

Students from disadvantaged families and rural areas are finding it difficult to get a university education. Some people believe that universities should help them. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Quite a few people believe that the cost of tertiary education for impoverished students should be covered by universities. In spite of the dispute against such aid, I maintain it brings major benefits for both universities and individuals as well as the community.

First, universities may enjoy the healthy competition elevated by the presence of deprived learners as they are hungry for success. Having been raised in poverty, these children contented with various family, economic or social problems, which made them fully aware of the dire consequences of any educational failure. Only when an individual has experienced living hand to mouth, will he seize every single opportunity to **meet that** again. The spirit of rivalry therefore will be promoted since these new players will fight to win until their last gasp, for they view education as their last resort.

Second, university aid may give students the chance to pursue their study thereby finding a better job. With higher education commonly regarded as the key to having a thriving career, individuals who find the cost astronomical will not get to aim high and is-are obliged to be humble. Raised from the ashes below the poverty line, however strong the phoenix, it cannot soar if not given wings to fly.

Finally, society can profit most when educational centers welcome those who live on the breadline. Besides the obvious advantages such as eradication of illiteracy, this can come as a merit to the entire community. Spending his lifetime in penury, a teenager who has have endured times of privation, now faces an obstacle which needs more than he possesses to surmount, and despite his will he has no choice to give up. The denial of assisting more impoverished students with keeping their heads above water and not suffocate will come back and haunt the whole community. According to statistics, children from disadvantaged families are more suitable-susceptible to join street gangs and commit crime later in their life. Once ambitious teenagers, they are now adults who are no longer replete with hope and enthusiasm, but repressed anger and grief for what they have lost to their wealthier counterparts. Watching others living the life they wishfully dreamt every day, and the respect they sought from the early years of their lives, prompt them to wonder if it is truly worth it, to make either rational or irrational comparisons and pose questions about the equity and fairness. well-done! Salute to the opponents of government funding who ridiculed the idea of helping disadvantaged children! We have officially turned prospective assets to society into real liabilities.

In conclusion, I strongly believe although some gained entry to elite universities, others need help. standing on the edge of the precipice, their fate is in the hands of universities and the government; whether to hold on to them or let them go. Save the hypocritical sympathy, the crocodile tears, and the shaky voice as what they need is a hand reaching out to them.