

**Some people think people working in creative arts should be financially supported by government. Others think they should find financial support from other resources. Discuss both views and give your opinion.**

立场：政府资金紧张的情况下，只能寻求其他资金的帮助

正方：艺术让一个社会更有活力，也能侧面促进技术更新

反方：政府也有很多社会问题需要解决，很多时候没法为艺术家留下太多的资金

Some people think that creative artists should be supported by the government while others think that they should look for help from other resources. From my view, I would say that if there is little funding for arts in one country, these artists probably have to rely on others rather than the government.

There is no doubt that the arts add value to society, Art, music, and the theater can provide entertainment and beauty to many people. Arts are important to society because they provide a means for creativity. A society that is without creative thinkers is a society that is probably stagnant and certainly not innovative. Many of our technological advances have come from societies in which people were taught and encouraged to think creatively.

That being said, the government has so many other priorities to consider in determining which areas to allocate funds including health care, education, transportation, security, and the military services. Many of these other priorities are viewed as absolute necessities, as they affect almost all of the citizenry and they are tied directly to each citizen's life.

Although no one should question the value of the arts in modern society, it is generally considered that a government should finance people working in the arts only if funds are available after these other priorities have been covered. With this in mind, and the fact that extra funds are generally not left over to fund the arts, many areas of the arts have to seek for other sources for funding.

其他观点

Some people claim that governments should provide financial support to artists in the creative art field whereas others do not think this is governments' responsibility and the artists need to rely on other support. I would say that governments can directly invest in some promising artists, but there is also a need to find co-sponsors.

Art, as an important part of a country's culture, surely deserves governments' support. More importantly, it cannot develop without the creative artists who produce groundbreaking works to boost a new change in culture. Creative art, on the other hand, may change young people's attitude and redevelop their interest in art. Therefore, government help, particularly for this aspect of art, is necessary.

Of course, the government may not financially available all the time for these artists. Some

countries face severe economic recessions which already tighten the budget, so it is difficult to spare some money for art. Some artists' works are creative but only attractive to the minority and are thought as complicated to common people. Even if there is some prospect in the projects, governments need to consider the majority of taxpayers' opinion. If most of them are against raising the amount of governmental fund for art, the artists should look for other alternatives.

I would suggest the government to select candidates carefully and consider those who have the potential to make a great contribution to local art. Because, if a government is restricted with tight budget, it would be better to look for potential sponsors for these artists rather than ignore their requests for help. After all, we need creative art for it brings freshness to people's life and injects more power to sustain a country's culture.

**Some people say that governments should focus on reducing environmental pollution and housing problems to help people prevent illness and disease. To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

立场：政府应该纵观社会问题，同时决定哪些问题需要优先解决  
正：

1. 如果环境问题不解决，势必会导致疾病
2. 环境问题拖得越久，解决的代价越大
3. 住房问题不解决，同样会导致疾病的传播

反

1. 每一个政府都有很多需要解决的问题，优先级很重要。

Some people maintain that their governments should focus on reducing environmental pollution and housing problems to help prevent illness and disease.

It is obvious that environmental pollution can create widespread illness. Studies have shown that poor air quality can create illness, including cancer, and those illness can reduce our quality of life and our lifespan. The same can be said for water pollution, as many diseases and illnesses are a direct result of poor water quality. Unfortunately, in many countries the water and air quality is already poor due to years of abuse or negligence. Government efforts to ensure air and water quality can be quite expensive as a lot of cleanup is required.

In regards to a lack of quality housing, that can result in similar health problems and concerns, as people who are homeless or living in the street are certainly more prone to disease and illness.

That being said, a government cannot spend all of its financial resources in curbing polluting or creating affordable housing. The government has other priorities and problems to consider, including transportation, education, employment, and health care. If these priorities are ignored, other problems will arise. Bad roads or bad bridges may impact the economy. Un-educated and unemployed citizens are also sure to have a negative impact on

the economy. If a society is unable to care for its sick population, the society will also suffer.

With this in mind, it seems that the government is best served in establishing a balance in determining which problems and areas to focus on. Although they may never be able to solve all of those problems at once, maybe they can make enough progress so that someday those problems will be in the past.

**The government should spend money in promoting sports and art in school, rather than sponsoring professional sports and art events in communities. To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

立场：同意

正方

1. 通过艺术和体育，学生可以提升创造力和团队意识，同时保持健康的体魄
2. 支持学生多参加艺术和体育，有助于早期就培养学生对这两项的兴趣
3. 大部分职业体育、艺术活动都有收入来源，不需要政府的投资

反方

1. 对社区体育、艺术活动支持，有助于培养社区群众的自豪感和归属感

Some people maintain that sports and art in school deserve to receive more governmental funds than professional sports and art events in communities. I certainly agree with this opinion.

It is important to promote sports and art in school, as this provides an opportunity to reach young people who are at an age where, if they become interested in sports or art, they may then maintain interest and participation in those activities throughout their entire life. Not only do sports and art provide enjoyment, sports participation often provides an excellent means to stay physically fit and the arts provide an excellent means for students to express their creativity. Participating in sports also provides an opportunity for team-building. The sense of teamwork that these activities provide has a definite value to the students, even if that value is sometimes difficult to measure.

In sponsoring professional sports events and art events within its communities, the government is often trying to foster a sense of belonging and a sense of enjoyment within the community. Many citizens enjoy those events, which can create a sense of pride in the community. That being said, many professional sports have shown the ability to finance themselves. Sports like professional basketball and soccer are very profitable entities.

Although governments can receive benefits from sponsoring sports and art events within the community, they will probably be better served in promoting sports and art participation in school, as students are at an age when they are determining their interests, many of which will be life-long interests. Most professional sports and many art events are able to support themselves through ticket revenues, private sponsorships, and other merchandising ventures.

**Some people say government should give health care the first priorities, some others believe there are some important priorities to spend the tax payers' money. Discuss both views and give your opinion.**

立场：政府应该平衡各项社会开支

正方：医疗保险是社会发展和人们生活质量的基础保证，现在医疗成本增加，更应该增加投入

反方：其他方面也需要政府资金的投入

Some people say that government should make health care concerns a top priority. I would say that the government should be flexible in utilizing taxpayers' money.

Health care affects all of us, either directly or indirectly with family or friends. The need to provide quality health care at an affordable price is viewed as one of the main responsibilities of government. Now that people are living longer lives, the need for affordable health care has grown. The availability of quality and affordable health care is directly related to the quality of life that we all have. Without good health, many of the other factors which create quality of life become somewhat unimportant. Unfortunately, the costs for good health care have increased substantially and governments are left to try to control those costs and to ensure that good health care is available to all.

On the other hand, if a government allocates all of its financial resources to health care, other areas that contribute to people's quality of life will suffer, including roads, bridges, and other infrastructure. Governments also spend tax revenue to provide safety and security for residents. Moreover, in many instances, governments use tax revenues to provide education and public transportation.

Although health care should be a priority for any government, that government must make sure not to ignore other areas that affect citizens' quality of life. The government must strike a balance in determining its priorities, but health care should always be at or near the top of the priority list.