

Nations possible. Although this question could not in their view be discussed only in relation to its budgetary and administrative aspects, however, both the Russian and Chinese delegations claimed that the estimates of the Secretary-General, even as reduced by the Administrative Committee, were grossly inflated, and detailed figures were produced in an attempt to show that the additional cost to the United Nations of the adoption of either of these languages would be less than the cost of Spanish.

Those delegations which held the contrary view paid tribute to the traditions and great inherent worth of both the Russian and Chinese languages, and to the contribution to victory made by the Russian and Chinese peoples, but denied that such considerations could be taken into account, since it might be argued with much the same justification that other languages also be made working languages of the General Assembly. For instance, it was pointed out that millions in India spoke a common language and that Arabic also was spoken by a great number of people and was a language employed by a greater number of delegations than either Russian or Chinese. In the view of the opponents of the proposals the facilities now provided under the existing rules of procedure (in accordance with the practice which had grown up) made it unnecessary to impose additional administrative and financial burdens on the General Assembly. Nor could the adoption of Spanish as a working language be used as a precedent, since this language was employed by nineteen member States. Finally, the fact that a large number of people spoke a language and that these people wished to have United Nations documents in their language could not be used as an argument for its acceptance as a working language of the Assembly, since the official records and working documents of this body were intended primarily for the use of member Governments and their representatives, and it was the duty of the official Department of Public Information to inform the general public of all countries regarding the work of the United Nations.

The *New Zealand* delegation, which had voted against the adoption of Spanish, opposed the present proposals for the same reason—namely, that they were not justified on the grounds of practical necessity. The New Zealand representative stated that no question of prestige or politics should be allowed to influence the decision. In Paris his delegation had expressed friendly understanding and appreciation of the arguments advanced in favour of Spanish, but had considered that they were outweighed by the financial and administrative drawbacks of its adoption as a working language. It regarded the Chinese and Russian proposals with the same appreciation and understanding, but could not justify the financial and administrative burden which their adoption would entail. There was full scope, within the existing rules