

# PALESTINE MANDATE DEFEATED IN LORDS

British Government's Policy Is  
Condemned, 60 to 29, Despite  
Balfour's First Plea There.

---

HE POINTS TO OUR ACTION

---

Fears That Zionists Would  
Usurp Political Power Are  
Unfounded, He Says.

Copyright, 1922, by The New York Times Company.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LONDON, June 21.—The Earl of Balfour made his first speech in the House of Lords this evening in circumstances of uncommon interest with an unfortunate result. The die-hards did not treat him kindly and the Government was defeated 60 to 29. He had to reply to a motion by Lord Islington condemning the mandate of Palestine on the ground that it violated the pledges given by the Government to the people of Palestine and was opposed to the wishes of the majority of that people and that therefore its acceptance by the council of the League of Nations should be postponed until it was modified by being made to comply with the pledges given by the Government.

There was a select, but not large gathering of peers to hear Lord Balfour address the House for the first time.

Lord Islington said that if the mandate was ratified it would impose on Britain the responsibility of the trusteeship for a Zionist political predominance where 90 per cent. of the population was non-Zionist. The mandate, he said, was a distortion of the mandatory system. A small proportion of the population would be given preferential treatment, he declared, and British authority was to enforce the system. The mandate, he asserted, would give rise to the most bitter hostility on the part of the Arabs.

Lord Balfour did not find himself in a friendly atmosphere in replying, although the Lords gave him a hearty cheer at the outset. He declared that the existing mandate was supported by America and the other associated and allied powers, with the assent and approval of the League of Nations. Lord Islington, he said, had declared it was impossible to establish a Jewish home in Palestine without giving to the Jewish organization political powers over the Arab races. That was a poor compliment, he said, to British government and the League of Nations. He could not imagine any political interests being exercised under greater safeguards than those of the Arab population in Palestine.

"Under the British mandate no form of tyranny, racial or religious, will ever be permitted," he declared. The resources of the country could only be developed by capitalists, and, having regard to the enthusiasm of the Jewish community throughout the world, he believed that as soon as the mandate question was settled its members would come forward and help in the development of the Jewish home.

"It is not going to be a great speculative investment that will prove wildly exciting on the Stock Exchanges of London and New York," he remarked. "It is going to be carried out by those who desire to help forward great idealistic designs, rather than for the purpose of earning dividends."

Lord Balfour defended the Ruthenberg

---

Continued on Page Four.

The New York Times

Published: June 22, 1922

Copyright © The New York Times

# PALESTINE MANDATE DEFEATED IN LORDS

Continued from Page 1, Column 2.

concessions, and said the whole scheme had been examined in the most critical spirit by the experts of the Colonial Office. They were quite unanimous that the terms and character of the undertakings were such that no better contract could have been obtained. There was nothing in the nature of undue favoritism in it, and if it could be carried into effect it would give economic advantages to Palestine which could be obtained in no other manner.

In replying to the charge that Britain had been unjust to the Arab forces, Lord Balfour pointed to the fact that it had been mainly through the British that the Arab race had been freed from Turkish rule. The policy of the allied powers had been and would continue to be most helpful to the Arab population.

Finally, after quoting Lord Islington's declaration that he had no feeling against the Jews, Lord Balfour said that he on his part had no prejudice in their favor. He submitted that this was a partial solution of the great Jewish problem and he concluded:

"We are giving the Jews something of a local habitation and a home where they may develop in peace and quiet under British rule those gifts which hitherto they have been compelled from the very nature of the case to bring to fruition in countries which knew not their language and belong not to their race."

This eloquent claim did not placate Lord Islington and his friends. Lord Sydenham proved himself an advocate of Turkish rule. Lord Lamington and Lord Buckmaster from different points of view demanded greater consideration for the Arabs.

The Government whips did not appear to have made any special efforts to obtain a majority. When Lord Islington challenged on his motion, therefore, he gained an easy victory. It was a blow for the League of Nations.

LONDON, June 21 (Associated Press).—The defeat in the House of Lords is not expected to involve the resignation of the British Government, but it is considered as damaging to the Government's political credit, coming, as it does, after similar incidents in both houses of Parliament. It probably will have some influence, however, on the Government's subsequent policy.

Something may develop tomorrow in the House of Commons when Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Unionist, raises debate on the question of the concession to Pincus Ruthenberg for harnessing the Jordan River, and Secretary for the Colonies Churchill is expected to make an important statement.

**The New York Times**

Published: June 22, 1922

Copyright © The New York Times