

6. Does the State Government not think that since land is taken away from the displaced families, inclusion of land should be obligatory in the package for rehabilitation?	-do-
7. If, in any state, land for land is not available, should a share in the new enterprise (like industrial project) be not assigned to displaced ST families? In the Report of the Working Group for Empowering the Scheduled Tribes during the Tenth Five Year Plan (July 2001), the suggestion has been made that tribal families should have 15 to 20 per cent share in the enterprise in addition to having a lead.' time to prepare for employment before the proposed undertaking becomes operative. Further, the community should be deemed to be the owner with 50% share in its favour by virtue of its allowing the industry to use the local resources and getting established.	-do-
8. It has been observed that generally village communities displaced are not taken up for rehabilitation on community basis, but individual ST families are rehabilitated, scattered. This tears up the socio-economic fabric of the village community. Would the State Government consider rehabilitation of communities rather than individual ST families so that there is cultural continuity on relocation?	-do-
9. For ensuring these different conditions, the tribal population of the concerned area should be made a party to the agreement or MOU along with the other concerned parties. Do you agree or disagree? Please delineate your views clearly in this regard.	-do-
10. The experience generally is that even the educated members of ST families are not employed in the new enterprises established on land from whom the families have been displaced. What has been the policy of the State Government in this regard? What is the ground position in regard to employment of the oustees?	-do-