The reading passage discusses how to solve the problem of declining frog populations, but in the listening passage the speaker disagrees with the the solutions in the reading passage and gives three reasons of their own to show why they disagree.

The reading passage states that if laws regulate the farmers from using harmful pesticides near sensitive frog populations, it can reduce the harm that pesticides cause to frog. However, the listening passage disagrees and says that this is not economically practical since farmers rely on pesticides, which prevent the crops from illness. If farmers don't use pesticides because of law prohibition, they are less advantageous than those who use pesticides due to the fact that they may loss more crops or sell more ill crops than others.

逗號

Secondly the reading passage says that if antifungal medication and treatment apply on a large scale, it would protect sensitive frog populations from infection, but the states speaker disputes this point and state that this approach is convoluted and expensive since the treatment should be applied to each individual frog. Moreover, the treatment do not affect on frogs' offspring, which implies that we should do the treatment on the offspring again and again.

Lastly, the reading passage claims that if the key habitats are better protected from excessive water and development, many frog species would recover, but the lecturer argues against this point by the main threat is exactly global warming! In past, there are many species of into extinction because of global warming. Prohibiting humans from using water or building near frog habitats is unlikely to prevent the ongoing habitat changes caused by global warming.

短號

In conclusion the speaker disagrees that the solutions provided in reading passage because law regulations about may lead to less advantage for farmers, antifungal treatment is complex and expensive, and global warming is the main threat rather than excessive water and development.