

Governments should spend money on railways rather than roads.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

It ~~is~~ needless to say that railways and roads are the most important infrastructures which governments should invest ~~in on them~~ to develop their countries. Meanwhile there is an argument which suggests governments concentrate on developing railways rather than roads.

Firstly, railways and roads are ~~the~~ means of transportation. Therefore, developing these infrastructures results in developing countries. The more ~~facilitated~~ transportation becomes, ~~facilitated~~, the more ~~easily~~ products can be exported or imported. Also, it is worth knowing here that trains as a result of consuming less energy and conveying huge amounts of products are more beneficial in comparison with trucks, so it seems warranted to focus on ~~constructing erecting~~ railways since many countries consider it ~~as~~ one of the most important criteria for development. For example, the US as the most developed county on the earth has the longest railways more ~~than that~~ China and Russia combined.

Secondly, I think every country should regard their ~~own interests~~/benefits. Some countries need to allocate ~~bigger~~/more budgets for developing railways while others have to do so for roads. For example, in Iran, roads are the main culprit of the death of thousands people. Providing the government spends ~~its~~ whole ~~of its~~ civil budget on developing railways, the rate of death in car accidents will probably increase. Nevertheless, meager attentions to the quality of roads will raise social grievances. It is a right for citizens of a county to travel safely on an appropriate road.

In a nutshell, from the author's perspective, according to the situation of countries, governments should decide what proportion of their civil budgets should be allocated to developing roads or railways.