Some people think that shops should not be allowed to sell any food or drink that has scientifically been proved to have bad effects on people's health. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Some people think that stores should be prohibited from selling any food or drink that is proved to be harmful to people. I disagree with this opinion。

There is no doubt that some food and drinks can be harmful to a person's health. Drinks such as alcohol, energy drinks and soft drinks, and even coffee, can all be harmful if over-consumed. Along the same lines, it has been well-documented that food items such as fast foods, fried foods and processed foods can have negative effects on a person's health, if consumed regularly.

That being said, most of these foods are not harmful if consumed in moderation. As an example, wine consumption can be good for a person's heart health, but only if that consumption is moderate. A person who overconsumes wine or other alcohol may well be subject to negative health risks.

Before products are allowed to be sold in shops, most of those products have already received safety approval from governments to make sure the products do not contain toxins, contaminants, or cancer-causing agents. Some products are then required to contain labels which list contents, possible side effects, or health warnings. Often these warnings are in regards to overuse, over-consumption, misuse or abuse. After the government deems products safe for sale on the market, it becomes the responsibility of the consumer to choose and use those products responsibly.

Although some foods and drinks can have negative health effects, those negative effects are almost always related to overuse or misuse. Ultimately, it should be the responsibility of the consumer to use the product as recommended. We do not need additional rules and regulations to prohibit food and drink sales as those regulations and guidelines are already in place.

其他观点

There is an opinion that all shops should stop selling food and drinks that can cause any harm to customers' health. Although science warns that these products are harmful, I think it is not a mature opinion.

It is true that many health issues originally come from some harmful food that is accessible to anyone shopping in the store. In theory, if people cannot buy these kinds of food or drinks, they should be able to maintain good health. For instance, with no sugary drinks on the shelves, young buyers can stay away from obesity because scientists have proved relation between sugar and weight problems.

Nonetheless, people may have neglected an important perspective, which is that any kind of food can be fatal to one person but harmless to another. A typical example is that it has been proved that it is dangerous for babies to drink milk as there are substances in the milk that can cause problems for young kids. But adults can prevent having fragile bones by drinking milk. Another example is that meat has been an essential source of energy for humans, but eating too much red meat directly leads to heart problems. If we only focus on the bad sides of foods and drinks, people will starve because everything seems dangerous.

To sum up, eating without care and caution turns safe food and drinks into poisons. Thus, I do not think it is wise to prohibit shops selling "scientifically harmful" foods and drinks. A more practical approach is to inform people the potential danger of overseeing some foods and let consumers make decisions.

The increase in food production owes much to fertilizers and better machinery, but some people think that it has a negative impact on human health and community. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Fertilizer and better machinery are largely responsible for the increase in food production over the years. Some people contend that this increased production has had a negative impact on human health and community.

There is no doubt that food production is important to society. We live in a world in which millions of people still die of starvation. The earth has a limited amount of land which is available to raise crops and it is important to make sure that the yield for that land is as high as possible. Fertilizer and better equipment play a major role in ensuring high yield in food production. Fertilizer makes the crops grow faster, while bigger and better machinery allows for the crops to be planted and harvested in a more rapid manner, ensuring that less of the food produced is wasted.

On the negative side, studies show that fertilizer can harm the environment and can also be dangerous to people. It can get into the streams and rivers surrounding the land where crops are grown. When this happens the water in those rivers and streams can be contaminated. Bigger and better machinery can also have a negative impact on the environment, but to a lesser extent. When more land is cultivated the equipment is widely used to destroy forests to accommodate additional planting.

Although high yield and increased production are certainly important in food production it is crucial to make sure that the methods and means used to do so are not harmful to our environment.

其他观点

With the rapid growth of population, food shortage has been an urgent problem. Thinks to the invention of fertilizers and agricultural machinery, food production has increased

dramatically. Although the benefits of the development are obvious, it has negative impacts on our health and community as well.

It cannot be denied that the application of fertilizers and machinery makes a great contribution to the world. Advanced machinery raises work efficiency to a higher level. That is to say, more land can be farmed and fewer workers need to work in the field. Apart from that, the use of fertilizers creates high yields as they turn some barren fields into fertile ones. In this way, food production is increased and the production cost is reduced, which allows food to be cheaper than before.

However, there are many hidden drawbacks of the development. It is reported by some researchers that some health problems are closely associated with farming products. Some chemical fertilizers contain heavy metals and toxic element, which does great harm to human health. In addition, environmental problems related to the wide use of fertilizers are out of control. People grow food at the price of destroying soil quality. In the long run, more farm land will be abandoned because of concerns on fertility. Moreover, once the pesticide residues in irrigated water flow into rivers or lakes, it will cause further water pollution.

It cannot be denied that fertilizers and agricultural machinery contribute to mass production and save more lives than before. However, we should also be cautious about the disadvantages they can have. Authorities should intensively supervise and encourage farmers to use environment-friendly fertilizers to reduce the harm to the environment and human health.

Today, some food travels thousands of miles from farms to consumers. Some people think it would be better to our environment and economy if people only eat local produced food. To what extent do the disadvantages outweigh the disadvantages?

Nowadays, some food travels thousands of miles in order to reach consumers. I would say that excluding food from other areas is not a wise idea.

There are many advantages to eat locally-produced foods. When people do that, they are supporting local farmers and food producers, making sure that they can earn a sufficient living. This helps the local economy and many people benefit from that. Also food that is produced and then consumed locally is often of higher quality than food that is imported from other areas. as it is fresher. And those local foods may be less expensive, as there are only minimal transportation costs involved in getting them to market.

On the other hand, it is important to point out that not all of the foods can be produced locally. Factors such as climate, growing seasons, and soil content may prohibit items from being grown locally. For example, fruits such as pineapples and bananas will not grow in colder climates. It should also be pointed out that when crops and other foods are produced locally, there may be an excess of those items and farmers and food producers will either need to ship those food items to other areas or let them go to waste. The importing and

exporting of some foods allows us all to eat a wider variety of nutritional foods. It also gives farmers and other food producers an additional market in which to sell excess foods.

Although there is no doubt that we should buy and consume local foods whenever available, we should realize that some of the foods we need and enjoy cannot be produced locally. In these instances consuming foods from other areas makes sense.

其他观点

In a globalized world, food transported from one place to another is very common these days. Although people can enjoy multiple choices of food because of this trend, I would argue that this would bring many problems to the society and people should purchase more locally produced food.

Long-distance transported food can cause some environmental problems and economic turbulence. The transportation of food may exacerbate air pollution due to the fact that cars or airplanes will release exhaust emissions. Also, these kinds of food, because of the higher transportation fee, will lead to higher prices and many people may be unable to afford them. The imported food, for example, is much more expensive than local products. As a result, fewer people would buy and the food would expire and become a waste of resources.

In terms of advantages, local food is always fresh as it is sold directly to consumers. In contrast, food travelled thousands of miles has to rely on additives to maintain flavors or freezers to prevent rotting.

Moreover, purchasing local products can boost economy. These days imported food has become a threat to the local food market. Customers may be attracted by fresh-new foreign food, so local food producers have to work harder to compete for market share. Otherwise, the loss of market will lead to the closing down of factories and high unemployment rate. So, it is important to keep people interested in local food.

In conclusion, food travelled long distance will indirectly contaminate the environment and result in higher commodity prices, but local food is not only nutritious and fresh but also great support to economic development. So, people should be encouraged to purchase food produced locally.

Some people think everyone should be a vegetarian, because we do not need to eat meat to stay healthy. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Some people think that it is necessary for everyone to eat like vegetarians. Although I will agree that eating meat is not necessary in order to have a healthy diet, I believe that individuals should be allowed to choose as to whether they eat meat or not.

Studies have shown that many vegetarian diets can be healthy, sometimes healthier than

diets which include heavy meat consumption People who have diets which are centered around fruits and vegetables may well have fewer health problems than those people who have diets in which meat is the main part of the diet. Meat contains saturated fats which can have negative effects on a person's health.

That being said, meat can be an excellent source of proteins, vitamins, and minerals. Proteins are especially important to a diet and meats are one of the best sources of protein. Although there are non-meat items such as eggs, yogurt, dry beans, milk and some vegetables which can provide proteins, a person would have to eat a lot more of these alternative options to get the required amount of proteins. Also, meats provide the body with necessary fatty acids that can result in improved body immunity by preventing disease-carrying viruses. Meat consumption, which has been a staple of human diets since early man, can also provide people with loads of energy.

Although vegetarian diets can be conducive to good health, it should be pointed out that we can also receive valuable nutrition from meats which are often accessible to many people. Whether a person should have a vegetarian diet or not should be left for the individual to decide.

其他观点

It is believed that vegetables play a crucial role in human health so there is no need to eat meat for being healthy. I would argue that it is narrow-minded to limit people's choices on how to eat healthy.

Admittedly, science has proved that vegetables contain a variety of nutrients such as vitamins and minerals that are essential to human health. Also a quite massive portion of vegetarian population demonstrates that human beings can live without meat, therefore eliminating meat form diet seems to be a sound choice.

However, we should not ignore the fact that not everyone can maintain their health in perfect condition by only relying on vegetables. Especially in some areas where some nutritious plants can hardly grow, local people need to find alternative sources like meat for adequate nutrition. Another example is that some people are allergic to plants like peanuts that are an important source of protein. If these people cannot eat meat, chances are they would suffer from malnutrition.

Moreover, there is a need to allow difference in diets. Since eating meat in moderation will not pose a threat to most people's health but supplement necessary nutrition to their bodies, I would respect their personal preferences on what to eat. As long as people successfully stay away from poor health, however they choose to sustain their well-being should not be interfered.

To conclude, there is nothing wrong to encourage more people to eat vegetables for better

health, but forcing everyone to stop having meat is not reasonable in many cases.

The government has the duty to ensure that its citizens have a healthy diet, while others believe this is individuals' responsibility. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Some people think that it is the government's duty to ensure that its citizens have a healthy diet. Other people believe that dietary choices are the responsibility of individuals. I agree that dietary choices should be left to individuals.

Some people maintain that the government should be involved in this because there are some people who are not willing to take responsibility for their own health. Those same people may argue that if a person does not have a healthy diet, they will be more likely to become sick. If that happens, the government may then have to spend monies to care for people that might not be sick if they have taken responsibility for their own health.

Even though there may be some truth to that, it should be pointed out that the government cannot do everything for its citizens. At some point, those citizens have to take responsibility for their own choices and actions. It is unrealistic to think that the government has the financial resources to monitor what individuals include in their diets. Even if some food products were banned, the government would have expenditures in trying to make sure those items would not be sold on the black market or illegally smuggled.

In my opinion, dietary choices should remain with individuals and it is unnecessary for government to play a large role in dictating what its citizens can and cannot eat. Even though I believe that it is the responsibility of our government to make sure that our foods are as safe as possible, it should then be our individual responsibility to make sure they eat healthy.