

# PAU SETEMBRO 2013

Código:

## **INGLÉS**

### OPCIÓN A

### Read the text and the instructions to the questions very carefully. Answer all the questions in English

Could you imagine having to apply and pay for a licence to buy tobacco? It might sound extreme, but this is the proposal of a public health expert in Australia, who suggests that it could provide a practical "disincentive" for smokers.

Prof Simon Chapman from the University of Sydney is interested in the next generation of truly effective anti-smoking measures. Laying out his case for a smokers' licence in the latest issue of the journal *Plos Medicine*, he said it could be of interest to "high-income nations that are actively pursuing tobacco control goals". So could a government-issued licence be the best solution to reduce smoking? And how could such a scheme work?

Prof Chapman used the analogy of prescription drugs, prescriptions essentially being "temporary licences" to buy certain medicines. The licence that Prof Chapman proposes would be a swipe card, like a Visa or Mastercard; smokers would be required to apply for a card and tobacco products would not be sold to anyone without one. "Selling cigarettes to anyone without a licence would be severely punished," he explained "and an establishment which did this would lose its licence to sell, as happens now with pharmacists who sell drugs to anyone without a prescription."

Tied into his scheme would be a limit to the amount of tobacco any one person could buy - perhaps to 50 cigarettes per day or less, and of course the periodic inconvenience of renewing their licence. Along with the cost of a licence, Prof Chapman says that all of this could provide some real smoking disincentives. He also suggests building in a financial reward to entice smokers to quit. "As a quit incentive, all licence fees paid during a smoker's licensed smoking history would be fully refundable, with interest," he explains. "And licence surrender would be permanent and reapplication not permitted."

of the text in English, including the most important points, using your own words

#### **Ouestions**

1. Write a summary of the text in English, including the most important points, using your own	worus
whenever possible (maximum 50 words, 1 point).	

- 4. Answer the following questions in your own words. (2 points: 1 point each).
- a) Why does Prof Chapman compare a licence for smoking with a licence for prescription drugs?
- b) Why would having to have a licence to smoke dissuade people from doing so?
- 5. Do you think that it is right for the state to control whether people smoke, drink or take drugs? What arguments are there for and against such control? (Approximately 120 words; 3 points).



# PAU SETEMBRO 2013

Código: 1

## **INGLÉS**

### OPCIÓN B

### Read the text and the instructions to the questions very carefully. Answer all the questions in English.

One airline says it will offer baby-free "quiet zones" on its flights. Should all planes and trains follow their example, or do adults need to learn to live with child passengers?

At 10,000 metres, the howl of a baby screeches through a pressurised cabin. For travellers already stressed by lengthy security checks, squeezed into cramped seating and unnerved by the very fact of being so high above ground, it's almost enough to make them shatter the Plexiglas windows and jump.

It's a source of anxiety for the embarrassed parents too, desperately trying to pacify their offspring while facing disapproving stares from fellow adults. One airline is offering what it says is a solution. Low-cost carrier Air Asia says from February it will provide a "quiet zone" for passengers aged 12 and over at no extra cost. Separated from the rest of the cabin, these seven rows of seats should be immune from the sound of children, the company claims. It is following the example of Malaysia Airlines, which in April announced it would ban families with children from sitting on the upper deck of its Kuala Lumpur to London service.

For the childless and the easily irritable, it may be a relief, but introducing segregation would risk infuriating families who resent the idea they should be treated as second-class citizens. After all, there are no separate compartments for adults who disturb the peace and quiet of others by snoring, for instance, or taking off their shoes to unleash malodorous feet.

However, there appears to be support for segregation. In April, a survey of 1,666 British adults found that over a third of Britons would be prepared to pay extra to travel by air without the presence of children.

#### Questions

- 1. Write a summary of the text in English, including the most important points, using your own words whenever possible. (maximum 50 words; 1 point)
- 2. Find words or phrases in the text that correspond in meaning to the following (1 point: 0.25 each)
  - a) break
- b) children
- c) airline
- d) smelly
- 3. Complete the second sentence of each pair so that it has the same meaning as the first one (2 points: 0.5 points each)
- a) It will provide a "quiet zone" for passengers at no extra cost.

Passengers will be given a "quiet zone" without ...

- b) Parents will be angry at the suggestion that they should be segregated from other passengers. If airlines suggest ...
- c) Do adults need to learn to live with child passengers?

Is it necessary ...?

- d) Malaysian Airlines will ban children from the top deck of A380 aircraft. Children ...
- 4. Answer the following questions in your own words (2 points: 1 point each)
- a) Why are parents sometimes embarrassed by their own children when travelling?
- b) What are some other things that can make passengers' journeys unpleasant and stressful?
- 5. Would you like to have children? What is the best age to start a family? (Approximately 120 words; 3 points).