

## 2019 年 10 月 26 日环保类（观点型）

Some people think that companies and private individuals should pay to clear up the pollution they produced. The government should not pay for it. To what extent to you agree or disagree?

A **burning question** these days is who should be responsible for the damage caused by environmental pollution. Some commentators believe that businesses and people should be responsible for the cost of cleaning up any contamination they cause and not the authorities. I completely agree with this position, but also believe that governments have a **role to play**.

There are numerous reasons why businesses should pay for contaminating the environment. Firstly, many companies make huge profits and should be **held accountable** for the damage they do to nature. For example, the Amazon rain forest is being destroyed by companies like McDonald's in order for people to **raise** cattle and grow soya beans for their products. Clearly, the earth depends on the Amazon to help regulate the climate. Therefore, companies should mitigate the damage their operations are doing to our planet.

I also agree that individuals have a responsibility towards our environment and should **pay up** to clean the mess we find ourselves in. Increasingly, this payment will be taxes or higher prices which will go towards protecting our world. For instance, in supermarkets we pay for plastic carriers to help the environment. Importantly, this is where governments can **step in**; rather than **shouldering** the financial burden of the clean-up, governments can create laws to ensure that pollution is reduced.

To summarise, I strongly agree that pollution is a serious issue and individuals and companies need to **provide compensation**. They need to **clean up their act**, whereas governments need to make it **mandatory** for companies to minimise their pollution.

259 words

By Dr Rob Burton

**Vocabulary**

**burning question** (idiom) a question whose answer is of great interest to everyone; a question that needs very much to be answered, as a fire needs to be extinguished.

There's a burning question that needs to be answered: Why did you leave your wife of only one month?

**role to play** (idiom) To have a specific involvement or participation in something.

There's no use lying to the committee, Mr. Marshall, as we know for a fact that you played a role in hiding your company's losses from its investors.

**held accountable** (idiom) be called/held/brought to account. If someone is called, held, or brought to account for something they have done wrong, they are made to explain why they did it, and are often criticized or punished for it. The robber was held accountable for stealing Mrs Jones's purse and was sent to jail.

**pay up** (idiom) to pay what is owed.

I want my money now. Pay up! If you don't pay up, I'll take you to court.

**step in** (idiom) To enter into some position, activity, or situation to intervene or improve it.

We'd still be dealing with this mess if the manager hadn't stepped in and figured out a solution.

We have a new marketing specialist stepping in to try and turn the company's profits around.

You're here as an observer, but if you see a situation in the classroom, please step in.

**shouldering** (idiom) To take on; assume: shouldered the blame for his friends.

**clean (one's) act up** (idiom) To improve one's behaviour.

*After I got in yet another fight at school, the headmaster told me that I had to clean my act up or else I'd be expelled.*

**mandatory** (adjective) Required or commanded by authority; obligatory:  
*Attendance at the meeting is mandatory.*

范文解析:

这是一篇典型的观点类的大作文，话题为环境保护类。这篇范文中，作者使用了双边类的结构来完成。首先手段，作者通过改写题目的方式来呈现主题，并在首段就表达自己的观点，作者认为公司和个人的确应该为保护环境做出努力，但同时政府也应该为此做出努力。在第一个主体段部分，作者论述的是商业公司应该为保护环境负一定的责任，在这段中作者使用了观点+举例+解释的结构，是文章逻辑清晰明了。第二个主体段，作者论述了个人和政府可以为保护环境做出的努力。最后，结尾段，作者总结上文，并且重申观点。这篇文章中有一些值得重点学习的词汇已经重点画出，各位考生可以参考学习。文章中的大作文结构在启德 2019 版新教材 I 段第八课中有详细的讲解，环保类的话题在标准化教材中也有讲解，欢迎大家来启德上课。