

compensation in the event of pre-term confiscation of a part of the leased forests.

Neither can I agree with the assessment that was made of managerial performance in integrated enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry. This is not to suggest that there are no shortcomings in their work. How could it be otherwise, for the vast majority of them were formed only two to three years ago?

Unfortunately, the situation is such that forestry and the timber industry, by operating for the most part as separate entities, have been unable, despite the existence of vast forest resources, to meet the needs of the economy and the general public for wood and wood-based products. The quality of the forests is continuing to worsen. Throughout the USSR as a whole, the quantity of standing timber that perishes annually is one and a half times the amount being extracted. The unstocked areas in the State forest lands (Goslesfond) are equal in area to all of the forests in the capitalist countries of Western Europe put together. There can be no question that in a situation such as this is ridiculous to speak of the advantages derivable from separate management of the forest.

Besides, experience shows that when forestry and the timber industry were amalgamated during the period 1959-1965 there was a 1.3-fold rise in the volume of reforestation work and a 1.5-fold rise in forest planting and sowing, in addition to which there was a 1.4-fold increase in the seeding areas in the nurseries and in the areas devoted to tending the plantations and a 2.9-fold increase in the establishment of nurseries for raising saplings.