

NABARD

PY - 2016

(Maximum Marks—100)

[Duration : 3 Hours]

PAPER-I-GENERAL ENGLISH

- Instructions.*— (1) All questions are compulsory.
 (2) Figures to the right indicate full marks to each question.
 (3) Each question should be answered on a new page.
 (4) All parts of a question should be answered together, without other answers intervening.
 (5) Marks will be deducted if an answer is longer or shorter than the limit, or is irrelevant, or if illegible.
 (6) Answers must be written only in English.

Marks

1. Write an essay of about 500 words on any *one* of the following :— 40
- (a) Robots will take over our lives in the future !!
 (b) Farmers Loans must be looked upon as good investment.
 (c) Pollution is a manmade disaster in Metros.
 (d) Alternative Sources of Energy.
 (e) Market Access to Rural Handicrafts.
2. (a) Make a précis of the following passage reducing it to about 180 words, and give it a suitable title. Use the précis sheet provided for it :— 20

“ The Centre needs to follow through with pending legislation for the goods and services tax (GST)”. As the recent Arvind Subramanian expert committee points out, the lack of reforms in the indirect tax regime leads to high costs and inefficiencies in myriad ways. For instance, blocked input taxes or distorting tax-on-tax and cascading rates could add up to as much as three-fourths of investment in plant and machinery.

Hence the pressing need to change over from the dual value-added tax (VAT) system in the Centre and the states to an integrated GST, with tax levied only on the value added and input tax credits seamlessly available across the value chain. It would shore up transparency and boost tax efficiency.

For starters, the government needs to respond to the three main points raised by the Congress: one, that a standard GST rate of no more than 18% be part of the constitutional amendment; two, an independent dispute-settlement mechanism be in place; three, that the additional 1% interstate tax be dropped. It is notable that the Subramanian panel does make a strong case for doing away with the 1% tax, but only as a small footnote in very fine print.

[Turn over