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The reading proposed three methods to reduce the decline of frog populations, while the speaker thinks none of them is practical and there is problem in each method.

First, the speaker starts by pointing out prohibiting the use of pesticides is not economically practical and it is not fair to farmers in that area. Farmers rely on pesticides to kill insects that eat or cause harm to crop, if they were to follow strict rule with no use of pesticides, their crop will sure suffer severe damage. Therefore, farmers in these areas are likely to lose more crops, have lower yield and thus become less competitive in market compared with farmers from other places. This kind of regulation that causes loss and break the balance in the market will not be effective.

Second, the speaker explains the problems in the method of using medication and treatments to kill fungus. These treatments can only be done individually, which means it needs chasing, catching and treating of each frog. It is not practical in a large area because it is too difficult and expensive to achieve. What's more, even if a frog gets treated, it can still pass the fungus to the next generation, so this operation will need to be taken again and again, requiring too much money and effort.

At last, the speaker argues that although protecting water and wetland habitats is good to the environment, it will not help sole the problem of declining frog population. The reason is that human use of water is not the main reason of frog habitat reduction, global warming is. During the last several years, global warming have caused much lakes and wetlands to disappear, saving use of water is of tiny influence and will not counteract that of global warming.