth of food in food storage warehouses to be destroyed, had more debilitated pest control than the Buzzoff Pest Control Company. It seems that using services from the Buzzoff Pest Control Company can save money with less amount of pest damage. However, we can not ensure whether the capacities of warehouses in Palm City and Wintervale are the same. To be more concise, maybe the food storage warehouse in Palm city is large enough to accommodate $1,000,000 worth of food whereas that in Wintervale can only fit $20,000 worth of food. In this case, the percentage of pest-induced loss induced by Fly-Away is considerably lower than that by Buzzoff. Unless the company provides sufficient information about the values of each warehouse, we can not make a quick conclusion of which company controls pest damage better and determine which services should be utilized with such information.

In addition, the argument rests on the assumption that the fee for pest control will be permanently the same. In order to conserve food properly and to make more profits, the vice president presumed to choose Buzzoff for their all pest control services. This could be feasible if Buzzoff promises to provide the services at equal charging standards. But it is possible that when Buzzoff takes over the services, they may enhance their charge for increasing management difficulties. In such a case, the author’s assertion that assigning Buzzoff company to manage all of the food warehouses is hasty and porous. (或許多描述一點失去競爭者之後政府沒有議價能力)

Finally, other factors may even contribute to the detriment from pests. For example, the climate conditions are different between Palm city and Wintervale. Despite (Compared to) cold and windy weather in Wintervale, hot and humid weather in Palm city is more appropriate for insect living. Different companies may specialize in different situations considering pest control. Thus, more comprehensive discussions about the pros and cons of services provided by different companies are essential to warrant the vice president’s suggestion.

In conclusion, this is a weak argument. To be fully convinced, I have to know the percentage of pest-induced loss in several cities and a thorough comparison between companies in the aspects of prices, agreements and specialties need to be further revealed to make the argument more complete and convincing. After all, a wrong policy may be dangerous for the earnings of a company.
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