MAKE FULLER USE OF POTENTIALITIES FOR FURTHER PROGRESS IN AGRICULTURE

Speech by N. S. Khrushchov at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. December 25, 1959

FOR FURTHER PROGRESS IN AGRICULTURE

Resolution of the Plenary Meeting of the C.C. C.P.S.U. Adopted December 25, 1959

MAKE FULLER USE OF POTENTIALITIES FOR FURTHER PROGRESS IN AGRICULTURE

Speech by N. S. Khrushchov at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. on December 25, 1959

FOR FURTHER PROGRESS IN AGRICULTURE

Resolution of the Plenary Meeting of the C.C. C.P.S.U. Adopted December 25, 1959

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
Moscow 1960

CONTENTS

MAKE FULLER USE OF POTENTIALITIES FOR FURTHER PROGRESS IN AGRICULTURE

Speech by N. S. Khrushchov at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on December 25, 1959

Comrades, this, the first year of the seven-year plan, has been a year of great advances in all fields of the national economy. Reports are now being received from all parts of the country on the fulfilment of the national economic plan and socialist obligations ahead of schedule. Remarkable victories have been achieved by the working people of Moscow and of the Leningrad economic region who are in the vanguard of the effort to carry out the decisions of the 21st Party Congress.

With great enthusiasm the whole country is completing the first year of the seven-year programme. Industrial output in 11 months of this year showed an increase of 11.3 per cent, instead of the 7.7 per cent envisaged by the plan. That is a very good and encouraging beginning.

Over a thousand big new establishments are being commissioned during the opening year of the seven-year plan. Industry in our country is, therefore, receiving large reinforcements in the form of these newly opened factories, mills, coal and ore mines, and electric power stations.

The plans for a further improvement in the living standard of the Soviet people are being carried out with success. The results have been especially tangible in the vitally important field of housing construction.

Housing floor space totalling over 80 million sq. m. has been built in the cities and industrial communities

during 1959, or more than 2,200,000 modern flats. In addition the collective farmers and village intellectuals have built some 850,000 homes for themselves.

Agriculture is on the upgrade. Even though this year was an unfavourable one in many districts, the results achieved must be recognized as good. Two thousand eight hundred and forty-five million poods of grain were purchased by the state this year. The average level of state grain purchases for the past four years, it should be said, has been 3,000,000,000 poods as compared with 2,000,000,000 poods for the preceding four years.

Meat output on the collective and state farms increased by 32 per cent during 11 months of 1959, and sales of meat to the state by 36 per cent. Output of milk on the collective and state farms increased by 15 per cent and sales to the state—by 16 per cent. There was a notable increase in butter production.

The cotton harvest has been good. The figure for cotton purchases is 4,669,000 tons as compared with 4,373,000 tons last year. This is more than we have had in any year in the entire history of cotton farming in our country. Particularly distinguished work was done this year by the cotton farmers of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan who fulfilled with honour obligations undertaken in the field of cotton output. The cotton-growing problems have been outlined in detail by Comrades Rashidov and Uljabayev, the rapporteurs on this subject, and also by other speakers at this Plenary Meeting.

It must be said that some republics have not fulfilled the plan for cotton output. True, comrades from these republics have furnished good explanations of why the plans were not fulfilled. (*Animation.*) That is also important; if the reason why a plan was not carried out is understood correctly, it can be regarded as a token of sorts that next year they will carry it out.

We will have to increase cotton production still more even though we are developing the chemical industry intensively and increasing output of artificial fibre. Cotton is essential to the country.

Slightly less sugar-beet was lifted this year than in 1958. However, sugar-beet production this year was above the

annual average for the years 1954-1958. The amount of sugar refined this year was 600,000 tons more than last year. We are above the seven-year plan control figures for sugar output and it seems that the target will be surpassed in the future too. We attribute great importance to an increase in sugar output.

Output of other farm produce also increased this year. Rapporteurs at this Plenary Meeting and those who have taken part in the debates have quoted many interesting facts regarding the increased production of fruit, grapes and tea. All this means a higher standard of living for the Soviet people.

WHAT CAN BE LEARNED FROM THE EXAMPLE OF RYAZAN REGION

Now permit me to deal in detail with the development of animal husbandry. I have already told you how the output and state purchases of meat and milk have gone up this year. Such rates of growth were considered incredible in the past. Naturally, all eyes are on Ryazan Region today because it has, so to say, shaken us up: it has sold the state three times more meat than last year.

Just think what the figures mean, comrades: in one year our state and collective farms have sold a total of 36 per cent more meat to the state. That is a very great achievement!

The total share of the collective and state farms in state purchases of meat was 83 per cent, and of milk—92 per cent. That is a great victory for the socialist system of agriculture.

You are aware, comrades, that until quite recently a large part of the milk and meat was provided by the collective farmers from their personal small holdings. That was very unpleasant as far as our socialist sector was concerned and gave the enemies of socialism an opportunity for all sorts of inventions directed against the socialist system of agriculture.

But now we have achieved a completely different state of affairs. The socialist sector has become the chief and principal supplier of meat and milk to the cities. The col-

29—1

lective and state farms meet the country's needs in meat and milk. And that, comrades, is of great political importance. (*Applause.*)

As has already been said, there has been a 15 per cent increase in milk output. Had that been the case 6 years ago we would have considered it a major success and would have showered praises for such figures. But the situation is different in our country today. People say that a 15 per cent increase for the year is not enough. And that is actually the case.

On almost all collective and state farms the milk yield has been increased. That is a good thing but the main point now is not merely to get a higher milk yield, although that will always be our goal. The main thing is to increase the number of cows. The density of our cattle population is not very great at present: on many collective and state farms there are from 4 to 6 cows per 100 hectares of land. There are collective and state farms which have from 10 to 12 cows per 100 hectares and we praise them for this. But if a collective or a state farm has 20 cows to every 100 hectares of land, the managers of such farms are regarded as heroes.

Now that we really feel we have learned to grow maize properly, we must make an effort to have 25 cows to every 100 hectares of land. Even that won't be many, perhaps it won't be quite enough. When maize is properly used it offers exceptionally good opportunities for increasing the fodder supply and consequently the size of the herds. We must devote the most serious attention to this matter.

There has also been a marked growth in the output of butter. The amount of butter produced in the country in 1959 was 845,000 tons, an average of 4 kilograms per capita.

In 1958 the United States of America produced 685,000 tons of butter, or 3.9 kilograms per capita, including that made by the farmers. According to the estimates of the United States Department of Agriculture this year the figure will be 658,000 tons of butter, or 3.7 kilograms per capita.

In 1959 therefore, the Soviet Union has outstripped the United States in per capita output of butter. (*Prolonged applause.*)

5—2

This is gratifying to note, comrades, because following the decisions of the plenary meetings of the C.C. C.P.S.U. in 1953 and 1955, when the Party vigorously disclosed shortcomings in the development of agriculture, the reactionary press in the United States trumpeted that the collective farms had discredited themselves, that the Soviet Union was experiencing a crisis in agriculture and so forth. Well, the Soviet people have shown them a "crisis"! And that is only the beginning. They may as well get used to it. We have surpassed the United States in the per capita output of butter. Our overall output of milk is also higher than that of the United States. And the time is not far distant when we will outstrip the United States in meat output as well. (*Applause.*)

I don't believe the Americans have any right to be offended with us. The fact that we shall outstrip them and surpass them in the output of livestock products isn't going to give them any scratches or bruises. Our people are going to live better if there is more meat, milk and butter in the country. As for those who boast about the American way of life and extol it—the Soviet people are going to take them down a peg or two. Socialist economy will show its superiority over capitalist economy in the output of all types of production. (*Stormy applause.*) To say "will show" is possibly not quite accurate. It has already shown and proved its indisputable superiority and we are going to show it to those who cannot or do not want to accept such a fact in a still more convincing manner when we overtake the United States in other types of production. Then we will simply say to them: there is your output, and here is ours. Just look, all the statistics point to the fact that here in the Soviet Union the per capita output of this or that item, of these or those goods is higher than in your country, in the United States. (*Applause.*)

Comrades, many republics and regions of the country have done good work this year. The Russian Federation undertook to sell the state one million tons of meat over and above the plan. The republic has kept its promise with honour. By December 20 it had sold the state 4,200,000 tons of meat, or 1,000,000 tons in excess of plan. (*Applause.*)

The headway made in the Ukraine, Byelorussia and other republics in developing animal husbandry is well known. In giving you the figures, comrades, I am not going to level them out but, on the contrary, I want these figures to help in making my point sharper, to show that the progress is there, but that there has not been equal participation in achieving these common successes. I think you will understand for yourselves how this works out when I give you a few figures. Of course, not everyone is going to like them, especially when comparisons are made.

And so, in 11 months of 1959 meat production on the collective and state farms and meat sales to the state in all categories of farms in the individual republics increased as follows:

	Production (in percentage	Sales to the state to 1958)
Russian Federation . .	35	38
Ukrainian S.S.R. . . .	30	22
Kazakh S.S.R.	37	73
Byelorussian S.S.R. . .	31	23
Lithuanian S.S.R. . . .	32	36
Latvian S.S.R.	39	63
Estonian S.S.R.	42	51

Our possibilities of increasing production and state purchases of meat are much greater. This is shown by the experience of the leading collective farms, state farms, districts and regions.

The great labour feat of the agricultural workers of Ryazan Region must be given particular mention. Following the December Plenary Meeting of the C.C. in 1958 the collective and state farms of the region pledged to raise meat production 3.8 times in a single year and to triple sales of meat to the state. At that time there were sceptically-minded people who did not believe in the creative ability of the Ryazan people. But these sceptics proved wrong.

It must be said, comrades, that the Ryazan people gave considerable thought to their obligations before announcing them. I remember when I was in Byelorussia early in January 1959, people phoned me up there and reported that the Ryazan farmers had undertaken to raise production of

meat in the collective and state farms 3.8 times in the course of one year and to sell three times as much meat to the state as in 1958. They asked me whether or not to publish these obligations. I said that if the Ryazan people had undertaken to do this, then, of course, their obligations should be published.

"And what about fulfilment?"

"The Ryazan people undertook their pledges and they will fulfil them," I said. "I know Comrade Larionov as a serious-minded, thoughtful man. He will never undertake an unrealistic obligation in order to show off and then sink. He wouldn't do anything like that."

"And what about the obligations of the other regions?" I was asked. "What about them?"

"Let them think about themselves and their pledges. Since they will have to fulfil their obligations let them figure out their own forces and possibilities."

Many comrades, following the example of the Ryazan people, also undertook big obligations. A considerable number of the collective and state farms, districts and regions carried out their pledges, but there are some leaders who now, at the end of the year, speaking figuratively, realize that they have sunk. Well, let them learn: if you undertake pledges, fulfil them, and if you want to keep up on the surface, tie on water-wings. I think that the comrades who did not fulfil their commitments this year will themselves draw the necessary conclusions.

Ryazan Region sold 150,000 tons of meat to the state, whereas the plan called for 50,000 tons. Thus, three annual plans were fulfilled. At the same time the collective and state farms of the region considerably increased the livestock population.

Permit me once more on behalf of the Central Committee of the Party from the rostrum of this Plenary Meeting to thank warmly the collective farmers, the workers of the state farms, agricultural experts, the Party and Y.C.L. organizations, the Ryazan Regional Committee and its Secretary, Comrade Larionov, the Regional Executive Committee and its Chairman, Comrade Bobkov, for showing a splendid example in fulfilling the obligations undertaken. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Presidium of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. are recommending Comrade Larionov for the award of the title of Hero of Socialist Labour for important organizational work in fulfilling the adopted obligations. (*Stormy applause.*)

Comrade Bobkov is recommended for the award of the Order of the Red Banner of Labour. (*Applause.*)

The Presidium of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. have instructed the regional organizations to recommend for awards of Orders and medals all those working people of the region who distinguished themselves. (*Prolonged applause.*)

There were many in the past who reproached the Ryazan people because they were producing so little meat per 100 hectares of land. I was also among those who reproached them. When I criticized their shortcomings at that time I put before them the example of Moscow Region. Now, Comrade Muscovites, pull yourselves together, because Ryazan may outstrip you. Things are nearing that stage. Ryazan Region has already outstripped many others in some fields.

According to the data of the Central Statistical Board, Ryazan Region produced 53 centners of meat (slaughter weight) per 100 hectares in all categories of farms in 1959 as compared to 54 centners in the Ukrainian S.S.R. Thus Ryazan Region is only one centner behind. However, the collective and state farms of Ryazan Region produced 35 centners of meat per 100 hectares, while those of the Ukrainian S.S.R. produced 26 centners! This is where you, Comrade Ukrainians, should pull yourselves together.

You, Comrade Ukrainians, mustn't wonder at the information I am giving you—I am reading a document signed by Comrade Starovsky, Chief of the Central Statistical Board, so that if you have any doubts or complaints then take offence at your republican Statistical Board, because the Central Statistical Board does not invent figures, but collects information from the republics and makes use of those figures.

This document further goes on to say that in Ryazan Region sales of meat to the state in 1959 in all categories of farms amounted to 58 centners of meat in live weight per

100 hectares, 35 centners in the Ukrainian S.S.R., and 29 centners in the Byelorussian S.S.R.

The sales of meat to the state by the collective and state farms amounted to 49 centners per 100 hectares in Ryazan Region, 31 centners in the Ukrainian S.S.R. and 22 centners in the Byelorussian S.S.R. Such are the facts. That is Ryazan for you, the former backward region! Ryazan was such not so long ago, but now heroes have appeared there, too.

What do these facts speak of? Not so far back Ryazan ranked with those regions which lagged behind, and very much so. Ryazan was looked down upon, as if to say, what could you expect, it was only Ryazan after all....

But not in vain is it said that it is the people who grace the earth. The Ryazan people went about their job in a fine spirit. Credit is due to Comrade Larionov: he worked very well, he spared no pains to organize the people for a great effort.

I have already mentioned it, but today I would like once more to stress another feature characterizing Comrade Larionov. We have quite a few workers who, if invited to work in Moscow, will gladly quit their jobs in other places no matter how interesting they may be. But Comrade Larionov is not such a person. We once called him to the C.C. and offered to transfer him to Moscow, to take up a quite important post. He begged:

"I ask you to let me stay in Ryazan. I love Ryazan: I see its prospects and possibilities. Let me work there, and the Party organization will show what Ryazan is capable of doing!"

We agreed with Comrade Larionov and did not take him away from Ryazan. Now you see the results: Ryazan has forged ahead. Ryazan has every possibility to join the ranks of the most advanced, to rank among the best regions in the Russian Federation, and not only in the Russian Federation, but in the Soviet Union, in general! (*Prolonged applause.*)

EXPERIENCE OF FOREMOST WORKERS CALLS FOR NEW ACHIEVEMENTS

Comrades, many people are greatly worried that their regions or republics are lagging behind the general level. It must be said that all honest people feel worried when their neighbours are getting on well while their own affairs are not so good. We are not saying that agricultural development is proceeding poorly. No, quite the contrary, our affairs are proceeding well, very well. But, comrades, it would be unwise to say that everything is well and there is now no need for us to hurry. We have won a good position after the serious lag in agriculture we had in the recent past. Now that the position is good we must win still greater successes than we have today. Every region, basing itself on the experience of the foremost workers, can make a rapid progress in agricultural development, can in literally one or two years show an example of the competent use of their possibilities. We have good people everywhere: in Ryazan, in Tula, in Kaluga, in Bryansk, in Kiev, and all other regions, we only need the ability to mobilize and organize them for great deeds.

There are many examples of successful fulfilment of obligations. Take the Comintern Collective Farm in Michurinsk District, Tambov Region, where Yevgenia Ivanovna Andreyeva is the chairman. This collective farm fulfilled its obligations ahead of time. At a meeting in Voronezh in the spring of 1957 Comrade Andreyeva on behalf of the collective farmers declared that their collective farm would in 1960 produce 170 centners of meat per 100 hectares of land. Her words at that time were like a peal of thunder. The collective farm adopted a big obligation. Many people believed that a pledge was only a promise, that chicks should not be counted before they are hatched but in the autumn. Autumn had not yet arrived, only the summer had passed: autumn would come in 1960. Still by December 2, 1959, the Comintern Collective Farm had produced 171 centners of meat and 350 centners of milk per 100 hectares of land. (*Stormy applause.*)

So you see what possibilities we have! What seemed incredible at that time, because we did not think on such a

scale, has become a reality today. And the laurels here belong to Comrade Andreyeva. She showed what Tambov Region and the collective farm she heads are capable of doing. This considerably exceeds the present level in the United States of America.

The Presidium of the Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. are recommending Yevgenia Ivanovna Andreyeva for the award of the title of Hero of Socialist Labour. (*Stormy applause.*)

There are quite a number of collective farms which this year produced 150-170 centners of meat per 100 hectares of land. All honour and glory to them because they have responded to Comrade Andreyeva's appeal, set out to make a great effort and have shown that there really are genuine possibilities for rapid progress in animal husbandry. They have demonstrated by their work how these possibilities should be put to use.

In 1959, major successes in developing state- and collective-farm animal husbandry and in increasing meat output were scored by Sverdlovsk Region (Regional Party Committee Secretary Comrade A. P. Kirilenko, Chairman of the Regional Executive Committee Comrade K. K. Nikolayev) and by Kirov Region (Regional Party Committee Secretary Comrade A. P. Pchelyakov, Chairman of the Regional Executive Committee Comrade I. F. Obyedkov) which have each fulfilled two annual plans for the sale of meat to the state. These regions are recommended for the award of the Order of Lenin. (*Stormy applause.*)

Comrades, the question of raising labour productivity is one of mechanization, one of introducing new machines, of mastering them. Today we must pay special attention to this. Visiting the Uzbek, Tajik, Kirghiz and Kazakh republics, I saw the selfless effort of the agricultural workers there. Cotton-growing is, indeed, extremely arduous labour. Not so long ago many jobs were done with a hoe. Try and wield an implement weighing several kilograms all day long under the scorching, burning sun of Tajikistan or Uzbekistan. And it was mainly women who did this work. Or take cotton-picking. You know, the women would pick thousands of kilograms of raw cotton in a season.

S. Rashidov: Some up to three tons.

N. S. Khrushchov: And those three tons not only had to be picked but carried away from the field as well! And at that time we already had cotton-picking machines. We have made so many of these machines that if people had only mastered them we could dispense with manual labour in cotton-picking altogether.

We have also machines for planting cotton by the square-pocket method and for criss-cross cultivation and there is no need to resort to the hoe.

But some people displayed their backwardness by clinging to old habits. Many fine machines were scrapped while most of the collective and state farms continued to pick cotton by hand.

When the leaders of Uzbekistan realized that, in order to organize the machine cultivation and harvesting of cotton, it was necessary to pay more attention to machines, that it was necessary to explain to the collective farmers the significance of machines and, more important still, to choose from among the farmers the most capable people, those able to master machines, matters took an entirely different turn. Comrade Rashidov described it vividly in his report when he told us how they had taken the abandoned machines and repaired them, and how with these machines people had shown examples of truly selfless labour.

So the thing is not only to supply a good machine. Some of our people are wont to blame a machine for its poor quality without themselves even knowing what it is for. Very often a good worker can make an excellent showing on a poor machine, but a poor operator, even on a good machine, will produce nothing and will only spoil it. It is necessary to reward people who make better use of machinery. There should be material rewards, and public rewards, and governmental rewards.

The Presidium of the Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. have submitted to the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet a proposal that the following people who have shown initiative in the introduction of overall mechanization of crop cultivation and achieved high productivity of labour be awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labour:

Comrade Tursunoi Akhunova (*prolonged applause*);

Comrade Valentin Afanasyevich Tyupko (*prolonged applause*);

Comrade Melikuzy Umurzakov (*prolonged applause*).

A few days ago it was announced that these comrades had been awarded the Order of Lenin. We have proposed the rescinding of that decree and that they be awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labour. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrade Tursunoi Akhunova, a machine operator on the Kirov Collective Farm, Tashkent Region, has spoken from this rostrum. We all admired her. You look at her and think how very delicate she is and yet, how energetic and persistent. And the confidence with which she set about studying her machine, she wasn't afraid of it, and she mastered it. Comrade Akhunova is competing with tractor team leader Comrade Tyupko. She is a worthy representative of the younger generation of our country. I alone, Comrade Akhunova says, pick as much cotton as one hundred people used to pick by hand.

Higher labour productivity is a decisive condition for an increased output of agricultural produce. In our country labour productivity is not raised by exploiting human energy to exhaustion, but through better use of machinery, through know-how and through better organization of work. That is why a young woman is able to do the job of one hundred people. She has achieved this because she has mastered a machine. We consider her worthy of the title of Hero of Socialist Labour. (*Applause.*) We are proud that young, energetic people displaying wonders of labour heroism are succeeding our older workers. (*Applause.*)

Nikolai Fyodorovich Manukovsky, the well-known innovator, machine operator of the Kirov Collective Farm, Voronezh Region, has also been recommended for the title of Hero of Socialist Labour. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Wonderful achievements have been scored by foremost agricultural workers who spoke here at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee. Take Yaroslav Chizh, who also spoke here. He is not only a fine pig-tender, but also an excellent speaker. Twice I have heard him speak: the first time when I was in Lvov Region where I visited the Shevchenko Collective Farm, Zolochev District, on my way back from Hungary. It then gave me pleasure to hear

him speak with such conviction. When he speaks he does not read from notes. Such a man is well able to uphold the dignity of our country even in the midst of enemies and not only when explaining his achievements to friends.

Comrade Chizh has a thorough knowledge of his job and he knows how to stick up for his opinions. Just look at what he has achieved. In 11 months of this year he has obtained more than 560 centners of pork at a cost of 224 rubles per centner of weight increase. And this, despite the fact that two or three years ago, some of our state farms used to produce pork at 1,500 rubles per centner, and continue to do so even today. But Yaroslav Chizh's pork costs 224 rubles for each centner of weight increase, and he has undertaken to produce 1,000 centners of pork at 180 to 200 rubles per centner in 1960. With pork at such a price you can have an excellent breakfast and dinner and even a pork chop for supper if you want. (*Animation.*) Comrade Chizh undertakes to produce 2,500 centners of pork in 1961.

The Presidium of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. and the Council of Ministers consider that Yaroslav Semyonovich Chizh is worthy of an award, and accordingly we have submitted to the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet a proposal to award him the title of Hero of Socialist Labour. (*Prolonged applause.*)

You have heard a speech by Ivan Nikitovich Malashenko, head shepherd of the Stalin Collective Farm, Stavropol Territory. He has employed new methods of sheep-breeding and in 1958-1959 he obtained 374 lambs from every 100 ewes and an average clip of 10 kilograms of wool per sheep. The Presidium of the Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Ministers recommend that Comrade Malashenko be awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labour. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We may expect him to receive many more awards. We are proud of such people because they display examples of labour heroism for the good of our country. (*Applause.*)

Only in our time, in our socialist country, comrades, could there possibly be shepherds capable of challenging doctors of agricultural science. (*Applause.*)

When I was a boy, before I went to work at a factory, I worked as shepherd's boy on a landlord's estate. At the

time of my childhood only those people who were unable to find any other application for their strength worked as shepherds. Today, thanks to the collective-farm system, the situation has changed, and so has the idea of this calling and of the people who engage in it.

Outstanding successes in increasing the milk yield of cows have been achieved by Vera Nikolayevna Rybachek, dairymaid of the Krasnoye Sormovo Collective Farm, Stalingrad Region, who has obtained 5,100 kilograms of milk per cow. Her whole family works in the farm's dairy department. She has even talked her husband into working as a cowman. She is a wonderful person. We consider Vera Rybachek to be worthy of the title of Hero of Socialist Labour. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Tatyana Pereshivko, a young worker of the Victor State Farm, Omsk Region, has performed a great feat of labour. She is only twenty, but she is already famous for her brilliant work. In 11 months of this year she has raised 2,076 pigs and delivered to the state 1,972 centners of pork. Tatyana Pereshivko deserves the distinguished title of Hero of Socialist Labour. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Anton Petrovich Bartulis, a worker on the Kaķenieki State Farm, Latvian Republic, has recorded an outstanding achievement. This year he has fattened 2,000 pigs and delivered them to the state and has pledged to deliver 3,000 pigs next year. Comrade Bartulis deserves the distinguished title of Hero of Socialist Labour. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We have discussed this question in the Presidium of the Central Committee and we consider that the foremost agricultural workers, the people who have been invited here, who show examples of labour heroism and capable utilization of collective- and state-farm potentialities, people from whom we constantly learn, that these people should be awarded so that they will continue to work selflessly and serve as an example to all collective and state farms.

Well-known innovators, talented organizers of collective-farm production, Yevgenia Alexeyevna Dolinyuk, Anna Mikhailovna Ladani, Makar Anisimovich Posmitny, Khamrakul Tursunkulov, Saidkhoja Urunkhojayev, Sergei Xenofontovich Korotkov, Kirill Prokofyevich Orlovsky, Ivan Fyodorovich Kabanets, Terenty Semyonovich Maltsev,

Pyotr Alexeyevich Prozorov, Alexander Vasilyevich Gitalov, Vasily Vasilyevich Grachov and many others have taken part in the work of the Central Committee's Plenary Meeting. We have submitted a proposal that the comrades who have displayed labour heroism and whose successes have earned them the title of Hero of Socialist Labour, now be awarded the Medal for Labour Valour. (*Prolonged applause.*) We discussed this question in the Presidium of the Central Committee and we came to the unanimous view that it was necessary to give greater significance to the Medal for Labour Valour. What does it mean to be awarded this medal? It means the public and official recognition of the recipient's valiant labour, it means that a comrade who has shown himself to the best advantage in labour is highly honoured for it. It is an honour for any citizen to be deemed worthy of the Medal for Labour Valour. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We think that the Medal for Labour Valour will be also awarded to others present at the Plenary Meeting who have set an example in their organizational work for the implementation of the decisions of the 21st Congress of the Party and the December Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee on the further development of agriculture. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Many wonderful examples of the fulfilment of obligations could be cited. Collective farmers, state-farm workers and agricultural experts labour selflessly for pre-schedule implementation of the seven-year programme to increase agricultural output.

Take, comrades, any republic, territory or region as an example. There are thousands of front-rank collective farmers and state-farm workers who have given us examples of high labour productivity. Their example inspires all people engaged in agriculture, their experience makes one confident that the seven-year plan targets will be exceeded.

Here, at the Plenary Meeting, considerable successes scored by many republics, territories and regions in agricultural development were mentioned. But there are also executives who do not fulfil their obligations.

This is why it is also necessary to criticize some comrades. As we say, if you have undertaken an obligation you must

carry it out. Imitating Ryazan some of the executives undertook big obligations but they did not imitate Ryazan in organizing the implementation of those obligations and landed in a puddle.

Permit me to cite some figures on Bryansk Region, for example. It undertook to produce 51,000 tons of meat (slaughter weight) on the collective and state farms in 1959 but produced only 21,000 tons in 11 months. In 1958 it produced 24,000 tons. As you see, the region not only did not fulfil its obligations but even cut down meat production as compared with last year. If obligations are to be fulfilled this way we shall not only fail to supply the country with agricultural products but shall eat up all we have.

The Bryansk executives will, evidently, try to blame this on the Lord God. Once upon a time man invented God. And although no one has ever seen God or heard him, even now some careless organizers have nothing against putting all the blame on him. (*Animation.*)

Land is not bad in Bryansk Region and there are good people there, the same working people as in the other regions and they can obtain as good results as others do. If the executives had been able to organize the people, results would have been different.

Many districts and collective farms in the regions neighbouring on Bryansk Region raise good crops on the same kind of land and have been very successful in developing animal husbandry. Let us take the collective farm in the village of Kalinovka, Kursk Region. This village is situated at the junction of three regions: Kursk, Sumy and Bryansk regions. The collective farm has this year obtained 130 centners of meat and 500 centners of milk per 100 hectares of land. Good results have been also achieved in a number of other collective farms in Kursk and Sumy regions.

It is necessary, comrades, to be able to choose people well, to be able to organize them, arouse their enthusiasm and inspire them to great deeds. But to achieve this the organizer himself must be enthusiastic, then he will be able to lead people. And if he himself is as cold as an icicle, he will not kindle fire in other people's hearts, but will only freeze them. (*Animation.*)

I can name other regions where resources were not utilized to the full and where a lag in the implementation of obligations has been incurred. There are regions which have attained good results in some fields of production but have not fulfilled their obligations in others (especially the output and sale of meat to the state).

I recall that I said to some of the comrades when they were undertaking obligations: it may happen that the fulfilment of your obligations in the field of animal husbandry may not work out as well as it does in writing. It will probably be difficult for you to carry out the plans. Perhaps it would be better for you to devote more attention to the development of fruit- and grape-growing, for you will do well in this field. But they said they would fulfil their obligations. A year has passed and their obligations are not fulfilled and they sit there and keep quiet. And although their names were not mentioned here they know whom I mean, know that they have not kept their word.

It is necessary, comrades, to take a better stock of your possibilities when making a pledge. But you must undertake your obligations boldly, as Comrade Andreyeva did, as the people of Ryazan did. And obligations must be carried out. Extensive organizational work is needed for that.

Only bold, daring people can go forward and lead others. And if you let things drift: undertake an obligation and then wait to see which way things turn, you may drift into a swamp and get stuck in it. I think there is no need to speak of this further and mention any names. Let us consider that we have given a loan, so to speak, to those who have fallen short of their pledges and hope that they will do better next year. And if they work badly we shall not forget it next year: we shall remind some executives of this year too.

WE MUST NOT REST CONTENT, WE MUST IMPROVE OUR WORK CONSTANTLY

Comrades, the working people's living standard has considerably improved in the last few years. The amount of meat products sold to the population increased by 20 per cent,

of dairy products by 10 per cent, of eggs by 9 per cent and sugar by 10 per cent in the 11 months of the current year as compared with the relevant period of last year.

During talks we had with working people we met at enterprises and collective farms, in speeches at meetings and in letters to the Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Ministers, the Soviet people thank the Party and the Government for their solicitude. Allow me to read some of the letters addressed to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.

Here is a letter from Ivan Vasilyevich Shablovsky, a war invalid residing in Leningrad where he works as a weigher at a railway station. He writes:

"I want to ask you a favour. When Mr. Eisenhower arrives in the U.S.S.R. and visits our city of Leningrad I should like to invite him to my house, let him see how I live and value my Party and Government and how they value me.

"I am a veteran of two wars. I lost all I had in the flames of the last one. But thanks to my Government and the Communist Party I, a second category invalid, have a good flat of 40 sq. m., an orchard in front of my windows, a small vegetable garden, a TV set, a radio set and a bicycle. I bought two wardrobes and two bedsteads.... My family consists of my wife, me and three children. We live well and do not wish for more. All I want to say is that I wish all people over there in the West might live as well and without worries and that the same solicitude might be shown for invalids and for the working class."

Not a bad letter, this. (*Applause.*)

Pyotr Ivanovich Polishchuk, a miner from the town of Sokolniki, Tula Region, writes to the Central Committee:

"I am writing to you from the bottom of my heart and I would like to convey to you a miner's gratitude from myself personally and from all miners of our leading pit No. 38 of the Stalinogorskugol Trust. Our Party and the Government are dear to our people, they are showing great solicitude for man. A miner myself, I, like all Soviet miners, say this—our hearty thanks to the Party and the Government for the day-to-day improvement in the miner's life."

Nina Alexeyevna Tutkina from the city of Ivanovo has sent to the C.C. a letter which says in part:

"At first I did not like you very much because it seemed that too little attention was being paid to the workers, but later I saw that everything was going for the best. Of course, not everything in life is easy going as yet, but it is impossible to do everything at once. We all realize this quite well."

This is also correct. (*Applause.*)

And here is the letter of Vera Alexandrovna Inzhevatova from the city of Stalingrad:

"It does one's heart good to see what great attention is paid to the ordinary man, to feel the solicitude of the Party and the Government for the people, it is pleasant to know that you can speak to anyone about life and openly express your opinion about the shortcomings which, unfortunately, still exist in some parts.

"Things are all right in general, but what that woman told you during your trip to Vladivostok about flooding the shops with goods because of your arrival is also correct. There are still such lovers of 'flooding the shops' among us, those who love to throw dust in the eyes of the authorities, as the saying goes. Had not you addressed that ordinary woman, asking her how things were, you might never have learned the real state of affairs. When you came to visit us in Stalingrad last year, there, too, one felt that goods, especially meat and meat products, had appeared in the shops in connection with your arrival in such quantities as had not been available before. At present Stalingrad is well provided with meat and meat products. One actually enjoys shopping—there are several kinds of sausages and plenty of meat. Only a year has passed since your visit. Your words come to our minds—meat shortage will last only for a year and then you will have meat as well. This is coming true. The heartiest thanks to the Party and the Government and to you personally as the head of the Government for the concern for the people. We have shortcomings, however. We have difficulties with knitted goods (silk), we are short of cheap fabrics, and it is not always possible to get the children's footwear and clothes you need. We hope that you will help us in this too. And we shall try to work at our factories in a way that will make our country even stronger and more prosperous. And then we shall

live still better—we are sure of this, if only peace will prevail throughout the world." (*Applause.*)

There are many such statements and many letters. People share their thoughts and express their opinions on various questions.

We have great successes to our credit. But, comrades, we must not give ourselves airs and rest on the laurels. We have quite a few shortcomings. In some areas and cities there are interruptions in the supply of food in the shops. We receive complaints about poor supplies from the workers on the state farms in Akmolinsk, Kustanai and North Kazakhstan regions of Kazakhstan. There have been some big faults in the organization of trade and public catering on the Karaganda construction sites. The supply of milk and meat in Kharkov, Dniepropetrovsk, Gomel, Rostov and Chelyabinsk regions, as well as in some cities of Georgia and Kazakhstan, has recently deteriorated. As a result the market prices for dairy products and meat in certain cities and towns have risen.

Letters indicating shortcomings in the food trade come to the Central Committee of the Party from certain regions. Engineer Galina Vasilyevna Kozyrina from the city of Omsk writes:

"Excuse me for my troubling you, but the question on which I am addressing you is rather important. At present there is no butter in the shops of our city, or in the canteens at the enterprises, for that matter. Butter is indispensable to the child, because there are no other food products that can be substituted for it. This is probably a temporary difficulty, and if so I should like to know when this state of affairs will change."

Comrades, I am telling these facts to prevent swelled heads. Otherwise, some people are apt to look through rose-coloured glasses and shout hurrah, hurrah, while they are actually allowing serious faults to occur.

Omsk Region is a good region and certain successes in the development of agriculture have been achieved there. How could it have happened that there are interruptions in the sale of dairy products? I think that Comrade Kolushchinsky, Secretary of the Omsk Regional Party Committee, and other leaders will take the necessary steps to provide a

35-2

better supply of dairy products for the working people.

These things occur in other regions. A letter from Dniepropetrovsk signed by Volodko says:

"Please send someone to Dniepropetrovsk to investigate the facts on the spot. Two weeks ago there was plenty of everything in the city—fowl and all sorts of meat and sausage products. But now, for five or six days there has been shortage of food in the shops. It is painful to hear of such shortcomings against the background of general successes. It may be that there are not enough products in Dniepropetrovsk Region, and if so ability should be shown in distributing them evenly. Otherwise, they are in abundance in August and September and there is a shortage of them at present."

People might ask how such things are to be explained. I think this is a result of the poor organization of service, for we have meat and we have it in the Ukraine as well. Comrade Kalchenko, have you got meat, or do you just have it in Kiev and not in Dniepropetrovsk? (*Animation.*)

Comrades, I am citing these facts to worry the life out of those executives who show a carefree attitude to shortcomings and dream about achieving a better way of life through their tranquil existence, who want to be applauded all the time and do not want to hear about the shortcomings which are an annoyance to the people.

We must inspire the people, call forth the enthusiasm of the working man, for the successful fulfilment of the plans of communist construction. And at the same time it is the duty of the Party organizations to carry out the most merciless struggle against shortcomings, to mobilize the masses to fight shortcomings and distortions that still exist in order to put an end to them as soon as possible and not allow them again. (*Prolonged applause.*)

It should be borne in mind that the farther we advance, and the more impressive our achievements are, the more exacting and irreconcilable will be the attitude of the working people towards shortcomings. Why? Because if there are successes in economic development, the people want to feel them in the shops and in their shopping bags. Our Party gives free play to the initiative of the working people,

gives them every opportunity for greater activity so that life in our country may become fuller and better. In our country one can say openly and directly what he thinks, say it to anyone he likes, and everyone to whom questions are addressed must reply to them.

We must, comrades, constantly improve our work, and abolish our shortcomings with determination. And the main thing is that we should increase the output of all goods.

COLLECTIVE FARMS AND STATE FARMS HAVE INCALCULABLE POTENTIALITIES

Comrades, the correct utilization of all potentialities to increase the production of grain and fodder is of the greatest importance for the further development of agriculture. We have every possibility of ensuring a regular supply of grain both for food and fodder.

Whenever we speak about the need to increase grain production, certain comrades are apt to say: let us plough more of the still unreclaimed virgin lands in Kazakhstan, Siberia and the Far East. Of course, we have reclaimed new lands and shall continue to do so, especially where no heavy investments are involved. But I would like to speak today about that virgin soil which, in fact, calls for no funds for its reclamation.

When Comrade D. S. Polyansky was preparing his report to the present Plenary Meeting he came over to consult me. During our talk I advised him to present this problem: which is cheaper and more profitable—to plough virgin land in Siberia and the Far East or use other resources for increasing grain output?

It is common knowledge that at present we have enough grain for food. As the per capita output of livestock produce grows, the consumption of food grain will decline: some of the foods prepared from cereals will be replaced owing to the greater consumption of meat, bacon, butter and milk.

What we need is chiefly fodder grain and feed to satisfy the requirements of the growing animal husbandry. The collective and state farms possess virgin lands that can be reclaimed without any expenditure of additional funds,

on which to grow fodder grain and raise various fodder crops.

What are these virgin lands? First, clean fallow in the humid zone. The collective and state farms of this zone have six million hectares of clean fallow. Here are virgin lands for you! We plough this land, and then neglect it, it becomes overgrown with grass where the collective farmers graze their privately-owned cattle. This is no new question but one that has been raised many times. What is clean fallow in fact? Actually the term has little bearing on anything "clean." Yet every year, on the collective and state farms, it is allowed to lie. Now let us turn this clean fallow into green fallow. What can be sown on this land? Everyone knows it very well. You can sow a vetch and oat mixture, reap it in time, plough the land in time, sow winter grain and you will get a bumper crop of wheat or rye.

Sow maize and you will get even more fodder units. You will harvest maize (I take Orel, Kursk or Bryansk) in August and you will get 400 or perhaps 500 centners of green fodder per hectare. Then sow wheat—and you will get a yield which will be no lower, but probably even higher than you would get on clean fallow.

Here, comrades, are six million hectares of virgin land for you! Put it into the rotation and see how many fodder units, how much additional milk and butter can be obtained by the collective and state farms. These lands, I repeat, do not call for any particular expenditure. A minimum of labour will be involved and the return will be immediate and several times more than the investment.

We have reclaimed 36 million hectares of virgin lands. If a fifth of this amount is set aside for clean fallow, as is done by Comrade Maltsev and others, there will be seven million hectares of fallow. By sowing these seven million hectares to a vetch and oat mixture or maize, it is possible to obtain a large amount of fodder for cattle. Nor would this do harm to the harvest of spring wheat. It has been said here that maize is a good predecessor to wheat. Wheat sown on clean fallow in the Chistovskoye State Farm in North Kazakhstan Region yielded 10 centners per hectare, while wheat which had had maize as its predecessor yielded 17 centners per hectare in the current year.

Maize in the newly-developed lands can provide tremendous amounts of fodder in the form of good silage. There is your beef and mutton, there is your milk.

This, of course, does not mean that all clean fallow in Kazakhstan and Siberia must be immediately planted. Regrettably, not everyone as yet has a liking for maize and can see its merits, not everyone has learned how to grow it. But, as the experience of virgin-land development areas shows, green fallow land can yield good results, given rational farming.

Consequently, if 6 to 7 million hectares of fallow land in Kazakhstan, Siberia and the Urals are added to the 6 million hectares of clean fallow land in humid regions, we shall have 12 to 13 million hectares of a kind of virgin land.

The revision of crop distribution and the substitution of higher-yield for lower-yield crops constitutes another, no less important, means of increasing the stocks of grain and fodder.

I shall cite some figures, and you will see how it works out. Collective and state farms plant mangels. A harvest of 300 centners per hectare provides 5,200 fodder units; but if mangels are replaced by sugar-beet, we get 9,500 fodder units, almost twice as much.

Considerable areas are still sown to oats. But what is the yield? Five to seven centners per hectare. Many tens of thousands of hectares in Moscow Region are under oats. What do they sow oats there for? To feed horses. But you know that horses do not work now, that the horse is a sacred animal on the collective farms of Moscow Region. (*Laughter.*)

Still greater areas are sown to oats in other regions of the non-black-earth belt.

In Kirov Region, 544,000 hectares are sown to oats and 6.9 centners per hectare is obtained; in Gorky Region, 299,000 hectares and 7.9 centners respectively; in Kalinin Region, 296,000 hectares and 8 centners; in Smolensk Region, 292,000 hectares and 5.2 centners; in Orel Region, 171,000 hectares and 8.2 centners. If maize is sown and only 300 centners is collected per hectare, the amount of fodder will immediately be increased 5 to 6 times!

Comrades, I want to make a reservation; I am not suggesting that everyone should replace oats with maize.

Preparatory work must be done for this to ensure a high yield of maize. But I am convinced that this is the right thing to do. The substitution of maize for low-yield crops opens up very big possibilities for increasing the output of fodder.

I think it is possible to cut down the planting of late potatoes on the collective farms of Moscow Region. Why? Firstly, because the city's supply of potatoes can be ensured by specialized state farms. It would be reasonable to shift a certain share in the production of late potatoes for Moscow's winter supply to Orel, Tula, Kursk and some other regions. There the conditions for harvesting potatoes in autumn are better than near Moscow. It usually rains heavily in Moscow Region in autumn, while in Orel, Kursk and Tula autumn is drier. It pays, therefore, to bring 300,000 to 400,000 tons of potatoes to Moscow over 200 or 300 kilometres and release areas for maize on collective farms near Moscow. This will increase the output of silage and the number of cows per 100 hectares of farm land. At present we deliver milk to Moscow from Tula and Orel. Would not it be better to bring potatoes instead of milk from Orel and produce milk closer to the consumer, that is to say, to get it fresh from collective and state farms around Moscow? This would be a more correct use of the potentialities of the same areas of land. It is only necessary to replace some crops by others, and within a short period of time, literally in one year, we can effect a considerable increase in the output of agricultural products.

Take Byelorussia. What area is sown to potatoes there? Hundreds of thousands of hectares. Comrade Byelorussians, you are famous as great potato lovers. But bear in mind that your forefathers did not admire potatoes as such. They ate them because they had no other food, they had nothing else to eat. Give a man meat and milk, and he will not ask for potatoes in place of milk and ham. Think this over: would not it be expedient to sow maize on some of the area previously sown to potatoes? You are getting 90 centners of potatoes per hectare. Turn to maize, and the output of fodder units will grow several-fold. You will be able to use the ears to fatten pigs and the stalks to feed dairy cattle. You will be producing more beef, butter and milk. And this does not call for any additional capital investments. The

land is already under cultivation, it only has to be utilized reasonably. I draw attention to it as an important means of increasing grain and fodder resources.

Of course, the collective and state farms will also be developing virgin lands. I was told in the Far East that there are good unused lands in Amur Region. How much of this land do you have, comrades from Amur Region?

A voice in the hall: Six hundred thousand hectares!

N. S. Khrushchov: Six hundred thousand is quite a lot. Thought should be given to growing soya in Amur Region. In the regions of the People's Republic of China bordering on Amur Region, I am told, they obtain 14 centners, and on good farms, 24 to 25 centners of soya per hectare. We, too, could grow good soya in Amur Region and produce soya oil for the food industry. This would be beneficial to the country.

Comrades, I would like to say a few words about buckwheat. It should be noted that the Party and Soviet bodies in some republics, territories and regions have failed to fulfil the Central Committee's instructions to increase the output of buckwheat. When we introduced the new system of planning in agriculture we agreed that the heads of every region and republic would ensure fulfilment of grain production plans for individual crops. What is taking place in reality? The sale of buckwheat and even millet to the state is falling year by year. In childhood, you must have heard the saying: borsch and porridge are our food. True, today Soviet people, as a rule, eat borsch with meat and porridge with milk or butter. Still, they stick to porridge. And how can the Russians or Ukrainians do without buckwheat porridge? A Russian cannot do without porridge any more than an Uzbek can do without pilaff. So the Uzbeks must have their pilaff and the Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians, buckwheat and millet porridge. The Ministry of Agriculture must see to it that the output of buckwheat and millet is greatly increased in the coming year. I think it would be useful to warn local leaders from the rostrum of the Plenary Meeting that they are responsible for ensuring that there are both buckwheat and millet porridge on Soviet people's tables. Provision must be made for this in the plans for the sale of grain to the state.

Now for the fertilization of fields. I have heard many statements by Trofim Denisovich Lysenko concerning the importance of mineral-organic composts to increase crop yields. Several years ago he took patronage over Moscow Region and conducted very useful work on collective and state farms. Then he was asked to take patronage over Gorky Region. The collective and state farms of Gorky Region used the method of fertilization suggested by Comrade Lysenko and obtained good results. Therefore dolomite and lime quarrying must be organized for preparing loam-manure and other composts.

It must be regarded as one of the most important tasks of the day to organize the accumulation, correct preservation and application of manure. The Germans have a saying: show me how you keep manure, and I'll tell you what kind of a farmer you are.

What is our attitude to manure? There is a lot of manure on collective and state farms, but it is utilized incorrectly, taken to the fields in autumn or summer and left lying in small heaps. Rains and snow leach it, wash the nutrient substances out of it, while the wind dries up the remaining straw. What remains is not manure, but ordinary straw.

Every collective and state farm must set up a kind of fertilizer factory, build manure storages and dungwash collectors and arrange the composting of peat and all kinds of waste. It goes without saying that an increase in the cattle population must be an indispensable condition for accumulating fertilizer. The more cattle, the more manure; the more manure, the higher the crop. The higher the crop, the more cattle. Such is the indisputable rule for the organization of agricultural production.

I shall not bore you with calculations, they have been published repeatedly in the press. Still there is one fact I should like to mention. To replace the necessary amount of organic fertilizers with mineral fertilizers would mean erecting many new plants and investing tens of thousands of millions rubles in it. Of course, we still cannot do that now, we cannot produce the amount of mineral fertilizers we need.

Apparently it will be worth while to think over the expediency of directing part of the means allotted for

increasing the output of mineral fertilizers to the construction of enterprises to produce urea and herbicides. Urea means nitrogen obtained from the air, urea means protein which can be added to the feed for fattening cattle. Urea will supplement maize excellently as a protein fodder. Urea is also a good fertilizer.

The accumulation of manure, I repeat, must be tackled. Some items on the best utilization of fertilizer should be worked out for socialist competition so that in this important field, too, there would appear front-rank people—directors of state farms, chairmen of collective farms and team and brigade leaders, who would raise these questions, display initiative in an important matter that is so vital to raising crop yields.

ASSUME GREATER RESPONSIBILITY FOR YOUR JOB, BE A VIGOROUS ORGANIZER OF THE MASSES

Comrades, the question that must be posed today is that of the quality of work done on the reclaimed lands, of improving the standard of farming. The reclaimed lands have adequate material means, equipment and machinery, and there are excellent people working there. The state is obtaining large amounts of grain from the areas where virgin land has been brought under cultivation. But still the new lands are not giving us even one half of what could be obtained from them if correct farming methods were used.

This Plenary Meeting has been addressed by the well-known scientist and plant-breeder F. G. Kirichenko. I have talked with V. Y. Yuryev, one of our leading scientists. The collective and state farms cannot grumble at our selectionists. They have given them good varieties and are improving them still more. This applies to both grain and oil-bearing crops. The varieties of sunflower developed by V. S. Pustovoit are of excellent quality. The same may be said about many varieties of wheat. Nevertheless, things are not so good with their introduction to the farms, and the organization of seed growing and seed distribution. Many collective farms do not know what variety of seed they are planting.

For example, if you ask what sort of maize seed should be sent to some particular region you are likely to get the answer: give us maize seed and that's all we care about. Since you are a maize expert—you ought to know best yourself! (*Laughter.*)

Such an attitude to farming is impermissible. Agriculture must be developed in such a way that it is run with real efficiency, with due account taken of the latest achievements of science and the experience of the best people on the collective and state farms. The trouble is that one still comes across agricultural executives among us who know nothing at all about agriculture and maintain contact with agriculture through the dining-room (*laughter*) but certainly know how to give instructions for farming.

Agriculture is no less complex than the other branches of our socialist economy—industry, for example. But there are some comrades who have a most superficial knowledge of farming that they got from their grandmothers and grandfathers and although a man may think he knows everything his actual knowledge may be limited to the ability to distinguish nettle from goose-foot. And if, as a little boy, he used to run around without his pants, he certainly knows what nettle is! (*Laughter.*)

In our day that sort of knowledge is clearly insufficient to farm the land efficiently. For this reason, comrades, we must pull ourselves together. I have in mind the leaders of Party organizations, Soviet and agricultural bodies, and we must pull others together. The devil is not as black as he is painted. Knowledge is something that can be acquired. Just see how our best young people are gaining knowledge. A man starts out on the job, goes right ahead and picks up his books and copy-books—he studies and very soon has learned all about his job. Take I. N. Malashenko as an example. This man came from the Soviet Army and became a shepherd, an innovator at his job. You have heard how very well he argued with a doctor of agricultural science and how this argument ended in the shepherd's favour.

Or take Yaroslav Chizh, the pig-tender. He was semi-literate but is now studying very well in secondary school. His name is Chizh,* but he flies like an eagle! (*Animation, applause.*) I am sure that Comrade Chizh is going to finish secondary school, he will receive a specialized secondary education as well and possibly a higher specialized education—that of zootechnician or some other profession. Our country offers the working people every opportunity to study.

* *Chizh*—finch.—*Tr.*

We have very fine people and in agriculture we must not only expand in breadth but in depth as well, we must not only take the road of increasing sown areas, but also the road of raising yields by the introduction of improved agrotechnical methods, we must work for a higher productivity of labour and we must reduce production costs. Our road is not that of extensive forms of conducting agriculture based primarily on increasing the sown area, but that of highly efficient intensive farming that produces the maximum output per hectare of land, and per unit of labour put in.

In 1954 I spoke in favour of the development of virgin land and we must not today give up the continuation of this work. The development of the virgin lands was a vitally important matter. A certain economic effect will be produced in the future as well by the use of new lands. But to plough up and sow land is not the hardest job of all. If the machinery, the seed and the people are supplied—virgin land can always be cultivated. What we have to do now is to launch work that is more difficult and not delay with it. We must farm in the most efficient way the land that has been ploughed up, we must raise the level of farming. In that way alone will it be possible to secure an abundance of high-quality products with the minimum expenditure of labour.

Questions pertaining to improved farming standards, to reorganizing the service given the collective and state farms by scientific institutions and experimental stations are deserving of exceptional attention. We must make better use of the achievements of science, of our leading scientists, of people whose scientific work is closely connected with practice.

Comrades, great headway has been made in the past few years in developing agriculture. But we still have many serious shortcomings. At this Plenary Meeting I should like to criticize the comrades from Kazakhstan. With the help of the peoples in all the fraternal republics, a good deal of work has been done in the Kazakh S.S.R. in recent years to cul-

tivate virgin lands and increase the output of grain. But the republic is making far from full use of its potentialities.

This year Kazakhstan failed to cope with the tasks set it and carried out very important farm work in an unsatisfactory way.

Comrade N. I. Belayev made a report here and in the debates we have heard the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh Republic, Comrade D. A. Kunayev. But these comrades did not have the courage to speak about the shortcomings in a way befitting Party members. And so, comrade leaders of Kazakhstan, in my speech I want to mention the things you preferred to keep silent about, and to show how the agricultural year ended in the republic.

This year, again, the crop was good in Kazakhstan. But because the work was poorly organized, the crop was not entirely harvested. By November 1 the grain had not been reaped and removed from an area of 1,618,000 hectares. The people from Kazakhstan, I know, have their own explanation for this. They say: part of the grain was snowed under by the first snow-fall, but we continued harvesting later. Now what sort of harvesting is that? You know how geese will peck at grass, particularly a gosling. A young goose will take a blade of grass, pull at it and sit down on its tail. A cow will not eat the grass where geese have been. (*Laughter.*) Everybody knows that. In somewhat the same way the grain left under the snow was harvested in Kazakhstan.

I may be exaggerating the situation somewhat but I think this is correct. Friendship is one thing, but work is another. There is a folk saying: you are my brother, but the truth is my mother. If at this Plenary Meeting we do not tell you the truth, comrades Belayev and Kunayev, you certainly are not going to be told it in Kazakhstan, they will applaud you there. You will say that there was a Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee and that everything went very well. As a matter of fact things are bad, very bad.

The leaders of the Kazakh Republic claim that a certain amount of the grain was not reaped because it had not ripened. Dear Comrade Belayev, but why didn't the grain ripen? I'll tell you why! Eighteen thousand of your tractors were not used in the spring sowing because they had not been overhauled. And what does that mean, comrades? It means

that the collective and state farms dragged out the sowing. When it was already time to prepare for the harvesting, the sowing was just being finished in Kazakhstan. So why put the blame on the Lord and say that the grain didn't ripen. You just sow on time, and then you will see, the Lord will say—you've done your job and I'll do mine. (*Animation.*) But you planted too late and now you say the grain did not ripen. That's the wrong way to act. And you said nothing about this at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee. Eighteen thousand tractors were not overhauled and they couldn't be used, but how many tractors gave a bad performance and actually functioned only on paper. They were driven out to the fields, came to a standstill and there they stood until the end of the sowing. That's not the way to farm, comrades!

The same shortcomings existed also in the preparations for the harvesting and the harvesting itself. According to the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Agriculture, 32,000 harvester combines, 21,000 pick-up balers and 11,000 reapers were not in use during the harvesting on the state and collective farms in Kazakhstan. Yet these machines represent a tremendous force! If you had put them into action you would have gathered in the grain before the snow came. But since these machines were not put into action, and, as has been related by Comrade Ivanov, Director of the Rostov Agricultural Machinery Works, many other machines were assembled offhand and went out of order the first few days, it is perfectly natural that the harvesting was dragged out and part of the grain was covered by snow. The poor organization of work has resulted in a great loss to the state.

I asked you, Comrade Belayev, what else you needed to ensure the timely harvesting of the crop. You replied:

"We don't need anything. We got everything. Everything will be done."

This, comrades, is how matters really stand. This is not the way to work. Pledges must be kept.

How could such mismanagement have come about? The land has been developed, work has been spent on manufacturing machines, on ploughing the land, on seed, on tending to the crop, but part of it perished. And this happened only due to poor organization of work.

Why did Ryazan Region keep its word, what ensured its success? The regional Party organization, the Regional Party Committee and its Secretary Comrade Larionov correctly organized the people to solve the task that had been set, to fulfil the pledges undertaken.

In Kazakhstan, on the other hand, organizational work was not carried on properly, there was no real leadership in the struggle for grain. In order to conduct harvesting successfully it was first of all necessary to arrange for the personnel, to select tractor drivers, combine operators and other machine operators. If it was difficult to find them on the spot assistance should have been asked for. It was possible to bring 30,000-50,000 of the best combine operators by air lift from the Ukraine and Northern Caucasus to Kazakhstan. These are good combine operators and would have ensured grain harvesting in good time. One experienced man would have worked for ten. We have great opportunities for manoeuvring, comrades, ours is a country of vast expanses and we can always render assistance to one or another republic.

Perhaps it would pay to couple, to co-ordinate, for instance, the work of the state farms of Kazakhstan with the work of the state farms of the Ukraine. Combine operators on completing grain harvesting on their state farms in the Ukraine would go by plane to Kazakhstan. Perhaps the work of the state and collective farms of Krasnodar, Stavropol, and Rostov should also be co-ordinated with that of the collective and state farms of Altai Territory and other districts of Siberia. Or let us consider the possibility of using a certain number of highly skilled people from local factories, of training them to operate combines and when the harvesting season sets in the factory director could dispatch these people to definite collective farms for work as combine operators.

We are compelled to send students, pupils of vocational schools, and office employees who do not have the necessary skill, to take in the harvest. This explains why their labour productivity is extremely low.

In a word, everything can be done, given the desire, to gather in the harvest in an organized manner and on time. It is necessary to tackle this matter in a business-

like manner. If something is needed ask the Government, ask the Central Committee, you will always find support. Of course, the Kazakh S.S.R. has no mean achievements as has been pointed out in Comrade Belayev's report. This year the republic has considerably increased the production and sale of meat to the state. If it had had such good results in grain production as well, then better opportunities would have been created for advancing livestock-breeding in 1960. But as you see Kazakhstan also has extremely serious shortcomings.

If the above-mentioned shortcomings had not been allowed to come about, our agriculture would have developed even more successfully and we would have speeded up the solution of the task of creating everything necessary to meet the requirements of our people in full.

Let us, comrades, work with still greater energy, devoting all our strength to improving the well-being of our people. A Russian proverb says that you can't back out once you've begun. Put your shoulder to the wheel, and if you feel that you are failing to cope with the task, speak up. We have splendid cadres, we can find replacements. This is not a threat, comrades. It is quite normal that when an executive fails to cope with his assignment he is replaced by a more capable person, by an experienced organizer.

You know that Ryazan Region was lagging behind for a long time. Its former leaders failed to organize and head the masses in solving great tasks. But Comrade Larionov who now heads the Party organization succeeded in mobilizing the people and putting the organizational work on a proper footing. And today the very same people are literally performing miracles. The point is that the Party gives us extremely responsible duties and it is necessary to cope with them. If you don't cope with them, make way for another man. It cannot be that our Party, with its 8 million Communists, cannot organize work in every region properly.

I spoke in detail about Kazakhstan. But there are shortcomings in the work of other republics as well. The necessary conclusion should be drawn. If we do not tell each other these displeasing things then the people will say: Why do you only speak of good things and do not note what

is bad? Then let us speak not only of achievements, but in a Party, in a principled, in a Leninist way, let us expose shortcomings and rapidly eliminate them. (*Applause.*)

MECHANIZATION OF AGRICULTURE— THE MAIN CONDITION FOR INCREASING LABOUR PRODUCTIVITY

Comrades, socialist emulation to overtake the United States of America in the per capita meat and milk output has been started throughout our country on the initiative of leading collective and state farms. We have every opportunity to overfulfil the seven-year targets for meat output, and thus make an important step forward in the achievement of this aim. This year 8.6 million tons of meat were produced in the Soviet Union. In order to carry out the seven-year plan it is necessary to increase output by another 8 million tons a year. It would be good if in addition to this figure there were a further increase of 4-5 million tons in meat production, overfulfilling the plan as a result of this emulation. Then the country would be able to catch up with the United States in per capita meat output by the end of the seven-year plan.

We have every opportunity of achieving this. In order to obtain an output of 20-21 million tons of meat in 1965 instead of 16 million tons as envisaged by the seven-year plan we must have an average annual increase of approximately 16 per cent for all categories of farms and a considerably higher increase for collective and state farms. If we ensure such an increase then the challenge of the leading collective and state farms will be met.

You can see from the results of this year that the collective and state farms have increased meat production by over 30 per cent. But with every succeeding year it will be more difficult to achieve such rate of increase. If 30 per cent of this year's volume amounts to just over one million tons, in 1960 it will be a much higher figure and in the following years the figures will be still higher. That is why we must make a very great effort.

It is, of course, not the physical effort we have in mind, but I would say primarily the organizational effort, meaning the scope of organizational and political work to be carried out among the masses. Just look at this fact: we have collective farms which produce 12 centners per 100 hectares and collective farms which under equal conditions produce 150-170 centners of meat per 100 hectares of land.

Organize matters in such a way that the collective and state farms with low production indices can make a rapid advance; then the Russian Federation, for instance, can fulfil its pledge much faster and make its contribution to the common cause, i.e., to produce an average of not less than 54 centners of meat per 100 hectares of land.

The same can also be said of the Ukrainian S.S.R. which should produce not less than 101 centners of meat (slaughter weight) per 100 hectares of land. Today, Comrade Ukrainians, we are shaking you up a bit by way of encouragement so that you won't think you are working miracles. (*Animation.*) We call your attention to Ryazan's achievements as an example worthy of emulation. The collective and state farms of Ryazan Region have already surpassed you in meat production per 100 hectares of land. Pull yourselves together, comrades, step out.

The state farms on the reclaimed land in Kazakhstan have great potentialities for developing animal husbandry. I listened with satisfaction to the speech made by Comrade A. I. Kozlov, Director of the Chistovskoye State Farm. You all know, and Comrade Kozlov spoke about it in his speech, that he made some serious mistakes when working in the agricultural department of the Central Committee. He had been granted great powers but he lacked a sufficient understanding of problems, important for the state as a whole, the ability to approach correctly the solution of intricate tasks in the sphere of agriculture. He was sent to work as the head of one of the big state farms on the newly-developed lands. And as you see he is doing well. I proposed in the Presidium of the Central Committee that Comrade Kozlov be invited to this Plenary Meeting. All the comrades supported this proposal. I must confess that I kept track of the situation on the Chistovskoye State Farm and I was told on many occasions about the good work being done there. Comrade Kozlov is a

man with an excellent training who knows his job well and I asked that a message be sent to him telling him to start introducing maize on virgin land in order to show what opportunities there are for developing animal husbandry and increasing the fodder supplies of the state farms in that part of the country. The state farm personnel has shown what possibilities there are. In 1959 the Chistovskoye State Farm planted 3,501 hectares to maize. They obtained an average of 314 centners of stalks and ears per hectare: 680 centners per hectare from an area of 397 hectares, and 1,008 centners per hectare from an area of 70 hectares. The state farm ensilaged 64,000 tons of maize, the cost price per centner of silage being 4 rubles 80 kopeks.

In 1959 the state farm sold 7,800 centners of meat to the state instead of the 4,400 centners planned.

Comrade Kozlov was correct in raising the question of sheep-breeding on the state farms on the new lands and in saying that we must not allow it to be squeezed out. When we started to develop the new lands, many people said that sheep-breeding should be shifted from the northern areas of Kazakhstan to the southern and south-eastern areas. At that time there were some who submitted to that mood. Now the matter has to be rectified. Kazakhstan's new state farms have fairly good conditions for the breeding of fine-fleeced sheep.

In 1960 the state farm will plant 4,500 hectares to maize.

The people there have set themselves the target to produce 100 centners of meat and 321 centners of milk per 100 hectares of land in 1965. Here you see what maize means in the newly-developed lands!

We believe that Comrade Kozlov deserves to be awarded the Order of Lenin for such work. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Our Party criticizes an executive when he deserves it, but it values men and forgives old mistakes, decorates people when they improve and show a good example of work. (*Stormy applause.*)

Comrades, the mechanization of farm work is now the main thing in raising the productivity of labour and lowering production costs. Many people have spoken about it here and we are considering the question of further mechanization in agriculture.

Comrade A. F. Zasyadko has spoken at this Plenary Meeting. He toured enterprises, met people and reported to the Central Committee on the results of his tour. He is a critical-minded, so to speak, man and does not tolerate shortcomings—which is a very good quality. He told me about the shortcomings he had noticed and I advised him to speak at the Plenary Meeting. Most of his critical remarks are correct. Unfortunately, some of our tractors are too heavy and some other machines have serious faults.

In his speech at the Plenary Meeting, Comrade V. V. Matskevich tried to put up a defence against the critical remarks levelled at the Ministry of Agriculture by Comrade Zasyadko. You, Comrade Matskevich, are a more adroit speaker than Comrade Zasyadko. (*Laughter, applause.*) But his criticism of you was correct. In point of fact we have cases of agricultural machines being produced without the specific features of the various zones being taken into account. There are also other faults in the way the problems of overall farm mechanization are being tackled. It is impermissible to hush up these shortcomings, and you, Comrade Matskevich, are wrong where these problems are concerned.

A few words regarding the manufacture of land-reclamation equipment. This question was dealt with here by Comrade M. E. Matsepuro. I have long known him as a talented scientist and greatly respect his highly useful activity. The collective and state farms need land-reclamation equipment. So far, however, we do not have enough metal to cover all requirements in machines. Our metal output is growing very rapidly but the demand for metal is increasing still faster. I think that we can find additional metal resources for agriculture. Our metallurgists can help agriculture: they can step up their work and turn out metal above target. This will make it possible to allocate a certain amount of metal for the production of agricultural machines, including land-reclamation equipment. Progress in agriculture calls for an increase in the output of tractors and other farm machines and implements. Attention must be focussed on mechanizing the most labour-consuming operations, such as the cultivation of sugar-beet and cotton. Good proposals have been made in this field.

Our industry will continue to provide the farms with an increasing amount of new equipment and machinery. Perhaps, a special committee should be set up to approve new models of agricultural machines. It would be advisable to have agricultural experts from the various republics on this committee so as to give fuller consideration to the specific requirements of the various zones of the country.

Many comrades have spoken here about the repair and maintenance stations. Incidentally, this question was also raised during my conversations with the Ukrainian collective farmers at the time of my recent tour of the Ukraine. Some comrades suggest converting certain repair and maintenance stations into inter-collective-farm repair workshops. This has also been favoured by many speakers at the Plenary Meeting. The suggestion deserves attention.

Proposals have also been made to set up collective-farm associations. They were made as far back as the discussion on the reorganization of machine and tractor stations. This matter, among other things, was then taken up also in my memorandum to the Central Committee. We exchanged views in the Central Committee on this question and decided not to set up, so far, special bodies of the collective-farm-centre type.

Now it is again said that in expanding ties between collective farms new organizational forms conducive to the development of these ties must be found. We, obviously, should not set up again collective-farm centres, but we should seriously consider the question of inter-collective-farm organizations in the districts, because many problems have accumulated which require the collective farms' joint efforts. Now that we have established rather large collective farms, it is not always advisable to continue amalgamating them, because this may impair management efficiency. The efforts of the collective farms should be pooled in such matters, for example, as the construction of electric-power plants, roads, boarding-schools, etc. This is rational and should be done.

The proposals advanced at the Plenary Meeting on this question deserve attention.

There is an urgent need to expand the training of farm engineers for the collective and state farms. Now

that the collective and state farms own much diverse complex equipment, this is extremely necessary.

The time has come to tackle the problem of cultivating such crops as cotton, sugar-beet, potatoes, soya, beans, and others without the use of hand labour. This will greatly raise labour productivity and reduce production costs.

I should like to speak particularly about the saving accruing from square-pocket planting of cotton. Wherever this progressive method is applied, it has demonstrated its advantages.

Here are some interesting calculations made by specialists:

In cotton-planting the ordinary row-crop method takes 153 kilograms of seed per hectare.

The square-pocket method—77 kilograms.

And the square-pocket planting with a specified number of seeds deposited in each hole—22 kilograms.

These comparative figures eloquently speak for themselves.

In our country we have 2,132,000 hectares under cotton. And for this area we need:

by the row-crop method—326,000 tons of seed,

by the square-pocket method—164,000 tons,

and by the square-pocket method with a specified number of seeds per hole 47,000 tons, or some 7 times less.

Thus, the latter method saves 279,000 tons of seed as compared with the row-crop method.

One ton of cotton seed yields: 170 kilograms of oil, 400 kilograms of oilcake, 300 kilograms of husks, and 30 kilograms of lint.

The seeds saved will yield: 47,000 tons of oil, 112,000 tons of oilcake, 84,000 tons of husks, and 8,000 tons of lint. The value of all these products runs into 924 million rubles.

To go over to the square-pocket method with a specified number of seeds per hole 52,000 seed-drills will be required. They cost 260 million rubles. Thus the seeds saved will in one year pay off the cost of all the seed-drills and leave over 664 million rubles. Besides that what a tremendous saving will be achieved by reducing labour expenditure! Nor is it here only a matter of economic advantage. We are interested in making labour easier and ensuring its greater productivity.

At the same time I would like to reiterate that I do not advance the slogan: Let's go over to this method everywhere and at such and such a time. The change over to this method should proceed gradually as the personnel able to operate the new drills are trained.

Experience shows that the square-pocket method is effective also for the mechanization of sugar-beet cultivation. At last a way has been found to solve the problem of mechanizing such a complex job as growing sugar-beet. True, the square-pocket method is so far not being applied to sugar-beet. The collective and state farms plant it by the ordinary row-crop method, then cluster the plants and cultivate the crop criss-cross, which saves much labour. And this is good.

But we have to try and produce a drill and to master the square-pocket method of beet-planting. It would be even better if beet were planted by the square-pocket method using single-shoot seeds in order to avoid the laborious job of thinning. If we achieve this it will be possible to release a great number of farmers now engaged in beet-growing and to expand beet plantations in the old sugar-beet regions, especially in the Ukraine. Although the Ukrainians have done a good job and considerably expanded sugar-beet plantations, great potentialities remain untapped in several regions of the republic, notably in the west.

We are most pleased with the prospect of expanding plantations of sugar-beet in Siberia where the crop bears well. I was shown excellent beet grown in Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk and Novosibirsk—some really amazing roots weighing up to five kilograms. If we push beet crops to that area we shall have scored a major achievement. The beet is called sugar for good reason: it is both tasty and nutritious. Sugar-beet products are a pleasing addition to a dinner table. Sugar-beet is a very profitable crop for the collective farms and the country as a whole and provides a good revenue for the state budget, and that is why our Minister of Finance, Comrade A. G. Zverev, is greatly in favour of it. (*Animation.*)

Besides, the pulp left after processing sugar-beet is a valuable fodder. We also know that sugar-beet is a fine predecessor for other crops. That is why this crop deserves

the greatest attention. It is necessary to continue expanding sugar-beet plantations and to devote more attention to seed-breeding and the mechanization of sugar-beet cultivation.

WE MUST CONTINUE TO STRENGTHEN COLLECTIVE FARMS BY PROVIDING EXPERIENCED PERSONNEL

The question of personnel, their correct placing, education and able use, is the cardinal question in all our work. Sometimes people wrongly approach this most important matter. I shall cite a concrete example.

The Central Committee has received a letter from the members of the Lenin Banner Collective Farm, Dmitrovsk District, Orel Region, signed by 53 people on behalf of the general meeting of the membership. Here is what they wrote:

"On November 28, 1959, the chairman of our collective farm, Comrade Stepan Nikitovich Fak, was appointed First Secretary of the Dmitrovsk District Committee of the C.P.S.U. We are very much grieved and distressed by this.

"Our chairman, Comrade Fak, was sent to our collective farm in 1954 after holding the office of zone secretary of the District Party Committee; now Comrade Fak has been transferred without the collective farmers being consulted on the matter. Before his arrival our farm was lagging behind, the economy was in a very bad way and animal husbandry seriously neglected. Comrade Fak was able to mobilize the collective farmers and to build up labour discipline. We felt that a real leader had come to our collective farm, we all did our best to work honestly, and the farm began to progress rapidly.

"We think that the action of the Orel Regional Party Committee was wrong. Is it possible that there is nobody in the whole region or among the personnel of the Regional Party Committee who can be appointed Secretary of the Dmitrovsk District Committee? It seems to us that it should be easier to find someone to work as secretary of a district committee than a collective-farm chairman (*animation*) who, like Comrade Fak, would take so much interest in his work and devote himself completely to it."

Appended to the letter was a resolution of the collective-farm general meeting which reads:

"1. To send a collective-farm delegation to the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. with a request that Comrade Fak be permitted to remain chairman of the Lenin Banner Collective Farm.

"2. The general membership meeting considers that Comrade Fak should not be relieved of his duties as chairman of the collective farm.

"3. The general membership meeting requests the C.C. of the Party and Comrade Khrushchov personally to permit Comrade Fak to continue leading the collective farm."

Comrades, this is not a bad resolution. (*Animation, applause.*)

In connection with this letter and the resolution of the collective-farm meeting I should like to ask the Secretary of the Orel Regional Party Committee, Comrade V. S. Markov, who is an experienced Party functionary, how it could have happened that in the regional committee they were unable to understand a thing which the collective farmers understand very well. Why do you engage in a controversy with the collective farmers instead of taking account of their wishes and their will? Such actions of the regional committee are contrary to the Party line.

The Party is doing all it can to engage efficient leaders directly in organizational work. Please understand, my dear Comrade Markov, that it must be realized by us all that where there is an efficient collective-farm chairman it is easier for the district committee to do its job of leadership. Then, one might say, a district Party committee secretary can visit such a collective farm for rest and a bit of honey, if he likes it, of course. (*Animation.*) When a collective farm has an efficient leader there is no need to have all kinds of representatives on such a farm, because there is nothing for them to do there. If you take an efficient chairman and appoint him district Party committee secretary, he will, of course, be unable to deal with collective-farm affairs directly as he did before. What we need now is good leaders for each district, each collective farm and each state farm, men who are excellent organizers and have a perfect knowledge of their jobs. Then work will go on still more successfully!

So, Comrade Markov, please let Comrade Fak remain as collective-farm chairman. All of us, our whole Plenary Meeting, appeal to you: please, satisfy the collective farmers' request. (*Animation, applause.*)

It is a thing to take pride in, comrades, if the collective farmers ask that a good Communist and organizer be permitted to continue managing their collective farm.

The enemies of communism claim that with the development of culture in the Soviet Union the social system will change, that the Soviet people will no longer put up with the existing system. They do not understand the meaning of real freedom for the workers, for the people. The exponents of capitalism try to represent the capitalist world, the world where people of labour are exploited, as a free world.

If they consider capitalism a free world, then they are narrow-minded and unfortunate people; they are to be pitied for not being able to understand what real freedom for the people means. Freedom exists where man is free from the chains of exploitation by capital.

Is not this a wonderful example I have mentioned—the collective farmers regard themselves the true masters of the Soviet land? We Communists have every right to be proud of the fact that collective farmers have sent a delegation to Moscow to appeal that a Communist, a district committee secretary, be restored to them as their leader, as the head of their collective farm because he knows his job well, is an able organizer of people and because with him they have come to work better. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, the request of the collective farmers must of course be satisfied and Comrade Fak must be left to continue as collective-farm chairman. And wherever requests are voiced to send a good organizer to a weak or lagging collective farm, we must comply. We can provide a man as good as Comrade Fak for every collective farm.

This has to be done, Comrade Markov, and you must see to it that the region makes good progress.

The soil in Orel Region is excellent. If you have insufficient experienced personnel, just tell us and we shall ask other regions for people. We have many fine workers and

they should be directed to those sections which are lagging behind. Everything must be done to give the region a worthy place in the front ranks.

I would also like to say a few words to the people of Kursk Region, my compatriots, I want to criticize them. Not much time has passed since Comrade L. N. Yefremov was transferred to another region, but the workers of the Kursk Regional Party Committee and the Regional Executive Committee have already issued several incorrect instructions on agriculture in disregard of the experience and opinions of the collective farmers. For example, they hit on the brilliant idea of instructing the collective farmers of Kalinovka Village, where maize has been grown for many years, to refrain from harvesting some 100 hectares of maize for silage and leave the crop to grow to seed. But the farmers of Kalinovka have no need for teachers in this subject. They themselves know how to run their farm. But since the regional authorities "instructed" them to grow seed themselves they complied. And what came of this? Neither one nor the other, as the saying goes—neither silage nor good seed. Why should this have been done? We have grown out of such things. Don't try to be too clever, comrades, and don't display your ignorance. Seeds should be grown in seed-breeding establishments.

Take American experience as an example. There every farmer does not grow his own maize seed. He buys it from a firm which specializes in seed-breeding. And here we have some of our people wishing to grow maize for both silage and seed on their farms. This is primitive. It is wrong to do so. We live in an age of specialization and our enterprises should be specialized.

We have organized excellent maize seed-breeding enterprises. We should also organize seed-breeding enterprises for other crops, only then shall we be able to sow really better seed.

Some executives think that if they have good, high-grade seed today, they will have them all their life. Such a conception is primitive. No matter how good the seed is it loses its qualities in time. Plant-breeders work to improve old varieties of seeds and to produce new ones, and it is this seed that should be used.

PAYMENT FOR LABOUR ON COLLECTIVE FARMS SHOULD STIMULATE THE GROWTH OF PRODUCTION

Comrades, those who delivered reports and those who spoke here have raised the question of payment for labour on collective farms. This was dealt with by Comrades S. R. Rashidov, T. U. Uljabayev, V. P. Mzhavanadze and others. I believe the question has been raised by them correctly.

It is well known that in our factories the rates of output and the rates of pay are regularly revised, in accordance with the growth of labour productivity. This is a normal thing, and the workers understand well the need for such practices.

In 1953, when many of the collective farms were in difficulties, the Soviet state, in order to help them to get to their feet, agreed to a substantial increase of the prices for collective-farm produce, despite the fact that some of the collective-farm produce even then cost more than that supplied by many of the state farms. If we were to approach the matter in a commercial way we might have argued as follows: why raise prices when the collective-farm produce costs the state too much as it is. But in this case we were not guided by commercial considerations, but by the need to help the farmers overcome a lag, to improve their collective farms.

When the prices of collective-farm produce were being fixed we knew that we were offering high prices for certain crops and products. But we understood that unless we raised prices the collective farms would not get over their difficulties, that the collective farmers would not have sufficient earnings: inasmuch as pay for labour would be low its productivity would not grow.

Now that our collective farms have got on their feet and moved forward, the earnings of the collective farmers have increased. In some regions they even considerably exceed a worker's wages. This is unjust. You know that the working class is the leading force in our society. The workers and peasants together, in close alliance, waged the struggle against the landlords and capitalists, established and consolidated Soviet power, fought against the counter-revolution in de-

fending the gains of the Great October Revolution. They fought together against the fascist invaders, defending the honour and independence of the country, now they march together in close alliance towards communism. And what does it mean to march together towards communism? It means to work together, to create public wealth and to receive payment for labour such as would not be considered unfair either by the workers or by the collective farmers. In my opinion this is right, comrades.

Voices: Right!

N. S. Khrushchov: Absolutely right. (*Applause.*)

Some of the collective farms have made good headway in the matter of payment for labour. They have advanced not only because of their work, but also because the state pays high prices for their produce. The seven-year plan envisages a growth of the incomes of factory and office workers and collective farmers. We must see to this and justly regulate the payment of labour. I, therefore, hold correct the initiative of the comrades who propose that the prices of certain agricultural produce should be revised. It is very important that this proposal has been made by those republics in which the incomes and payment of labour of the collective farmers have greatly increased in recent years. The Uzbek, Tajik, Turkmen, Kirghiz and Georgian collective farmers understand this matter correctly.

It must be borne in mind that far from all collective farmers receive excessive pay for their labour, 40-50 rubles per workday. If we take Georgia, for instance, the pay for the workday is high among the collective farmers of the Black Sea coast where citrus fruits are grown. On the plains and in the mountains, however, the collective farmers have the same incomes as those in other republics.

Voices: Right.

N. S. Khrushchov: We must give warning, however, that in carrying out this important work a thoughtful and circumspect approach is necessary to avoid bungling the whole thing.

In determining the pay for labour on collective farms the following circumstance should also be considered. We have good collective farms with a high labour productivity. We must see to it that they continue to hold a leading posi-

tion and are not thrust back by the change of prices of certain farm products.

It is very difficult, of course, to fix prices for produce that are suited to all collective farms. We have different collective farms. For one collective farm a certain price will be acceptable but for another collective farm, which has not yet reached high productivity, it will be low. But, of course, prices for products cannot be fixed for each individual farm. We must be guided by the principle that the purchasing prices for products and the pay for labour on collective farms should stimulate the growth of production.

I repeat once more that the matter must be approached with great caution. Some prices must be revised. It is advisable to regulate payment for the labour of the collective farmers by decision at each particular collective farm. For instance, the pay for a workday unit in a given zone should be fixed on a level that should not, as a rule, exceed the wages of a worker on a state farm of the given zone doing similar work.

We must establish such an order of payment of labour on collective farms as would preclude excessive, totally unjustified earnings, but must do it in such a way as to preserve the material incentive, as not to deprive the farmers of the stimulus for the further development of collective production. More money will be transferred to the farms' non-distributable assets, in the inter-collective-farm building of roads, boarding-schools, day schools and hospitals. This will benefit both the collective farms and the collective farmers.

The state has helped and continues to help the economically weak collective farms by credits and loans. Some of these collective farms have been reorganized, at the desire of the collective farmers, into state farms, the collective farmer has become a state-farm worker, he gets wages and enjoys all the benefits to which a worker is entitled. I think that if we explain all this correctly to the collective farmers they will understand it.

Thus, as the mechanization of farming expands, the skills of the collective farmers rise and the organization of labour improves, it is advisable that output norms and

payment rates on the collective farms be revised systematically and more progressive ones be established, as is being done in industry. This will ensure a continuous rise in labour productivity, an increase in accumulations for the extended reproduction in the collective economy and a higher living standard for the farmers.

Increased output of farm products and a lower cost price, with the incomes of the collective farms and of their members simultaneously rising, will make it possible to reduce the retail prices of these products, which will lead to a further improvement in the living standard of all Soviet people. The pay for the collective farmers' labour must not grow faster than the wages of workers in the district or region concerned. The workers and collective farmers, who by their joint labour create the country's material wealth, should advance in step as they raise their standard of living.

Comrades, I want to say something about certain defects in the payment for the labour of state-farm workers. On the state farms of Kazakhstan, for instance, according to data provided by the department for financing the state farms at the republican Ministry of Agriculture, the administrative apparatus is greatly inflated. There is an average of 110 workers of this apparatus per state farm, including 25-30 book-keepers, accountants, and registering clerks. In the course of a single month 15,000 different work sheets, registration sheets and other accounting documents containing 1,800,000 items relating to the recording of work and wages must be filled in by the state farm.

It is impossible to keep check of this vast amount of documents so that in practice there is no control of the way wages are calculated and there are serious violations and cases of payment for work which has not been done. Thus, in the Karasu State Farm of Kustanai Region, driver M. G. Bessarab received for one month 6,140 rubles, instead of the 761 rubles which he actually earned. On the Severnoye State Farm of Kokchetav Region the drivers of garage No. 6 of the Ministry of Grain Products received 772,000 rubles on faked way bills.

Apparently the present system of wages and accounting is highly complicated. It is confusing, obsolete, and makes

it impossible to ensure really correct accounting and control. The correct organization of planning, rate-setting, accounting for work done and the system of wages in the state farms, is the task of the Ministry of Agriculture, it is your duty, Comrade Matskevich. You may recall that you have been told about it before.

Agricultural science plays an ever-growing role in the development of agricultural production. We must bring science even nearer to production, we must be bolder in appointing young, capable, gifted scientists to the Academy of Agricultural Sciences and institutions, so that they can enrich science by their knowledge and help the practical workers in managing their farms. The scientific institutions should do a substantial part of their research on the basis of orders from the practical farmers.

Much work in building up and improving the villages has been accomplished in the last five years. Three and a half million homes and many schools, hospitals, polyclinics, nurseries and kindergartens have been built in the countryside. The Chairman of the Red October Collective Farm, Comrade P. A. Prozorov, who has addressed this Plenary Meeting, devoted most of his speech to this question. I think that what he said is correct and agree with it. It is already time for us to look a little ahead. I have recently visited the Ukraine and seen the village of Ksaverovka. It is a very good and big village. But in many respects building there still goes on in the old way.

Of course, it would be wrong at present to foist upon the collective farmers many-storied houses, for instance. They are not used to it. But we ourselves should steer a course towards it, we shall approach this question closely, tomorrow if not today. The maintenance of many scattered houses costs more than that of dwelling-houses concentrated around one point. It is also more difficult to improve such a village, for it is necessary to build many sidewalks and pavements, to lay pipelines for water and sewerage. Bear in mind that if a collective farmer says today that he does not need any sewerage, within a year or two he will demand it. It will be you and I who will be blamed for not having suggested to him the best way of building his home. That is why we must help the collective farmers by advice in

the building of villages and enlist the assistance of architects. I have talked with the peasants about that.

I ask them:

"What do you think of two-family houses?"

They answer:

"A two-family house is a good thing."

"And what about a house for four families?"

"That's worse."

"Why?" I ask them.

"Because two of the flats will be on the sunny side and the other two will have no sun."

"This is true," I say. "But it is possible to design a four-flat house in such a way that all the flats will be on the sunny side. There are such houses in Moscow."

The question of rural building and improvement should be given more attention now.

What does it mean to rebuild the village? This is not simply replacing old houses by putting up new ones. The task now is to build new socialist villages in place of the old villages which had taken shape under the system of private farming.

Along with good farm buildings, the new villages must have comfortable dwelling-houses, day and boarding-schools, clubs, catering establishments, hospitals, homes for the aged, public service establishments, baths, etc.

Rural communities should be well appointed and compact.

Patience is necessary in rural construction and improvement as in any other important matter. This is a vital question, of course, but it must not take the shape of a drive. We shall solve the task of rebuilding villages all the more successfully if we concentrate greater attention on increasing the output of agricultural products, mechanizing production operations, and increasing the accumulation of funds. Let those build who have the funds and possibilities. Moscow, as they say, was not built in a day. Let us first begin by building two-storey houses for two families. Some time will pass and then it will be safe to build more compact villages, and houses with a large number of flats.

There are, for instance, two houses standing on Mozhaisk Highway on the outskirts of Moscow. Several thousand people live in these two houses. One such house can be built to accommodate all the residents of a big collective farm. They could live like the Muscovites. It is possible in such a big house to have a shop, a nursery, and a school—everything would be close at hand and so it would be easier to serve the population more efficiently.

But what townspeople have grown accustomed to is something which the collective farmer has not yet reached. Therefore, we must pay tribute to time and to the habits of people. What conclusion can we make? Greater caution is necessary. We must do what the collective farmers want. Let them understand this themselves. If a well is dug in the wrong place, there will be no drinking water. Instead of bringing joy, it will only poison a man's life. It is necessary to take into account the requirements of the collective farmers, and to give consideration to their desires.

Comrades, this Plenary Meeting of the C.C. is a plenary meeting for the mobilization of resources of agriculture. This enlarged Plenary Meeting has been, to a certain extent and in a way, a Party conference. Present here are all the secretaries of the regional Party committees, chairmen of the regional executive committees, and some secretaries of district Party committees. A large number of Party activists, scientists, collective-farm chairmen, and innovators in production—machine operators, pig-breeders, dairymaids, and others—are taking part in the work of the Plenary Meeting. Here are many non-Party people, who always work together with the Party. Our strength lies precisely in the fact that the activities of the Party combine with the activities of the entire people, that non-Party people work side by side with members of the Party.

Now, after the Plenary Meeting of the C.C., when the comrades return home, to their collective and state farms, new pledges for the fulfilment and overfulfilment of plans ought perhaps to be worked out. The pledges this year were very good. You should not be afraid of the fact that some failed to fulfil their pledges—burned their fingers, so to speak. They have failed today, but tomorrow they will be able to fulfil them. There is a need for daring. Some may draw the wrong conclusion from the criticisms: we did not fulfil the plan, we were criticized, now we will adopt a

smaller pledge and fulfil it. But in this way they will not evade just criticism. We will criticize them for not displaying daring, for not having confidence. We will find arguments for criticizing such an attitude. Although you may not have reached the target, you still have accomplished a great deal, you have scaled a breath-taking height. We therefore urge you to take on a good, reasonable load. The main thing is to be able to select people, place them properly, organize and inspire them to work. The people will do everything they can to achieve equally high results in their work as those achieved by the Ryazan people, who have become a good beacon on the road of agricultural progress.

We shall confer in the Presidium of the C.C. and perhaps call a special plenary meeting of the C.C. in December 1960 to sum up the results of agricultural development in the second year of the seven-year plan. This will be a very good stimulus. Everyone will be able to prepare beforehand for the Plenary Meeting of the C.C. and to report on the results of his work.

Our achievements, in the final analysis, are brilliant. The enemies of socialism are today discouraged by the victories of the Soviet Union. With these victories we can move on more confidently to fresh achievements. We have scaled a great height and gathered good speed. Therefore, today it is already easier to gear to the next, still higher speed and to ascend a new height.

We are confident that when the comrades return from the Plenary Meeting of the C.C. to the republics, territories, and regions, to the collective and state farms, and to the industrial enterprises they will report to all the working people about the work of the Plenary Meeting and about the successes of our agriculture, and will boldly disclose all faults, adopt new pledges, and carry out militant organizing work.

We must not be afraid of criticism of shortcomings. In our society you will never make enemies through just criticism. Criticism at first acts unpleasantly on the comrades being criticized, but then it is also unpleasant for those who do the criticizing. Of course, it is easier to praise than to criticize, but we cannot hesitate to criticize when faults

are observed. This would be a crime against the Party. Don't be afraid of criticizing shortcomings. If someone you criticize does not understand your criticism correctly the worse it will be for him. It means that he does not understand the essence of the matter. The people will always support you in just criticism and will still closer rally around the Party in order to work better and thus ensure bigger successes in fulfilling the tasks set by the 21st Congress in the struggle for the building of communism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party is concluding its work. It has summed up the results of progress in agriculture in the country for the past year, the first year of the seven-year plan. These results show that our socialist agriculture is on the right road. Those who work on collective and state farms have achieved good results. Greater prospects lie ahead of them. All that is necessary is to work honestly, to fulfil your duty to the people, and our successes will multiply.

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, in carrying out the decisions of the 21st Congress of the C.P.S.U., has outlined concrete measures to expand agriculture, increase the output of farm produce and reduce cost prices, and strengthen collective farming.

The decisions of the Plenary Meeting of the C.C. will call forth a new patriotic upsurge among the working people of our country in their struggle for the fulfilment and overfulfilment of planned production assignments and their socialist emulation pledges. They will give rise to a new wave of popular initiative, of the labour and political activity of the Soviet people.

On to new victories in the development of socialist agriculture, in the building of communist society! (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)