topic: the money spent by governments on space programmes

would be better spent on vital public services such as schools and hospitals.

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

1. introduction: topic+answer,: governments spending,

agree - public services instead of space programmes

2. explain why space spending should be stopped

1. the limited fiscal buget 2. couldn't help people change life 3. risk of accidents

3. explain why public service spending should be supported

1. cheaper 2. establish some public services impact on everyone 3.reduce poverty

4. conclusion: spend on services that benefit us all.

Nowadays, many headlines hit the newspaper on the topic of governments spending,

where a**n** issue has sparked a huge debate on whether the fundings should be used for space programs or public services.

It is hard to deny that space spending could aid human being to explore this huge universe,

while many people argue **~~the idea~~** that these are a waste of money, and those funds should be supported to public services.

Personally, I completely agree with the latter view.

There are seve**r**al reasons why space programs should be stopped.

First and foremost, considering the limited fiscal budget, the gover**n**ment should allocate their resources and funds more reasonably.

Since if they devote too much to the space spending, **~~mean~~** other equally importance fields may be underdeveloped, **~~like~~** **such as** scientific research**es** or **the** pension system.

Secondly, those programs **cannot** **~~couldn't~~**help the **~~nomal~~** **ordinary** people change their life, which may **hinder** the comprehensive development of the society.

For instance, the rocket STAR launched successfully did not benefit infrastructures of our school, and students have no idea to care about what it is in those news.

Finally, many experiments of the space technology be fail conducted have risk of accidents, and thus impact **the** **~~on~~** environment and daily lives of human.

Convincing arguments can be made that the fundings can be supported public services instead of space programs.

Although **~~this~~** **there** is a trade-off **in** ~~of~~ the money spending, it is much cheaper to train doctors and teachers, build roadways, and work on other services than to explore space projects.

Moreover, since a large segment of gover**n**ment revenues comes from taxes paid by citizens, the **governments** are obliged to satisfy the public needs.

They can establish some public services that we all use, such as schools, hospitals and roads, which can make the government more trustworthy and reliable.

If early detection and timely intervention can remedy the situation, it could reduce poverty and give a wonderful and happy life for the local people.

In conclusion, I would concede that space programs may bring some impact for the country.

Despite that, I maintain that governments should spend more money on vital public services that benefit all members of society.

GPT-4o:

Nowadays, many headlines discuss government spending, particularly the debate on whether funding should be allocated to space programs or public services.

While space exploration can help humans understand the vast universe, many argue that it is a waste of money and that these funds should instead support public services.

Personally, I completely agree with the latter view.

There are several reasons why space programs should be deprioritized.

First and foremost, considering the limited fiscal budget, the government should allocate resources more judiciously. Excessive spending on space exploration could lead to underfunding equally important sectors, such as scientific research or the pension system.

Additionally, space programs do not directly benefit ordinary people, potentially hindering the overall development of society.

For example, the successful launch of a rocket does not improve school infrastructure, and students may not care about such news.

Lastly, the high risk of accidents in space technology experiments poses environmental and safety concerns.

Convincing arguments can be made that funding should support public services instead of space programs.

Although there is a trade-off in spending, it is more cost-effective to train doctors and teachers, build roads, and invest in other services than to explore space.

Moreover, since a large portion of government revenue comes from taxes paid by citizens, governments are obliged to meet public needs.

Establishing public services like schools, hospitals, and roads can enhance government trustworthiness and reliability.

Early detection and timely intervention in public issues can reduce poverty and significantly improve people's quality of life.

In conclusion, while space programs may have some benefits, I believe that governments should prioritize spending on vital public services that benefit all members of society.

Topic: Many manufactured food and drink products contain high levels of sugar; which causes many health problems. Sugary products should be made more expensive to encourage people to consume less sugar.

Do you agree or disagree?

Introduction: Sugary products,

Agree: Sugary products should become high prices for human healthy.

Explain why cheap sugary will bring issues

1. Poor ppl like to buy, 2. Causes health problems, 3. hinder the comprehensive development of the society

Explain why should be made more expensive

1. Reduce health issues, 2. The money transforms to healthy food. 3. Give people a warn.

Conclusion: the government should make sugar more expensive

Nowadays, many headlines hit the newspaper on the topic of sugary products, where an issue has sparked a huge debate on whether the government should make food which contains a lot of sugar more expensive.

It is hard to deny that **~~the~~** high levels of sugar can bring energy and mental happiness, while many people agree that sugary products should become high prices to encourage **~~those~~** citizens to consume less sugar.

Personally, I completely agree with the **latter** view.

There are several reasons on cheap manufactured sugary products existing many issues.

First and foremost, if the high levels of sugar **are** **~~were~~** contained in daily food and the price **is** lower than those vegetables in supermarkets, more and more people would choose the first one with high calories and fat, such as coke or cakes.

Furthermore, compared **~~with~~ to** **the** high price of healthy food, poor individuals prefer the cheap products considering the limited budget. As a result, **this** may lead **~~those people~~** **to** health problems, and thus the physical and mental system may be **~~broken~~** **affected**.

Finally, the sub-health population will increase and the hospital cannot take care of those, which may hinder the comprehensive development of the society.

Convincing arguments can be made that the government should make sugary products more expensive to encourage less sugar be ingested by the public.

Intuitively, reducing **~~the~~** sugar intake can make people health issues, such as heart disease**~~s~~** and obesity.

Although there is a trade-off in spending, the government should allocate their resources and funds more **~~reasonable~~** **reasonably**, where one possible solution is the money and tax can be transformed to those healthy products.

Moreover, establishing some rules and regulations about sugar prices can give citizens warns that do not consume too much sugar. They can launch some education campaigns and outreach activities to preach the importance of the healthy via revenue taxes which come from those sugar products.

~~In conclusion, I would concede the expensive sugar may lead citizens dissatisfied, despite that, I maintain the government should make sugar more expensive instead of using some empty slogans.~~

In conclusion, while making sugar more expensive may lead to dissatisfaction among citizens, I maintain that the government should enforce this policy instead of relying on empty slogans.

Nowadays, many headlines highlight the issue of sugary products, sparking a significant debate on whether the government should make food containing a lot of sugar more expensive.

It is undeniable that high levels of sugar can provide energy and mental happiness. However, many people agree that sugary products should become more expensive to encourage citizens to consume less sugar. Personally, I completely agree with this view.

There are several reasons why cheap manufactured sugary products pose numerous issues. First and foremost, if high levels of sugar are contained in daily food and the price is lower than that of vegetables in supermarkets, more and more people would choose high-calorie and high-fat options, such as cola or cakes. Furthermore, compared to the high price of healthy food, individuals with limited budgets prefer cheap products. As a result, this may lead to health problems like obesity and diabetes, and negatively impact their physical and mental health.

Moreover, an increase in the sub-health population will burden hospitals, which may hinder the comprehensive development of society. Thus, making sugary products more expensive can act as a deterrent and encourage people to make healthier choices.

Additionally, reducing sugar intake can prevent health issues such as heart disease and obesity. Although there is a trade-off in spending, the government should allocate resources and funds more reasonably. One possible solution is to redirect money and tax revenue from sugary products to subsidize healthy options.

Furthermore, establishing regulations on sugar prices can serve as a warning to citizens about the dangers of excessive sugar consumption. The government can also launch education campaigns and outreach activities to promote the importance of health, funded by taxes on sugary products.

In conclusion, while making sugar more expensive may lead to dissatisfaction among some citizens, I maintain that the government should enforce this policy rather than relying on empty slogans. This approach can significantly improve public health and reduce the burden on healthcare systems.