**Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? It is better for government to spend money on building modern housing than on preserving historic or traditional buildings and homes.**

Some people might argue that the government should allocate a budget to preserve historical buildings while others are inclined to the idea that it is better to spend more money on building modern houses. I adhere to the idea that it is better to invest in modern constructions.

Firstly, one of the most significant reasons noteworthy of mentioning here is the fact that building more modern constructions helps to house more people in a city. People’s population is increasing day by day, and if the government does not provide enough buildings to house these people, they will migrate to other cities or even foreign countries. Modern buildings, despite traditional homes, can accommodate many people suitably, because they have more space and are more affordable, thanks to new engineering methods. For instance, Tokyo is not only a populated city, but also a historic city with a lot of traditional constructions. Japan’s government has decided to spend more money on contemporary buildings rather than historical places, in order to hold Tokyo’s large population.

Secondly, another equally important factor is that modern societies have modern needs. People’s needs are far different compare to people who had lived a hundred years ago. The government should satisfy these needs, and it is not possible, unless by building houses by new methods. Unlike traditional houses, modern designed apartments can support new needs. For example, in new houses bathrooms are inside the house, and they are not so big, due to save space for other parts of the house, and the kitchen designs in a way that it is feasible to use oven, microwave, dishwasher, and so on, and architectures design houses with smaller windows to have more privacy inside the house. Therefore, people have new needs inside the house, so the government should allocate a large budget for modern construction methods.

In conclusion, spending money on contemporary buildings is more beneficial. In this case, more people can live in that city, and most of their needs would be solved.

The passage talks about frog's importance and their decrees in population. In the following, the writer gives some suggestions, in order to save frog species from extinction. The speaker however, thinks that these efforts will not practical.

First, the text states that pesticides that have used in the farms are harmful to frogs, and if farmers forbidden to use pesticides near frogs habitats, it might helpful. Conversely, the professor points that it is not economically feasible to farmers, if they follow this method their crops will decrees and their cost will increases, so they will not able to compete with other farmers in the market.

Second, the author mentions that frogs are being infected by fungus. These infected frogs have thicker skin, so they cannot absorb water properly, and they die. If some special treatments implemented in a wide area, it can help frogs. On the other hand, the lecturer argues that these treatments should apply on frogs, individually. If scientists decide to use that method in a large area it will cost an arm and leg, furthermore it will be so complex to cure frogs one by one, so it is not doable.

Third, the text asserts that frog’s habitats, such as lakes and marshes have been damaged by human activities. Hence, if these habitats protected by the government it would stop their population's diminishing. However, the woman in the lecture believes that human activities is not the main problem for frog's habitat. Global warming has more crucial effects in water habitats destruction. Limiting human actions would have less effects compare to global warming, and that will not save frogs that much.