The reading asserts that frog population of many species around the world have declined because of changing their environment. The writer proposes several methods in order to solve the problem. The lecturer, however, finds the solutions unpractical and casts doubt on the reasons presented by the reading passage.

First of all, the reading states that laws should ban using harmful pesticides, which have deadly effects on frogs, for the farmers who work near frog habitats. In contrast, the speaker highlights the idea that this solution is not economically practical and fair because farmers who are not allowed using the pesticides near frog habitat cannot compete with other farmers who are not close to the frog habitats. Thus, they lose more crops and they are not able to stay competitive.

Furthermore, the author believes that there are several ways to treat or prevent infection of special fungus which causes dehydration of frogs. The lecturer, on the other hand, points that this method should be applied for each individual frog, and using them in a large scale is extremely difficult. This treatment should apply for each generation of frogs again and again, so it is really complicated and expensive method.

Finally, the writer holds an idea that natural habitats of frog should be preserved from excessive water use and development due to the fact that frog is dependent on wetlands and they lay their eggs in water. This argument is challenged by mentioning that although protecting natural habitats of frog is a good idea, human activities is not contributed to disappearance of wetlands. Actually, the real thread is global warming. Thus, prohibiting using water and building near water habitats unlikely prevent declining frog population.
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