

4. PEACE SETTLEMENTS WITH ITALY, ROUMANIA, BULGARIA, AND HUNGARY

(a) Trieste

The Soviet Government maintained their refusal to co-operate in the drafting of a protocol to the Italian Peace Treaty to provide for the return of Trieste to Italy, and further notes on this question, which were transmitted by the United Kingdom, United States, and French Governments to the Soviet Government in April and June, 1948, were not answered by the latter. In August there was a lengthy debate in the Security Council on the Trieste question, and the Council once more failed to agree on the choice of a Governor for the Free Territory.

In February, 1949, this question was again raised by the Soviet representative on the Council, who proposed the appointment of Colonel Flueckiger, former Swiss Minister to Moscow, to the post of Governor. It was pointed out by the United Kingdom representative, who was supported by his United States and French colleagues, that the joint Western proposal for the return of the Free Territory to Italy, which would make the appointment unnecessary, had still received no definite answer from the Soviet Government. The United Kingdom representative recalled that the unsatisfactory conditions in the Yugoslav Zone of the Free Territory, and the virtual incorporation of that zone into Yugoslavia, had forced the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States to the conclusion that the Trieste settlement envisaged by the peace treaty had become unworkable. In the result the Soviet proposal lapsed without vote. Reintroduced on 28 March by the representative of the U.S.S.R., the proposal again lapsed, the Soviet representative reserving the right to reintroduce the item at a later meeting.

(b) Human Rights Clauses of the Treaties

On 27 December, 1948, the Government of Hungary announced the arrest of the Hungarian Primate, Cardinal Mindszenty, and other religious personalities on charges of treason, espionage, and illegal currency transactions. In the light of all available information, it appeared that the arrest of the Cardinal was a political act motivated by his opposition to the domestic policy of the Hungarian Government, rather than a result of the alleged offences with which he was charged. It was also apparent that the arrest might have as its object an attack on religious freedom in Hungary. In all the circumstances the New Zealand Government were unable to avoid the conclusion that the case constituted a *prima facie* violation of the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and of the Treaty of Peace with Hungary, to which the New Zealand Government is a