The passage and the lecturer argue problems cause the frog population changings and solutions for preventing the extinction of frogs and its consequences. The writer provides three ideas while the professor disprove all of them.

First, the author believes that the pesticides can attack the frog's nerves and make big problems with frog breathing. Therefore, when the government forbid the farmers from using pesticieds, it might decrease the bad effects of it on frogs. Constantly, the lecturer says that prohibiting the farmers might reduce the amount of the harvest in compare with other places. Thus, it would not be an economicaly fair and practical solution.

Second, the writer acclaims that if fungus which is a killing disease for frogs gets cleared from frogs' skin, the problem will be solved. In contrast, the professor asserts that the frogs should be treated individualy and every generation should be captured and treated again. Thus, it is an expensive way.

Finally, the passage averts that the human activities threaten the natural habitats of frogs. People use the water excessively and they drain the wetlands while the most of frogs are dependent to the water for laying their eggs on it. Considering this situation, the writer believes if we keep the habitats from draining, frogs would be recovered from extinction. On the other hand, the lecturer asserts that lackage of water is because of global warming and the human activities are not the exact problem.

**agree or disagree?**

**one quality that a successful leader must have is to make decisions quickly; when a leader takes too much time to make decision, he will be seen as ineffective to the people he leads.**

Throughtout history, making best decision in the shortest time for important situations have been always one of the most significant things for humans. It is the same in this era. Thus, everyone has to decide in a short time to recieve a better consiquence. I believe that a good leader also has a more difficult duty. Therefore, he has to be more concentrated to decide on time. It is really important for a leader not to be seen as an ineffective leader for his people.

The first reason coming to my mind is that due to the necessity of planning in the right moment, late desicions have not had enough effect. In the other words, sometimes late decisions might need more energy and effort to give as much the same result as when you decide in the right moment. For example, if a parent, as the leader of the family, who wants to choose a place for spending vacation decides in the early time, he can buy cheaper tickets whereas if he choose the destination in the last minute, he has to pay more. Also, sometimes late decisions does not work. For instance, that father might lose the time and be unable to buy any tickets.

Furthurmore, when a leader whom everyone trust delays, his people think that he is unable to measure every aspects of the situation. Thus, he might seem functionless and people get hopeless of him and try to decide by themselves. For example, if the father can not decide for the destination of the trip, children will choose it and then they impel their father to obey.

To wrap it up, a leader must not be seen as an ineffective leader for his people. If not, no one will count on him anymore because late desicions might not have enough effect and sometimes it is hard to compensate for the damages which is made by delaying. Also, the leader's people might think that their leader is unable to make a proper decision, therefore they might ignore position of the leader and decide by themselves. Thus, the leader have to be careful about time.