AILET

Question to Practice Reading Comprehension for CLAT

Aparna Shukla · 18 Oct 2020

Given below are two sets of questions to practice Reading Comprehension for CLAT.

Passage 1:

The political drama arising out of the passage of three ordinances on agriculture — Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Ordinance, Essential Commodities (Amendment) Ordinance and Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services — was entirely avoidable. The BJP's longstanding ally, Shiromani Akali Dal, has quit the Union government (but not withdrawn support); this has, in turn, turned the spotlight on the Haryana government, supported by the Jannayak Janata Party.

The **brouhaha** over the Bills reflects poorly on the Centre's political outreach and its inability to communicate to the farming community in two advanced agrarian States that the reforms envisaged in the two Bills will benefit them. The apprehensions are largely restricted to the first law that allows 'trade zones' to come up outside the APMC area. It allows farmers an option to sell their produce directly to these new zones, without going through the middlemen and paying levies such as mandi fees. While the hold of the middlemen will be reduced, farmers are apprehensive that the move suggests an eventual exit from the minimum support price.

Agriculture Minister Narendra Tomar has, however, said that the MSP is here to stay, even as the law does not explicitly say so. The Centre needs to reach out to the political leadership across parties and in key procurement States and ensure that an important reform does not become a dead letter.

The other two laws pertaining to the removal of stockholding limits as well as curbs on inter-State and intra-State trade and creating a framework for contract farming, respectively. The creation of FPOs on a large scale will help in creating a farmer-friendly environment for contract farming where small players can benefit. The two laws will enable private players to invest in warehousing, grading and other marketing infrastructure.

The Centre may have erred in choosing the ordinance route, instead of working on consensus creation. Such reforms have been on the anvil for years and would have met with acceptance. Another aspect highlighted by several MPs pertains to whether Parliament should be enacting a law on the sale and purchase of farm goods. Whether the matter in question falls under the State List (agriculture per se) or the Concurrent List (trade and commerce) is open to legal interpretation. Clearly, the issue is not going to die down soon. The Centre should reach out to those opposing the Bills, including farmers, explain to them the need for reform, and get them on board.

Source

Questions

1. The word in bold in the passage means:

- An unreasonable reaction
- Noisy and overexcited reaction
- Silent reaction
- Mixed reaction

1. Which of the following statements are not true as per the passage?

- All three legislations allows trade zones' to come up outside the APMC area.
- Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Ordinance allows trade zones to come up outside the APMC area.
- With the new laws, farmers will have to pay more mandi fees.
- None of these

1. Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Ordinance will

- allows 'trade zones' to come up outside the APMC area
- removal of stockholding limits as well as curbs on inter-State and intra-State trade
- enable private players to invest in warehousing, grading and other marketing infrastructure
- None of these

1. What should the Government do to convince people of these reforms?

- Ignore the people who are opposing it.
- Explain the need for these reforms to those who are opposing it
- Focus on people who are supporting it.
- None of these

1. Which of the following word in the passage means ‘making a mistake’?

- Erred
- Levies
- Outreach
- Blundered

Passage 2:

Maharashtra Governor Bhagat Singh Koshyari’s intemperate letter to Chief Minister Uddhav Thackeray, in which he mocked the latter, questioned his faith and even took a jibe at secularism, a fundamental tenet of the Constitution, is disgraceful. His letter, written purportedly to seek an early reopening of temples, could have urged that without the accompanying scorn and **derision**.

The Governor reduced himself to the level of a troll warrior, by declaring that “our gods and goddesses have been condemned to remain in lockdown” and wondering whether the CM has “suddenly turned secular”. He wrote to the CM that the latter used to be a “strong votary of Hindutva”, and cited his visits to temples as proof. This forces the conclusion that the intent, purpose and premise of the letter were all wrong.

A person’s faith in Hinduism and its practice is not Hindutva. The Constitution envisages no role for a CM’s faith in his functioning. Moreover, it is not the Governor’s job to interfere in the daily functioning of an elected government. Communication between the Governor and CM must be perfectly civil and respectful besides being constitutionally appropriate. And at any rate, restrictions on gatherings at places of worship as a measure to combat a pandemic are not related to the concept of secularism.

His warped logic apart, Mr Koshyari has a track record of privileging his political fealties over norms and propriety. In November 2019, he held a swearing-in for BJP leader Devendra Fadnavis as the State’s Chief Minister, in a dubious attempt to pre-empt the formation of a Shiv Sena-led alliance government.

He continued to wade into political controversies, in a manner unbecoming of his office. Mr Thackeray rightly reminded the Governor of the fact that secularism was a “key component” of the Constitution and the need to take care of people while being sensitive to their beliefs and sentiments. Mr Thackeray also descended into avoidable grandstanding in the letter by reiterating his own Hindutva credentials and revisiting earlier tussles with the Governor.

NCP chief Sharad Pawar on the other hand, called out the Governor’s ill-advised move in a letter to Prime Minister Narendra Modi, in which he expressed “shock” and “surprise” that the letter was released to the media. The Governor could convey his views to the CM, but the “kind of language” was unsuitable for someone holding a constitutional office, Mr Pawar pointed out.

Maharashtra is fighting a battle against COVID-19, and all steps in this regard must be based entirely on a proper analysis of the situation. Any political considerations can only be damaging, and a communal one will be dangerous. It is unfortunate that the Governor sought to insert himself into the situation in an extremely unhelpful manner. He must retreat and let the Council of Ministers and the Chief Minister take decisions that they consider appropriate and timely.

Source

Questions

1. The word in bold in the passage means:

- Ridicule and mockery
- Disheartening
- Abuses
- None of these

1. In the letter by the Governor to the CM of Maharashtra, which of the following has not been talked about?

- The inclination of CM towards Hinduism in past.
- Jibe at secularism.
- Reopening of temples in Maharashtra
- The threat of Putting Presidential rule in the State

1. “The Governor could convey his views to the CM, but the “kind of language” was unsuitable for someone holding a constitutional office.” – Sharad Pawar. It can be assumed that:

- Such immature behaviour was expected from the Governor.
- Governor was expected to behave in a better way.
- The Governor always uses this kind of language as he used in the letter.
- None of these

1. Hindutva is the key component of the Constitution of India. This statement is

- True
- False
- It is in the essence of the Indian Constitution
- Partly false.

1. Which word in the passage means doubtful?

- Combat
- Sceptical
- Dubious
- Envisage

Answers

Passage 1

1. (b)
2. (b)
3. (a)
4. (b)
5. (a)

Passage 2

1. (a)
2. (d)
3. (b)

4. (b)
5. (c)