ANSWER KEY — 22 NOVEMBER 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
D	B	C	B	B	A	D	A	C	D
Q11	**Q12**	**Q13**	**Q14**	**Q15**	**Q16**	**Q17**	**Q18**	**Q19**	**Q20**
A	B	A	D	B	B	D	C	D	C

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 **D** *Central claim* HARD

The opening paragraph names two modern expectations, that each work has 'a single author' and that a copy is 'a lesser thing', and says that applied to the imperial workshops 'they distort more than they reveal'. The second paragraph dismantles the first expectation (the page was 'the work of a workshop, not of a lone genius'), the third dismantles the second (copying 'was how a tradition stored its knowledge'), and the last paragraph calls the modern preference for 'the single signed original' a lossy 'translation'. The fourth option captures exactly this two-part thesis. The first option overstates: the author never says painters rarely composed; trainees copied, and borrowed figures were set 'inside compositions of their own'. The second option seizes on one detail, the specialist who 'sometimes' added faces, and turns it into a ranking that the passage explicitly denies the workshop made. The third option inverts the point about engravings, which shows the tradition 'took in what was foreign without being overwhelmed by it'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts because the passage praises copying, but defending the copy is not the same as claiming the workshops preferred it to composition.

Q2 **B** *Inference from a detail* MED

The second paragraph says the margin inscriptions record that 'one painter designed the composition, another laid in the colour, and sometimes a specialist added the faces', and it then explains why: 'The inscriptions recorded the division of labour because each contribution was valued, not because anyone wished to rank the contributors.' The second option restates this inference, that each painter's share was worth recording. The first option is the very purpose the passage rules out, since ranking contributors is expressly rejected, and payment and promotion are never mentioned. The third option reintroduces the hierarchy the author says the workshop 'did not recognise'; the face specialist is one contributor among several, and only 'sometimes'. The fourth option contradicts the paragraph, which presents the page as collaborative and states that the inscriptions themselves 'supply' the names, so assistants were named rather than hidden. Only the second option follows from what the passage actually states about the purpose of the records.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts readers who assume any record of who did what must serve a ranking, which the passage denies in so many words.

Q3 **C** *Function of a paragraph* HARD

The fourth paragraph opens with a concession: 'None of this means that every copy was as good as its model, or that the workshops lacked a notion of excellence.' It grants that writers 'praised particular painters by name' and then narrows the claim: 'The point is narrower. Excellence was measured by the mastery a painter showed within a shared practice.' Its job is to stop a reader from concluding that the author thinks all work was equal or that quality did not matter, which is the third option. The first option is wrong because the paragraph keeps the earlier claim intact; it ends by saying a copy could be celebrated for surpassing its source. The second option invents a comparison between court writers and modern viewers that the passage never draws. The fourth option misplaces the engravings, which belong to the third paragraph and are never ranked against the court's own pages. The paragraph is a qualification that protects the thesis, not new evidence or a retreat from it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option catches readers who read 'None of this means' as a retraction, when it is a limit placed on the argument so that it is not overread.

Q4 **B** *Vocabulary in context* MED

The sentence reads: young painters reproduced masters' works 'line by line, until the hand had absorbed what the eye had studied'. The point is that repeated copying turned visual study into the hand's own skill, so that what was learnt became habitual and automatic. 'Taken in so fully it became second nature' fits that meaning. The first option is the literal, physical sense of absorbing liquid; the passage does mention painting, which makes it tempting, but nothing is soaking up pigment here, and it is the hand, not the paper, that absorbs. The third option, using something up until nothing remains, describes consumption, which would mean the master's lesson was destroyed rather than learnt. The fourth option, being engrossed, is a genuine sense of 'absorbed' for a person who is deeply occupied, but a hand cannot be engrossed and the sentence is about learning, not attention. Context decides between several real dictionary senses, and only the second fits the training described.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts because the setting is a painting workshop, but the hand absorbs skill, not colour.

Q5 **B** *Weaken (Stretch)* ELITE

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

The author's account of copying has two parts: copying was a legitimate way for a tradition to store knowledge, and 'excellence was measured by the mastery a painter showed within a shared practice, not by his distance from it', so that 'a painter could be celebrated for a copy that surpassed its source'. The second option, if true, would show that contemporaries thought exactly the opposite: that copies were worthless and only work unlike any model deserved praise. That attacks both parts at their root, using the very kind of evidence (court writers' judgements) the author relies on in the fourth paragraph. The first option is consistent with the author's view and might even support it. The third option concerns quantity, not how copying was regarded. The fourth option bears on the authorship claim rather than on copying, and the passage says inscriptions on 'many pages' list contributors, not every page, so a few single-name pages do not contradict it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because it attacks the collaboration claim, but the question asks about copying, and 'many pages' already allows exceptions.

Q6 **A** *Main point* HARD

The first paragraph identifies the error: 'judging a creature's importance by how readily it can be admired', under which 'the most indispensable workers' rank near the bottom. The Australian and Indian cases illustrate it, and the fourth paragraph draws the pattern: the service is treated as 'a free background condition', its loss 'is noticed late', and replacing it 'costs far more than protecting the creatures would have cost'. The last paragraph says the case for conservation 'is incomplete when it rests on beauty alone'. The first option combines all three elements: appeal-based valuation, the vital work, and the high cost of replacement. The second option contradicts the author, who says 'there is nothing wrong with loving' the tiger and that admiration 'raises money'. The third option misreads Australia; importing beetles is presented as a costly repair, not a superior policy. The fourth option misstates the cause of the vulture decline, which the passage attributes to a cattle painkiller in carcasses, not to public dislike.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The second option tempts because the passage criticises favouritism, but the author explicitly defends admiration and objects only to beauty being the sole measure.

Q7 **D** *Purpose of a detail* HARD

The third paragraph describes the vulture collapse and its consequences: carcasses 'rotted for days', 'Feral dogs multiplied on the surplus, and with them the risk of rabies'. The next sentence states the point: a bird 'that many people found repellent had been performing a public-health service that nobody paid for and nobody counted'. The dogs and rabies are therefore cited to show that losing an unloved scavenger produced real harm to human beings, the fourth option. The first option makes a comparison between threats that the passage never attempts; the dogs matter only as a consequence of the vultures' absence. The second option introduces a policy claim about when the painkiller should have been banned, which the author nowhere makes. The third option invents a long history of competition; the passage says the dogs multiplied on the surplus carcasses after the vultures declined, not that the two had competed throughout the century. The detail is evidence for the thesis that invisible services matter.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts readers who notice that rabies is serious, but the passage uses it to show the vultures' value, not to rank dangers.

Q8 **A** *Inference* MED

The second paragraph ends with its own moral: 'A labour no one had noticed became visible only when it stopped.' In Australia the native beetles were present but 'could not process the large, wet pats that cattle produced', so the service failed and dung lay for months. The first option captures this, and its wording 'absent or unable' covers the Australian case of beetles that existed but could not do the work. The second option overgeneralises from one case: the native beetles failed because they had 'evolved alongside marsupials', not because native species are always less efficient. The third option goes far beyond the passage, which records a problem that was solved by importing beetles, not a judgement that cattle should never have come. The fourth option seizes on the flies, which appear only as one consequence of uncollected dung, and turns them into a general claim about research funding that the passage never makes.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The second option tempts because the imported beetles succeeded, but the passage explains the native beetles' failure by their evolutionary history, not by any general rule.

Q9 **C** *Vocabulary in context* EASY

In the final paragraph the author writes: 'A ledger that counted the work done by beetles, vultures, fungi and worms would not replace our love of the tiger.' The word is used figuratively. Earlier the passage says the scavengers' service is one 'that nobody paid for and nobody counted', and it is treated as 'a free background condition'. The ledger proposed is therefore an accounting that records value which would otherwise go uncounted, the third option. The second option is the literal commercial sense of a ledger, and it is close, but the passage is not about a shop or its sales; it borrows the idea of bookkeeping to describe counting ecological work. The first option is a genuine but rare sense of 'ledger' (a flat gravestone), which might tempt because the passage speaks of carcasses and the dead, yet nothing in the sentence refers to a grave. The fourth option, a scaffold timber, is another technical sense with no connection to counting work.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts because the passage dwells on the dead, but the ledger here counts work done, not graves.

Q10 **D** *Application (Stretch)* ELITE

The author's complaint is that conservation judges species by appeal, and that because the services of decomposers are 'invisible', their loss is noticed late and replacing them 'costs far more than protecting the creatures would have cost'. The remedy suggested is 'a ledger that counted the work done' by such species, which 'would not replace our love of the tiger' but would correct the judgement. Ranking

priorities partly by the cost of replacing each species' ecological work, the fourth option, puts that ledger into practice, and the word 'partly' keeps room for charisma as the author wishes. The first option goes too far: moving all funds from tigers contradicts 'The argument is not that charisma should be ignored'. The second option likewise attacks admiration, which the author says 'raises money' that protects shared habitats. The third option reverses the fourth paragraph, which treats building disposal plants as the expensive substitute that protection would have made unnecessary.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts because it seems to reward the unloved workers, but the author expressly refuses to take money or love away from the tiger.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 **A** ***Main conclusion*** MED

The first paragraph sets out the appeal of mandatory minimums and then states the thesis: 'Yet the floor rarely delivers the certainty it promises, and in important respects it undermines the justice it is meant to secure.' Each later paragraph supports one limb of this claim. The second shows that discretion is moved to the prosecutor rather than removed, so certainty is not achieved; the third shows that severe floors can produce 'fewer reports and fewer convictions'; the fourth shows that treating unlike cases alike is unjust. The final paragraph offers guidelines as the better alternative. The first option restates the thesis. The second option contradicts the author, who says 'Serious offences deserve serious sentences'. The third option is at most an implication of the second paragraph, and the author's remedy is sentencing guidelines, not reasons for charging decisions. The fourth option exaggerates the third paragraph, which says only that judges 'may be tempted', and proposes no discipline at all.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option tempts because the second paragraph faults hidden charging decisions, but the author never proposes this remedy and it is a premise-level point, not the conclusion.

Q12 **B** ***Necessary assumption*** HARD

The second paragraph argues that a mandatory minimum moves discretion from the judge, who acts 'in open court and must give reasons', to the prosecutor, whose charging decision is 'made out of view', and it presents this as a harm. That conclusion follows only if discretion exercised without reasons or review is worse, that is, more prone to error or abuse, than discretion exercised openly. Apply the negation test to the second option: if private discretion were no more likely to go wrong than open discretion, the shift would be a mere relocation and the paragraph would show no harm. The first option is far stronger than needed; the argument turns on visibility and review, not on prosecutors being dishonest or malicious. The third option is also too strong and in fact unnecessary, since the author's own remedy keeps judicial departures under review. The fourth option concerns guilty pleas, which play no part in the reasoning.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts because it seems to explain why prosecutorial power is bad, but the argument needs only that unreviewed discretion is riskier, not that prosecutors are malicious.

Q13 **A** ***Weaken*** HARD

The third paragraph predicts that a severe floor deters complainants who know the accused and tempts judges to acquit, so that 'A law designed to guarantee punishment can thus produce fewer reports and fewer convictions.' The first option supplies evidence directly against that prediction: where severe minimums were introduced, reports and convictions rose. If true, the mechanisms the author describes either did not operate or were outweighed. The second option is compatible with the author's claim, which says only that some complainants 'may hesitate'; that others report regardless does not show the overall effect is absent. The third option concerns whether judges give reasons for finding evidence insufficient, which does not show that they are not tempted to make such findings; reasons can be written for a strained acquittal. The fourth option repeats the first paragraph's account of why legislatures enact minimums and says nothing about their effects on reporting or conviction.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The second option tempts because it names complainants who are not deterred, but a claim about what 'may' happen in some cases is not refuted by other cases.

Q14 **D** ***Strengthen (Stretch)*** ELITE

The argument has two central supports: discretion is not removed but moved to the prosecutor's charging decision (second paragraph), and a fixed floor 'cannot register' differences in culpability (fourth paragraph). The fourth option confirms both at once: if, where minimums apply, sentences track charging choices rather than culpability, then the prosecutor really does decide the outcome and the floor really does fail to fit punishment to the offender. The third option is the trap. It looks like support because the author prefers guidelines, but it is in fact the standard case for mandatory minimums: if judges with full discretion sentence alike cases very differently, a fixed floor looks more attractive. The author concedes inconsistency is a problem to be curbed, so this option cuts against rather than for the argument. The first option merely says the offences are grave, which the author accepts. The second option, public approval, concerns popularity, which the author grants in calling the appeal 'obvious'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option tempts because inconsistency sounds like a reason for reform, but it is the classic argument for fixed floors and therefore weakens the passage.

Q15 **B** ***Role of a statement*** HARD

Having argued at length against fixed floors, the author anticipates an obvious reply: that someone who opposes mandatory minimums simply wants offenders punished less. The sentence 'None of this argues for leniency' meets that reply in advance, and the next words make the point explicit: 'Serious offences deserve serious sentences.' The author then offers guidelines as a way of curbing inconsistency 'without abolishing judgement'. The statement therefore forestalls the objection that rejecting fixed floors is the same as favouring lighter

punishment, the second option. The first option misreads the sentence as a retraction; the author maintains every earlier objection. The third option is wrong because no evidence about the severity of sentences appears in the final paragraph or elsewhere. The fourth option is partly suggested by the last sentence, which speaks of the legislature's proper task, but that sentence follows the statement and states a positive principle; it is not the function of 'None of this argues for leniency'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because the paragraph does end with the legislature, but the quoted sentence itself answers a charge of softness rather than changing the subject.

Q16 **B** *Main conclusion* MED

The first paragraph states the thesis: 'The charge, though modest in appearance, is usually the better policy', and the final paragraph restates it for the article in question: 'For an article as ordinary as a carry bag, however, the more effective policy is the one that changes the habit rather than the one that merely outlaws the object.' The second, third and fourth paragraphs supply the reasons: bans fail without enforcement, charges alter the choice at the counter, and bans reward substitutes that may be no better. The second option states this conclusion with the author's own limits, 'for carry bags' and 'usually'. The first option distorts the fourth paragraph, which says a substitute 'may' need many reuses, not that plastic is worse in every case. The third option contradicts the final paragraph, which says 'The ban has its place'. The fourth option inflates the Irish example, which is cited as evidence that use 'fell sharply', not that bags vanished everywhere.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option tempts readers who carry the anti-ban reasoning too far, but the author explicitly keeps bans for items with no substitute that cause severe harm.

Q17 **D** *Necessary assumption* HARD

The third paragraph claims that a charge 'changes the decision made at the counter': a shopper 'who must pay for every bag begins to carry one from home'. That mechanism works only if the price is large enough, relative to what shoppers can afford, to make them alter their behaviour. Negate the fourth option: if the charge were too trivial to matter to shoppers, they would simply pay it and the habit would not change, so the paragraph's reasoning would fail. The first option goes beyond the argument, which concerns carry bags alone; nothing depends on spillover to other plastics. The second option, if anything, would complicate the argument, and the passage never claims shops do or do not raise other prices. The third option is not assumed; it would in fact weaken the use of Ireland as evidence, because a uniquely conscious public would explain the fall without the charge. An assumption must be something the reasoning needs, and only the fourth option meets that test.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option tempts because Ireland is the paragraph's evidence, but believing Irish shoppers were unusual would undercut the argument, not support it.

Q18 **C** *Weaken* HARD

The argument's key contrast is that a ban 'works only where it is enforced' among 'millions of small sellers', whereas a charge 'does not depend on catching anyone' because it is collected 'through the shop's own till', so the seller 'has little reason to evade it'. The third option strikes precisely there: if, where small sellers dominate, vendors simply hand out bags free and ignore the charge, then the charge faces the same enforcement problem as the ban in exactly the setting the author uses to condemn bans, and its claimed advantage disappears. The first option raises a fairness objection but does not show the charge fails to reduce overall use, which is the argument's measure. The second option is consistent with the fourth paragraph, which already says reusable bags can beat plastic after many reuses. The fourth option slightly complicates the Irish example but does not explain away a sharp fall in use, and Ireland is only one supporting illustration, not the argument's foundation.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because it questions the Irish evidence, but removing one illustration weakens far less than showing the charge shares the ban's enforcement failure.

Q19 **D** *Strengthen (Stretch)* ELITE

The fourth paragraph argues that bans carry 'a further risk': sellers switch to a permitted substitute, and a heavier bag of cloth or paper 'may need to be reused many times' before its environmental cost of production falls below that of the plastic bag. The risk is real only if substitutes are in fact used briefly. The fourth option confirms it: where plastic was banned, shops gave out free paper bags used only once, so the substitute never reached the reuse level that would justify its higher production cost. The first option is the trap. Faster decomposition sounds like environmental praise for paper and so seems relevant, but it favours the substitute and therefore weakens rather than strengthens the paragraph. The second option, a preference for cloth bags at equal prices, suggests substitutes might be welcomed and reused, which also cuts against the author. The third option concerns the politics of repeal and says nothing about the environmental cost of substitution.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts because it mentions a property of paper bags, but it makes the substitute look better, which helps the ban rather than the author.

Q20 **C** *Parallel reasoning* ELITE

The passage's reasoning has a definite shape: prefer a price to a prohibition for an ordinary, widespread behaviour, because a price changes people's everyday choices without needing enforcement, whereas a prohibition depends on inspectors who cannot watch everyone. The third option has the same structure: meter water rather than ban lawn watering, because prices change habits and bans need inspectors. The fourth option is the strongest trap, since it also prefers a charge to a ban, but its reason is that taxes raise revenue, which is a different justification from the passage's reliance on behaviour and enforcement; parallel reasoning requires the same grounds,

not merely the same verdict. The first option reaches the opposite verdict, choosing a ban, and rests on boldness and popularity, the very features the passage dismisses in its first paragraph. The second option also prefers a prohibition, and rests on parental resentment, which has no counterpart in the passage.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because it shares the conclusion 'charge rather than ban', but its reason is revenue, not changing habits without enforcement.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Which emperor's illustrated manuscripts does the Mughal-painting passage discuss? — **Akbar**

2. In which centuries did the imperial workshops in the passage flourish? — **Sixteenth and seventeenth**

3. Per the passage, a large Mughal manuscript was the work of a lone genius or a workshop? — **A workshop**

4. Where were the inscriptions recording the division of labour written? — **In the margins of the pages**

5. Name the three tasks the inscriptions divide among painters. — **Composition, colour, faces**

6. Who sometimes added the faces to a Mughal page, per the passage? — **A specialist**

7. Why did the inscriptions record each painter's share, per the author? — **Each contribution was valued**

8. Did the workshop wish to rank its contributors, per the passage? — **No**

9. How were young Mughal painters trained? — **By reproducing masters' works line by line**

10. What foreign objects did European missionaries bring that painters copied? — **Engravings**

11. Name one element painters borrowed from European engravings. — **A figure or a receding landscape**

12. Per the author, copying was how a tradition did what with its knowledge? — **Stored it**

13. Copying let the tradition take in the foreign without being what? — **Overwhelmed by it**

14. Who praised particular painters by name, per the fourth paragraph? — **Writers at court**

15. By what was excellence measured in the workshops? — **Mastery within a shared practice**

16. Could a painter be celebrated for a copy, per the passage? — **Yes, if it surpassed its source**

17. What does the author call the modern preference for the single signed original? — **A translation**

18. What does every translation do, per the closing paragraph? — **Loses something**

19. What does each Mughal page record, per the closing paragraph? — **A collaboration**

20. Why may the copy be the more instructive object? — **It shows a tradition teaching itself**

21. Meaning of 'absorbed' in 'the hand had absorbed what the eye had studied'? — **Internalised; made second nature**

22. Two modern expectations the author says distort Mughal painting? — **Single author; copy as inferior**

23. Title of the Arts & culture passage on Mughal painting? — **The Copy in the Atelier**

24. Does honouring Mughal paintings require abandoning painters' names? — **No; inscriptions supply them**

25. What question do gallery visitors bring that the paintings never answer? — **Who made this?**

26. Name the three favourite animals listed in the passage's opening line. — **Tiger, elephant, great Indian bustard**

27. What three things does conservation's favouritism draw, per the passage? — **Funds, documentaries, affection**

28. What wrong habit does the author identify in judging creatures? — **Judging importance by admirability**

29. Name the three things decomposers deal with, per the first paragraph. — **Dung, carcasses and the dead**

30. Alongside which animals had Australia's native dung beetles evolved? — **Marsupials**

31. Why could native Australian beetles not handle cattle dung? — **The pats were large and wet**

32. How long did cattle dung lie on Australian pastures? — **For months**

33. Two harms caused by uncollected dung in Australia? — **Smothered grass, bred flies**

34. From which two regions did Australia import dung beetles? — **Africa and Europe**

35. When did Australia import dung beetles, per the passage? — **Second half of the twentieth century**

36. Moral of the dung-beetle story in one line? — **Unnoticed labour shows when it stops**

37. From roughly when did India's vulture populations collapse? — **The 1990s**

38. What poisoned India's vultures, per the passage? — **A painkiller given to cattle**

39. How quickly would vultures once strip a carcass? — **In hours**

40. What multiplied on surplus carcasses after vultures declined? — **Feral dogs**

41. Which disease risk rose with feral dogs, per the passage? — **Rabies**

42. What service had vultures performed unpaid and uncounted? — **A public-health service**

43. How are decomposers' services treated, per the fourth paragraph? — **As a free background condition, like air**

44. Two costly replacements for lost scavenging, per the passage? — **Imported beetles, carcass-disposal plants**

45. What does admiration for charismatic species do, per the author? — **Raises money that protects habitats**

46. The case for conservation is incomplete when it rests on what alone? — **Beauty**

47. Four creatures the proposed ledger would count? — **Beetles, vultures, fungi, worms**

48. Meaning of 'ledger' in the final paragraph? — **An account of uncounted value**

49. What has the current judgement confused, per the last line? — **Pleasant to watch with necessary to live beside**

50. Title of the Environment & nature passage? — **The Undertakers**

51. Is replacing a lost natural service cheaper than protecting its providers? — **No; it costs far more**

52. Why is the loss of decomposers noticed late? — **Their service is invisible**

53. What would the ledger not replace, per the author? — **Our love of the tiger**

54. How long did carcasses rot after the vulture collapse? — **For days**

55. What is a mandatory minimum sentence? — **A floor below which no judge may go**

56. What provokes legislatures to enact mandatory minimums, per the passage? — **Public anger at a crime**

57. Two things a fixed floor promises or signals? — **No leniency; the offence is serious**

58. Does a minimum sentence remove discretion, per the author? — **No; it moves it**

59. From whom does a mandatory minimum move discretion? — **The judge**

60. To whom does a mandatory minimum move discretion? — **The prosecutor**

61. Where does the judge hear evidence, per the passage? — **In open court**

62. What must the judge give that the prosecutor need not? — **Reasons**

63. On what does facing the minimum now largely depend? — **A charging decision made out of view**

64. Three people a complainant may know, per the third paragraph? — **Neighbour, relative, employer**

65. What might a complainant who knows the accused do under a severe floor? — **Hesitate to report**

66. What might judges find rather than impose an unjust minimum? — **The evidence insufficient**

67. Two outcomes a severe floor can produce, per the third paragraph? — **Fewer reports, fewer convictions**

68. The floor treats what kind of cases alike? — **Unlike cases**

69. Two contrasts in culpability given in the passage? — **Principal/accomplice; repeat/first offender**

70. Equality before the law requires what two things? — **Like alike; different differently**

71. What do serious offences deserve, per the author? — **Serious sentences**

72. What alternative to fixed floors does the author propose? — **Sentencing guidelines with a normal range**

73. What must judges give when departing from a guideline range? — **Reasons**

74. Guidelines curb inconsistency without abolishing what? — **Judgement**

75. The legislature's proper task, per the closing line? — **To declare how grave an offence is**

76. Title of the Law & rights CR passage? — **The Sentence Fixed in Advance**

77. Function of 'None of this argues for leniency'? — **Forestalls a charge of softness**

78. Two instruments for cutting carry-bag use, per the passage? — **A ban and a charge**

79. What does a carry-bag ban do? — **Forbids shops to hand bags out**

80. What does a carry-bag charge require shops to do? — **Sell each bag at a fixed price**

81. Which instrument is more popular with campaigners? — **The ban**

82. Which instrument does the author call usually the better policy? — **The charge**

83. A ban works only where it is what? — **Enforced**

84. Two kinds of small sellers named in the passage? — **Street vendors, neighbourhood grocers**

85. Under thin enforcement, in what form does the banned bag return? — **Thinner, less durable**