The above observations have led us to prepare a counter-proposal according to which Israel's legitimate needs could be more realistically considered, without, in our opinion, withholding from the Arab states the water required for the irrigation of their available lands.

Our scheme would provide for:

- a) Full satisfaction of all upstream uses on the Jordan, in Syria (42 MCM) and in Lebanon (35 MCM).
 - b) Full satisfaction of real Syrian requirements on the Yarmuk River (70 MCM).
 - c) Full irrigation (with the unit water requirments adopted in the Ambassador's proposal) of an area of 400.000 dunams in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (592 MCM), out of which 322 MCM would originate from the Yarmuk Diversion, while the remaining 270 MCM would be supplied from perennial flows.
 - d) The continuation of Israel's present use from the Yarmuk River in the Jordan-Yarmuk triangle (40 MCM).
 - e) The irrigation of Israel's valley lands as well as the irrigation of Israeli lands outside the Basin from the flow of the Upper Jordan remaining after the allocation detailed in Para. (a) above (411 MCM).
 - f) Salinity control of Lake Tiberias, effected by the diversion of 30 MCM of saline springs from the Lake.
 - g) 73 MCM spills from Yarmuk reservoir (assumed to have 150 MCM capacity) and 18 MCM for reservoir losses.
- 2. For any lands which can be developed in the Jordan Valley in excess of 400.000 dunams but within the figures given in the Ambassador's recent proposal resort should be had in the first place to the development of groundwater or to the further utilization of other local resources.
- 3. The total allocation of Israel from both rivers, i.e. 451 MCM, exceeds only slightly that included in the Ambassador's recent proposal (430 MCM not including Huleh reclamation). The difference between the allocation to the Kingdom of Jordan and that included in the Ambassador's proposal results mainly from the disdrepancies

system.

4. The Israeli diversion would be effected by an approriate structure and canal at Gesher B'not Yaakov and the Yarmuk diversion at Adasia.

All basis states would have to agree to these diversion structures. Furthermore, it would be understood that the place of use of water, once allocated, is an internal affair of each state concerned.

5. Should development of ground water and other local resources not suffice for the legitimate irrigation needs in the Jordan Valley (i.e. for an area not exceeding 85% of the gross irrigable lands mentioned above) and should it prove fessible to provide adequate alternative storage space at a reasonable cost elsewhere in Israel, Israel would be prepared to consider foregoing its present use form the summer flow of the Yarmuk against the diversion of they Yarmuk spill into Lake Tiberias, where it ∞uld then be partially utilised. In such event, the spill in the system would be in the order of magnitude or 30 MCM, as ∞ mpared to 20 MCM in the Ambassador's proposal, made on 27 January 1955.

By this procedure the Kingdom of Jordan would be allocated, under the above stipulation and only after all remaining available resources are fully utilised, am additional 40 MCM which would bring its total allocation (excluding ground water) to 632 MCM, a quantity which alone is almost sufficient to irrigate all areas considered irrigable in the Jordan Valley (85% from gross classified areas).

6. Should it prove unfeasible to arrive, under present conditions, at willimate allocation figures, Israel might consider the too possibility of partial allocations, which would make available to the basin states adequate allocations above present use, to meet most urgent requirements.