**政府类(1)。　　Most writers of fiction do not earn enough money to live from their writing.Do you think the government should give them financial assistance to help encourage good literature?**

　　Model Answer:

　　There are some conditions under which a novelist could reasonably expect some government support. In general terms, if the writer has already proved that he or she can write well, and if the stories produced are stimulating and interesting, then I consider that some financial help might be given.

　　Language quality is difficult to define, but if the writing shows, for example, good grammar, a wide vocabulary, and elegance and imagination, then I can see a valid reason for assisting an author to spend some time free from money problems. Such a writing needs to be encouraged. the entertainment value of a book would be also a factor in deciding whether to provide assistance to an author. Further consideration would include social and educational values expressed in the author's work.

　　However, if the ideas were socially irresponsible, or if the stories contain unnecessary violence or pornography for its own sake, then I would not want to see the author sponsored to write stories which do not benefit society. Other exceptions are the many writers of good books who do not require financial help. Books which proved to be extremely popular, such as the Harry Potter stories, clearly need no subsidy at all because the authors have become rich through their writing.

　　Views on what good quality writing means will vary widely, and so if any author is to be given money for writing, then the decision would have to be made by a committee or panel of judge. An individual opinion would certainly cause disagreement among the reading public.

**政府类(2)。　　Some governments say how many children a family can hare in their country. They may control the number of children someone has through taxes. It is sometimes necessary and right for a government to control the population in this way.Do you agree or disagree? Give reasons for your answer.**

　　Model Answer:

　　It is certainly very understandable that some governments should start looking at ways of limiting their populations to a sustainable figure. In the past, populations were partly regulated by frequent war and widespread disease, but in recent years the effects of those factors have been diminished. Countries can be faced with a population that is growing much faster than she nation's food resources or employment opportunities and whose members can be condemned to poverty by the need to feed extra mouths. They identify population control as a means to raising living standards.

　　But how should it be achieved? Clearly, this whole area is a very delicate personal and cultural issue. Many people feel that this is not a matter for the state. They feel this is one area of life where they have the right to make decisions for themselves. For that reason, it would seem that the best. Approach would be to work by persuasion rather than compulsion This could be done by a process of education that points out the way a smaller family can mean an improved quality of life for the family members, as well as less strain on the country's perhaps very limited, resources.

　　This is the preferred way. Of course if this docs not succeed within a reasonable time scale, it may be necessary to consider other measures. Such as tax incentives or child-benefit payments for small families only. These are midway between persuasion and compulsion.

　　So. Yes. It is sometimes necessary, but governments should try very hard to persuade first. They should also remember that this is a very delicate area indeed, and that social engineering can create as many problems as it solves?

**政府类(3)。　　All education, primary, secondary and further education, should be free to all people and paid for by the government.Do you agree or disagree with this statement?**

　　Model Answer:

　　Different countries have different education systems. I don‛t know all the education systems in the world but all the ones I do know about have free school education at primary and secondary level. I certainly agree with the statement that this should be the case. I believe university education is different.

　　No matter what standard of income someone has or what society someone comes from, everyone should have the opportunity to have a good standard of education. This is not always what happens but it is what should happen. Private schools can be available for those who want and can afford it but the free schools should always be there. This is certainly one of the best attributes of western democracy and all countries it seems strive to attain situation although some have problems due to the economic and political situations in their countries. Governments should make sure that all their citizens have access to a good standard of free education at primary and secondary level.

　　Further education is different. In an ideal world this should be free but governments have a lot of demands on their money. I think that students should have to pay, maybe not all, but at least a contribution towards their tuition fees. They will be able to earn it back once they have graduated. The UK has this system whereas in the US students have to pay all their high tuition fees which can run into the tens of thousands of dollars over a full course. I am not sure if I agree with this but it certainly would make sure that students make the best of efforts to pass or all their money would be wasted.

　　Therefore I conclude that primary and secondary education should be freely available for all if possible but that further education should not necessarily be wholly free.

**政府类(4)。　　The costs of medical health care are increasing all the time. Governments are finding it difficult to balance the health care budget.Should citizens be totally responsible for their own health costs and take out private health insurance, or is it better to have a comprehensive health care system which provides free health services for all? Discuss.**

　　Model Answer:

　　A much debated issue these days is whether citizens should take out private health insurance or not. The cost of providing free medical care for both the wealthy and the poor is far too great for any government, and most people agree that if you can pay for insurance, you should. In this essay, I will argue that all who can afford it should be insured, but free medical care must be made available for those too poor to do so.

　　The most important reason for encouraging people to take out private health insurance is the cost to the government of health care. Free health cover for people who are able to pay for it is a waste of public money. Of course, people will only pay health insurance premiums if they know that they are getting good value for their money. If they get sick, they should pay very little or nothing at all. In addition, the privately insured are entitled to special benefits such as having the choice of their own doctors, and being able to avoid long waiting lists for hospital beds.

　　On the other hand, those who really cannot afford to pay private insurance premiums, which are often very high, are still entitled as citizens to the best medical care available – they cannot be expected to pay their own medical bills. However, if they are working, they should still pay a percentage of their wage (say 1 to 2%) as a tax which pays towards the cost of providing "free" medical services.

　　In conclusion, most people should privately insure their health, but it is unreasonable to suppose that all citizens can afford it. Therefore, a safety net in the form of a basic free health care system must exist for the very poor and the unemployed.

**政府类(5)。　　Some people say the government should not put money into building theatres and sports stadiums; they should spend more money on medical care and education.To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?**

　　Model Answer:

　　What would the world be like without Shakespeare or the Olympics? While medical care and education are perhaps the highest causes to which money can be contributed, the arts and athletics are in some ways just as valuable. So, to ask the government to not extend support to these two areas could be just as detrimental to the welfare of society as the lack of sufficient health care and education.

　　The Romans believed in “mens sana in corpore sano”. In short, that there is indeed a correlation between a healthy body and healthy mind. When we are healthy, we feel better and so are more likely to be productive academically. Plus, the practice of sports can also teach us the very same discipline we need for our studies. Why even a brisk walk or watching an exciting athletic match can refresh the mind for greater work. Moreover, sports can serve to create healthier bodies, which in turn would serve as a form of “preventive medicine” thereby cutting down on medical costs. In the same vein, the arts are known to induce a sense of well-being in performers and audience alike, reducing mental problems and their associated physical manifestations and again, medical costs. As such, building theatres and stadiums, which spur interest in the arts and sports respectively, actually would be practically identical to spending money on medical care and education!

　　Now I realize the question specifically addresses the building of theatres and sports stadiums by government. Some people would contend athletics and the arts can still be enjoyed and practiced without such constructions. I would hazard that these buildings stand as the altars to the sports and arts worlds, inspiring would-be athletes and performers. Without such venues where would sports spectators and music aficionados be able to enjoy these events? Now some other people would also say business could support their construction, but we know the avarice of business could very likely jeopardize the lofty spirit of athletics and the arts just as well. Therefore, allowing government to retain some say in the matter on behalf of the people would, I believe, be in the best interest of the people.

　　In short, as long as the government does not go overboard in its expenditures for these buildings and uses such venues for the benefit of all, then, as mentioned above, people will benefit in terms of both medical care and education as well. This is not to say the government should neglect medical care and education, but rather to think of this not as an either-or choice but as a win-win situation for all.

**政府类(6)。　　　　Governments should make more effort to promote alternative sources of energy.To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?**

　　Model Answer:

　　It has been known for some time now that a move towards sources of energy which are not carbon-based is urgently required to stop the effects of global warming. In my view, there are too few governments who seem to be promoting the use of other types of energy such as wind, wave, solar and nuclear sources of energy.

　　Governments at present are too reliant on coil, oil and gas. Although some governments are doing research into the use of alternative energy sources, many are not. Energy from the wind, the sea and the sun does not pollute the environment and is an everlasting source of power. Nuclear power is clean, and although it is not totally unproblematic, it would provide a large amount of energy and dramatically improve the environment. Countries such as France have made good use of nuclear power.

　　My feeling is that more use could be made of wind power. In some countries, there has been a reluctance to use wind turbines, even in areas which are not densely populated, as some people believe they are eyesores. Personally, I believe they are not only useful, but beautiful as well. Governments should spend more time and effort promoting the benefits of this source of energy and trying to make the public understand the reason for change.

　　In conclusion, I believe that, if governments forced everyone to have a wind turbine and solar panels on the building they live in, made more use of wave power and built more nuclear power stations, then they would manage to avert the dangers that are seriously threatening the Earth.