

Some people argue that governments should invest more money in preventing diseases than in treating them. I largely agree with this view because prevention can reduce the number of people who become seriously ill and lower pressure on healthcare systems.

Preventive healthcare can address many diseases before they become severe. Governments can invest in vaccination programmes, health screenings and public awareness campaigns to encourage healthier lifestyles. For example, educating people about balanced diets, exercise and the dangers of smoking can reduce the risk of several long-term illnesses. Early detection through regular medical examinations can also allow diseases to be treated before they become more difficult and expensive to manage.

Prevention can also reduce healthcare costs in the long term. Treating advanced diseases often requires expensive medicines, hospitalisation and specialist care. If fewer people develop serious illnesses, governments can reduce pressure on hospitals and use healthcare budgets more efficiently. A healthier population may also contribute more actively to the economy because fewer workers need to take prolonged sick leave.

However, investment in treatment remains essential. Not all diseases can be prevented, and people can suffer from accidents, genetic conditions or unexpected illnesses despite living healthy lifestyles. Governments therefore have a responsibility to ensure that hospitals and medical services are properly funded.

In my opinion, prevention should receive greater investment, but it should not replace treatment. A balanced healthcare system needs both effective preventive programmes and accessible medical care for people who become ill.

In conclusion, disease prevention is generally more cost-effective and beneficial to society, but governments must continue providing adequate treatment for unavoidable and existing illnesses.