

At 8 A.M., you send your children to school. At 10 A.M., you learn that there is a mass shooting at your children's school. How do these parents bear the pain? Over the past few years, mass shootings have frequently happened in the U.S., and the issue of gun control laws have generated a lot of debate. Both the proponents and the opponents of gun control laws provide their evidence to support their positions. However, the proponents' argument is better supported because their evidence shows that gun control laws reduce gun deaths and economic costs.

Firstly, the proponents' argument is stronger than the opponents because they provide convincing empirical data to support their ideas that gun control laws help to lower gun deaths. For example, the proponents state, "According to a Mar. 10, 2016 Lancet study, implementing federal universal background checks could reduce firearm deaths by a projected 56.9%; background checks for ammunition purchases could reduce deaths by a projected 80.7%; and gun identification requirements could reduce deaths by a projected 82.5%." (ProCon.org Pro 2) These statistical data show that a background check, one of the gun control laws, is effective to prevent gun violence and save a myriad of precious lives.

Secondly, the proponents present a stronger argument than the opponents because they cite evidence that shows gun control laws are needed to reduce the economic costs related with gun violence. For instance, the proponents mention, "A study in the American Journal of Public Health estimated that hospitalizations for firearm-related injuries cost Medicaid and Medicare \$2.7 billion over nine years. 84% of those injured by firearms are uninsured, leaving taxpayers responsible for most of those bills through programs like Medicaid." (ProCon.org Pro 7) This means that gun control laws are vital as it could save enormous taxpayers' money due to gun violence and therefore, reduce the negative impact on the U.S economy.

On the contrary, the opponents of gun control laws argue that gun control laws would cause the government to gain too much power and take away all guns from people. The opponents say, "57% of people surveyed by Pew Research in Feb. 2013 said that gun control laws would "give too much power to the government over the people." (ProCon.org Con 6) However, the opponents' evidence is vague because there is no indication of which group of people participated in the survey. Although Pew Research is well known, it is necessary to be concise in presenting information to the public.

In summary, the proponents' argument that more gun control laws should be enacted is better supported than the opponents' argument. The proponents provide statistical data and cite evidence to prove that gun laws save lives and taxpayers' money. The opponents' argument is ambiguous as they do not specify how the researcher selected the sample for the study. Thus, the government should enforce gun laws to create a safer environment. .

Commented [1]: This is very well done! Your explanation is a clearly linked to your textual evidence and main idea. I hope that you can see the difference. Excellent work! ☐

Commented [2]: A comma is needed here.

Commented [3]: