

of this measure, according to the first part Goskomles SSSR is invested with exclusive rights to enjoyment of State-owned forest resources. But of course, it is common knowledge that any monopoly leads to stagnation. It was precisely on account of the monopoly in forestry (until recently about 96 per cent of the nation's forest resources were administered by Goskomles SSSR) that symptoms of stagnation developed within the sector, from which we are only now struggling to emerge.

The forest resources of our closest neighbour - Finland - are in very diverse forms of ownership (privately and State-owned forests, forests belonging to enterprises, communes, parishes etc.). Their managerial competence is superior to ours. Over several decades, a clearly defined forest policy which we call Scandinavian has been worked out in the country. Its main distinguishing feature is rationalism and efficiency.

Such a policy, however, could only have originated in the absence of exclusive rights to ownership of forest resources. Conversely, in a situation where one department is in a position to dictate policy it is difficult to anticipate favourable changes in the sector.

One of the "achievements" of our domestic forest policy is the highly complicated system of dividing the forests into groups and categories of protection, which now number 35 designations. Categories of forests functioning mainly in a protective role account for 9 designations.

Each category of forests has its own regime of forest use. In a substantial part of certain of the forest categories principal fellings are prohibited, with only improvement and sanitary fellings allowed. This accounts for the fact that in the European Urals zone alone 25.7 million hectares of forests, or 16.4 per cent of their total area, have been removed from the economic turnover.