

As the United Nations has expanded, some of its agencies have lost their focus and become bogged down in tasks that duplicate efforts elsewhere in the system or serve little purpose but to employ bureaucrats, critics charge. Meanwhile, financing problems have grown acute, especially with the explosion in recent years of expenses for peacekeeping, a function that was not specifically spelled out in the original charter.

The U.N. peacekeeping budget this year bulged to \$3.5 billion, far exceeding the regular U.N. budget of \$2.6 billion. Moreover, several countries, including the United States, owe U.N. dues totaling hundreds of millions of dollars. Unpaid peacekeeping dues for Bosnia alone come to \$900 million.

The Bosnian quagmire has underscored the limits of U.N. peacekeeping. Critics, notably in the U.S. Congress, have tended to blame U.N. bureaucrats for the mess, while U.N. officials say the operation exemplifies a penchant by member states for setting heavy new mandates without providing the resources to carry them out.

"Member countries should take advantage of the 50th anniversary to really look hard at the U.N. and to revise and strengthen it," said Catherine Gwin of the Washington-based Overseas Development Council. "Increased demands are being made on an organization that has been neglected, misused and excessively politicized by its member governments for years, and it is showing the strain."

As the United Nations has expanded, forming entities that deal with topics from outer space to seabeds, the original purpose often has been overlooked. That is, as the U.N. Charter's preamble states, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind."

While scores of conflicts costing millions of lives have broken out since that signing 50 years ago, some of the organization's promoters say it deserves a share of credit for averting its founders' worst nightmare: World War III. Clearly, the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the subsequent nuclear standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union may have been the main deterrents, but the world body also played a role, U.N. supporters say.

"If we didn't have the United Nations, we would have had another world war," said Bernardino in an interview in her New York apartment, where she keeps an office filled with U.N. mementos. On her desk is a large silverframed, personally dedicated photograph of her role model, Eleanor Roosevelt, and in her drawer is an original signed copy of the U.N. Charter.

At the time of the signing, U.S. public opinion held that there would be a third world war by the early 1970s, Stassen said.

"We believed we were going to stop future Hitlers from future acts of aggression," said Brian Urquhart, a Briton who joined the United Nations shortly after the conference and rose to become an undersecretary general. "There was an enormous sense of confidence and optimism in the charter . . . led by the United States. This was predominantly a U.S. achievement."

Indeed, the United Nations was principally the brainchild of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who gave the organization its name and reached agreement on its formation with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Soviet leader Joseph Stalin.

At the San Francisco conference, however, major problems developed over decolonization and the Soviets' insistence on a broad veto power over virtually all Security Council business, even the setting of agenda items and the discussion of disputes. Initially, the Soviets had also wanted 16 votes in the Gen-

eral Assembly, adding one for each of their 15 republics. They eventually settled for three after it was pointed out that by that logic, the United States ought to have 49 votes.

According to Stassen, who served as Minnesota's youngest governor before joining the Navy during the war and who went on to seek the Republican nomination for president four times, his wife Esther played a key role in resolving the veto impasse. Some of the Soviet delegates' wives had told her that Stalin had set the veto position and none of their husbands dared ask the dictator to modify it, Stassen said. But if the Americans could present their arguments directly to Stalin, he might change his mind, the wives advised.

Stassen said he reported this to President Truman, who had taken office upon Roosevelt's death. Truman dispatched Harry Hopkins, Roosevelt's closest adviser, to Moscow, and Stalin was persuaded to limit the veto to the Security Council's final resolutions.

The lone American woman delegate, Virginia Gildersleeve, the dean of Barnard College, played a key role in drafting the U.N. Charter's preamble.

Stassen recalls her exasperation after the drafting committee's first meeting, where language along the lines of "the high contracting parties have assembled and entered this treaty" was proposed. "That's no way to start a charter for the future of the world," fumed Gildersleeve. "It's got to say, 'We the peoples of the United Nations . . .'" Her proposal was ridiculed by diplomats, who insisted that the charter could not be formed by "peoples," but only by the representatives of governments. Eventually, however, she prevailed and eloquence overcame diplomatese.

For Stassen, the defining moment came five days before the signing when Secretary of State Stettinius, the conference chairman, announced that there was nothing else on his agenda. He then asked all heads of delegations who were ready to sign the charter to stand.

"Chairs began to scrape . . . and suddenly the delegations realized that every one of the 50 chairmen was standing, and they broke out into applause for the first time in those sessions," Stassen recalled.

Still, the seeds of the Cold War evidently had been planted. Pell, now 76 and the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, recalls walking to a restaurant with a Soviet admiral when a big black car suddenly pulled over and picked up the Russian.

"He wasn't supposed to go to lunch with capitalists," Pell said.

The senator also vividly remembers traveling to San Francisco by train from the East Coast with other young officers from Europe. As the train rolled past the seemingly endless grain fields and the unscathed cities and towns of America's heartland, the Europeans were stunned by the contrast with their own war-ravaged countries. "Their eyes got wider and wider," Pell said, and they arrived in San Francisco with a sense of awe for the power and resources of the United States.

Bernardino's most vivid memory was of the day the war in Europe ended while the conference was underway in May 1945. A Honduran delegate, who had just heard the news of the street, burst into her committee meeting and shouted, "The war is over!" and the room erupted in celebration, she said.

For Betty Teslenko, then a 22-year-old stenographer at the conference, the imposing cast of characters was most impressive. One who deserved special credit as a mediator of many disputes was the Australian foreign

minister, Herbert Evatt, whose broad accent prompted some good-natured ribbing, she recalled. One joke that made the rounds: What's the difference between a buffalo and a bison? Answer: a bison is what Evatt uses to wash his hands in the morning.

According to Teslenko, Hiss was so efficient in organizing the conference that he became the choice of many delegates to be the United Nations' first secretary general. However, an unwritten rule that the organization's head should not come from one of the five permanent, veto-wielding members of the Security Council—the United States, Soviet Union, Britain, France and China—made that impossible.

For Piedad Suro, then a young reporter from Ecuador, the conference was memorable chiefly for the difficulties of finding out what was going on in the closed sessions—and for a whirlwind courtship by the man who became her husband, Guillermo Suro, the State Department's chief of language services. Their son, Roberto Suro, is now a Washington Post editor.

"That was where we dated and he proposed," Suro said of the San Francisco conference. "We became engaged the last week and were married in New York two months later." She denies, however, that her fiancé ever gave her a scoop.

As Truman arrived in San Francisco to witness the signing 50 years ago, an estimated 250,000 cheering people turned out to greet his mile-long motorcade, giving him what The Washington Post at the time described as "the most tumultuous demonstration since he entered the White House."

"You have created a great instrument for peace," Truman said at the signing ceremony to a standing ovation. "Oh, what a great day this can be in history."

Today a common view among both U.N. supporters and critics seems to be that if the world body were to disappear, it would have to be quickly reinvented.

"While it hasn't been altogether a 100 percent success," said Sen. Pell, "we're certainly far better off for having the United Nations exist than we would be without it."●

CHANGING TIME FOR VOTE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled vote on Monday, July 10, be changed to begin at 5:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding adjournment of the Senate, that on Wednesday, July 5, committees have from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. to file any legislative or executive reported business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—EXCHANGE OF NOTES RELATING TO THE TAX CONVENTION WITH UKRAINE (TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 104-11)

Mr. DOLE. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the Exchange of Notes Relating to the Tax Convention of the Ukraine (Treaty Document No. 104-11), transmitted to