According to the reading passage, it is unnecessary to make a new restriction to coal ash, However, the professor thinks that these restrictions must be made, which contradicts what the reading states. In the lecture, she uses three specific points to support her idea.

First, the reading passage suggests that there is already an effective environmental regulation that exists, so there is no need for another one. But the professor argues in the lecture that the restriction nowadays is ineffective. She then gives an example of the liners, which are needed to be built only when there is a new factory. However, the older factories also generate much harm to the environment, such as these coal ash are combined with underground water, and endangers people’s health. Obviously, the professor’s argument disproves its counterpart in the reading.

The second argument in the reading is that strict rules may discourage people from recycling. In contrast, the professor contends that there are examples of people obeying rules even though they are strict. To support this point, the professor further points out that mercury, serving as an extremely dangerous material, has been ruled strictly through the past 50 years. However, nearly no one complains about that, and everyone is recycling mercuries.

The third point listed in the reading is the cost will rise if there are more strict rules. Yet the professor holds the view that the cost is extremely small for every household. The professor proves her idea by pointing out that although the cost is nearly 15 billion dollars, it just raises about 1 percent of the electricity fee for every family.