BO/I/1

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

JANUARY 28, 1955

TEL AVIV

(THE SESSION CONVENED AT 9:45 A.M., MR. ESHKOL PRESIDING)

PRESENT:

MR. TROXEL:

We thought that one very useful way to proceed would be for Mr. Wiener to pursue further his line of discussion. We have found some interesting ideas and have had an opportunity to consider them - this would be the orderly way to beg n.

MR. WIENER:

First, you tell us what you have worked out. We would like th hear your figures regarding area and water.

MR. TROXEL:

It might be decisive for Mr. Criddle to give us something.

MR. CRIDDLE:

I will explain the breakdown. We assumed diversion of canal would be (minus?) 198 meters. The east gore, northern end has net irrigable land of 129,000 dunams below the canal. The southern end of the east gore, below the gore has 150,400 dunams. The south end of the west gore has 87,800 dunams. The TOTAL net irrigable land under the canal, east and west gore, is 368,200 dunams. Above the canal on the northern end of the east gore there are 40,500 dunams. Under the southern end of the

.../2

east gore there are 32,200 dunams. Southwest gore, 63,300. TOTAL net irrigable land above the canal is 136,000 dunams. TOTAL above and below the canal is 504,200 dunams. This is according to the Baker-Harza figures for net irrigable area. The Wadi Faria, which has irrigation quite a way up, at the present time has 9,500 dunams which was not included in these figures. This makes a total of 513,700. 942,800 are classified - of that, 519,800 are either arable or potentially arable, and they reduced that amount 3% for roadways, etc. It was reduced to 504,000 dunams. The Wadi Feria is irrigated and not .....

MR. ESHKOL:

What is the saline classification of these dunams.

MR. CRIDDLE:

We have not yet been given the figures.

MR. BARNES:

The classification is probably according to the Burear of Reclamation Standards. We do not have at this time a breakdown in the areas of classification.

MR. ESHKOL:

Only 3% deductions.

MR. WIENER:

Will you give us at least a rough classification.

MR. CRIDDLE:

The classifications are: 1) 31.6%
2) 25.6%
3) 6.8%
4) 2.1%
6) 33.9% - non-irrigable

Class (6), which is non-irrigable, is 33.9%.

MR. WIENER:

Your irrigable land included up to Class 4?

MR. CRIDDLE:

Different classification than ... because of salinity. Most of the land

is in Classifications 1) and 2).

MR. WIENER:

About 15% is in Class 3) and 4) and about 85% in Classes 1) and 2). Israel includes just 1) and 2) according to the same standards.

MR. CRIDDLE:

We do not have the breakdown for the entire area.

MR. WEITZ:

About salinity - most of the lands were in 1) and 2). Did you take into account signs of black alkali?

MR. CRIDDLE:

Yes. Usually where there were old Roman drains which had been blocked up for years - but this is a very limited area.

MR. ESHKOL:

I think wa should decide if we should accept 3% deductions. This brings me back to our figure of 400,000 dunams. We think there should be a deduction of 20% for this purpose.

MR. CRIDDLE:

There are many things which enter into this work, but this is one difficult question which I knew would be raised. I asked about it specifically. When we pinned them down they said there was a basis for this reasoning. But we knew that would be a point with you people.

MR. GARDINER:

As laymen we are relying on the Baker-Harza report. They said that after a thorough sampling, etc., that this is the figure for the irrigable area. In a sense we are stuck with this figure. We cannot go to the other side and say that Baker-Harza did this wrong. If you are correct, we should know, and we will then have a lot of work to do on the other side, as honest people. A lot of this land is already cultivated - some more intensively than other parts. I would assume that Baker-Harza people were fully aware of those facts after writing off villages, roadways, etc. The roadways were to go up the valley; now there is a new main road down the valley. There is lots more farming there now than in the old days. They must have taken this into account and I would assume, since they are careful people

.../4

and this cost millions of dollars, that they make allowances for the facilities you speak in connection with this figure.

MR. ESHKOL:

Would it not be advisable to type (?) up in case there are more than 400,000 dunams. But our experts say there is more underground water. It will take years until you actually find water. Do we have the time to investigate and discover. So take 400,000 for granted - take into account all figures - at least 90% of 400,000 or 80% of 500,000 - but 3% - really! for such an area! You say 3%; we say 20-25%.

MR. GARDINER:

We have sets of figures: McDonald - 535,000
Maine - 490,000
Baker-Harza - 460,000 plus ?

But Baker-Harza are the most authoritative figures we have.

MR. HERZOG:

Would Mr. Criddle accept Mr. Blass' argument.. that within one year to establ the underground water available?

MR. CRIDDLE:

One way to find out whether there is water or not is to set down weelsand take the water out. The trouble in these negotiations is that we are dealing with an unknown quantity all the time. When we put in two wells we know we have that much water. But when you try to conjecture as to putting down 100 wells in 3, 4 or 5 years you run into problems. I am sure there is underground water in the area. The point is that not all that water which comes from the (Katch?) area is in a location which can be tapped and which can be brought in for anything within reason, from a cost standpoint. ... Some of it can. That is the difficulty in making as estimate

MR. ESHKOL:

There is no success like success. If you find water you have it.

.../5

MR. BLASS:

Speaking as a technical adviser and not on behalf of any one party, I am sure that a report of a first-class underground man like Prof. Jacobs, or someone else - they have methods of talking about underground water just as other people talk about surface water - there are now ways of determining such things - a report from a first-class man would be an asset in your negotiations and especially if a large program of drilling can be made during the year, it will prove...

The other point is about these figures. You gave us figures today as follows: below the canal there is 368, plus the Wadi Faria, plus the 3%. That might be 380 million bruot as against the Main figure which is more than 100 L.P. All the Main figures were for below the canal.

MR. CRIDDLE:

There is a difference of 2 metres in elevation.

MR. BLASS:

I am not against that... we can less the water a bit. The Baker-Harza report already showed that in the area there are 100,000 dunams less. But he found good area above the canal -- 136,000. That means he enlarged the bruot area of irrigation.

MR. CRIDDLE:

Under this plan it is proposed to use the Eadi water (gravity water) above the canal, plus this figure (about 50,000) which will be pumped from the lower end.

MR. BLASS:

Speaking purely as an expert I would say we can prove to you on maps, with tens of examples, that you cannot work with less than 15%. That is a technical.....that does not work. Don't forget that here we do not have

.../6

farms of the large size of those in the U.S.A. Here 100 dunams is an estate. All these roads, houses, ditches, etc. we can show you on maps and give you supporting material which you can show to the other side that we cannot do with less than 15%. I am sure Dr. Weitz will support me on this. We know this just as we know that 2 times 2 makes 4. There is no question about it. It can be proved by tens of examples of actual life.

Then there is a second thing. It is nevertheless true that the Reclamation Bureau Office officially stated, and we quoted it, that for this or another reason, from a gross area 15% of the area under the project are not irrigated. The same is true with regard to our knowledge here. Mr. Gardiner, it is absolutely clear for us that these are technical figures, not political figures. As the Chairman, the Finance Minister has said, from 513,000 take 400,000 -- 15% will never be irrigated. It is true, it is a fact. As Mr. Eshkol said, perhaps you will succeed... the Arabs will arrange such a kind of government that these facts will be eliminated, then there are additional sources, but actually you will not irrigate more than this.

MR. GARDINER:

We have been told by people who worked on Bureau of Reclamations standards that the Arabs are inclined to live in rather large villages which can be established on non-irrigable land.

MR. BLASS:

If it is a large pot, they cannot walk 8 or 10 kms. from their village to their field.

MR. GARDINER:

But not necessarily small plots. There are big holdings now which can be cultivated. Those people will find their way to their work. I am not sure that the same thing will be duplicated on the Israel side.

MR. ESHKOL:

Yesterday you said 100 mcm; we said 200 mcm.

.../7

MR. GARDINER:

Jordan will not agree to this figure..... if some upstream water had not be excluded by Israel -- no use to say they will get along with 400,000 dunams.

MR. ESHKOL:

400,000 to settle 15-20,000 families -- quite a job to do. Then let us start to do it. Try to investigate and find the water now. 20-30 years ago we started and you said there is not much water. We have shown that it is there. Professor Jacobs is very optimistic about this. In case there is more, tie up this additional land. So if you have 400,000 dunams tied up, with the underground water that the experts say is there, there is enough.

MR. GARDINER:

In Israel you are not going to be able tomorrow to develop the 568,000 dunams. You will take time to do it. Maybe that is the way to approach the thing.

MR. ESHKOL:

We discussed this once - partial distribution of water.

MR. GARDINER: I think that is productive - to give the Arabs a chance to show...

MR. ESHKOL: This brings us again to the figures.

MR. HERZOG: They are still off in certain quantities...

MR. GARDINER: We said we would be prepared to adjust ourselves to a time schedule.

MR. ESHKOL: Then let us start bargaining again - the best thing is to decide on the area. I am sure there is ample water for the irrigable area.

MR. GARDINER: We have an opinion which we must respect.

MR. ESHKOL: Even in case all of us want to settle the problem, there are more than 20,000 families, and you and all of us will be interested to find a way - and this is not the crux of the problem - the crux is to start to do something.

MR. GARDINER: There are two ways ahead of us: 1) a final definite settlement; 2) partial settlement. But we cannot have both.

.../8

MR. ESHKOL: You have two problems: 1) Israel's Jewish refugees; 2) Arab refugees. Regarding the Jewish refugees - there are more coming and for Jewish immigrants Israel is the only place. The Arabs are not settling their refugee problem. There are no more than 20-25,000 settled. The starting point is to settle 20,000...Question is to start. We have succeeded in bringing - in settling 28,000 families, working hard for 5-6 years. It is still a question of money and water. The rest of the question is the tens of thousands of dunams. You will see that other technical problems will arise. Leave these for the future and tie up with the underground water.

MR. CRIDDLE: We have tied it up with the Jordan water and the possibility of underground water. If you are going that far for ground water exploring, you have no right to say this is all there is and make a final settlement on the basis of this. We cannot do this for it spoils some larger plans. If you leave a reserve of water for later allocation, alright for later. I do not think that all the benefit of the doubt should be charged to the Arab side.

MR. HERZOG: You will agree that we are allowed a right to a certain benefit.

MR. ESHKOL: We cannot accept new figures every time.

MR. GARDINER: These are the first authoritative figures.

MR. ESHKOL: No.

MR. GARDINER: The Maine report is authoritative in a sense, but is based on possibilities.

MR. ESHKOL: Yesterday you said 10% and we claimed 20-25%.

MR. GARDINER: At present we must rest with the irrigable figures of Baker-Harza.

MR. HERZOG: How long would it take to establish underground water?

MR. GARDINER: We have dug some wells, but it will be many months before we can prove anything. There are now settlements based on these wells and they have proved extremely costly - about $3700 per settler - we cannot project that over many people. I hope that you people will understand my position. We have been trying as hard as possible to find ways to get together. We

.../9

are talking about a gross land reduction of 3% versus 15% - this is not quite true - it is more really 8% versus 15% because your calculations have used 60% irrigable efficiency and the Baker-Harza figures are based on 65%.

MR. WIENER: The percentage of reduction is purely technical. Baker-Harza has given you an elaborate and very technical survey. They came to a certain gross area. Somebody made arbitrary deductions of 3%. I understand Mr. Gardiner said this would be the subject for discussion. This is not a political issue - it is purely technical, a question of allocation efficiency. Le t us discuss this separately from area salinity. As we said, reduction is a technical point. If we accept your figure...we have to apply a certain percentage of reduction..

MR. GARDINER: My difficulty and Mr. Johnston's difficulty is going to be this - that Baker-Harza, who are competent, professional people told us that you require, they anticipate, a minimum of 760(?). This is not a political figure. Now we are in a spot. We believe that the minimum of beneficial use equals 760. It is going to be very difficult to dislodge us from that position unless you are able to demonstrate that we are wrong.

MR. ESHKOL: What should be done in such a case then - you claim 504,000 dunams we claim 375,000 dunams.

MR. WEITZ: We have a lot of experience in this and I can prove that in big communal workings it is at least 15% - in small holdings, 20-25%. When Mr. Criddle was here before, he said if you find one possibility of building villages in the border area, then the lowest, the very lowest, you will go will be 15%. I can suggest three ways of measuring it - it is easily done: take our Jordan Valley which is 100% Class A soil; take maps and measure them; and take, on the other hand, Jericho - this will establish the irrigating area - we have maps to do this - measure them also. I suggest that the experts of Baker-Harza take a plot of fo many dunams and plot settlements and show by measure what the percentage will be. Let them prove they can draw working plans with 3% deduction. Regarding the percentage of efficiency, you

.../10

cannot eat your cake and have it too. Either use crop rotation which is advisable and which has a correlation of 60% efficiency, or use more ... and develope and it will correlate with 70%. You cannot have it both ways. Take crop rotation, which will need less water per dunam, or if you use your crop rotation, have a more developed structure - then use 70%.

MR. GARDINER: Perhaps we can agree to differ on this point for the time being.

MR WEITZ: Regarding water requirements - only last night Mr. Criddle pointed out to us a tentative crop rotation which is different from our suggestions for this area. We did not have enough time to analyze your crop rotation. Mr. Robins is working on it. Then we can say there is no difference in water requirements, but we can say that you are suggesting a crop rotation in which the perennial crops are 32.55% of the area. Then you suggested that of the other crops - 68% of winter crops or spring crops. This crop rotation is an impossibility. If you examine this pattern, you will see that you cannot put in all the crops you took into account.

MR. CRIDDLE: We already have a cropping rotation which has been worked out. We have here the same as last year.

MR. WIENER: We cannot say much about this now - we must study it.

MR. CRIDDLE: There are many tentative conclusions.

MR. WIENER: We must defer our comments.

MR. CRIDDLE: I have one comment - you say that we cannot have that intensive a pattern. I want to point out that a more intensive pattern at this time is being used in the Yarmuk triangle. It can be done. Whether it will be done is doubtful. I hope you understand my figures, but they are the figures of the UNRRA people, fitting into the overall area. We are also trying to get the crops of the Jordan Valley to take care of other areas as the Israelis are doing. Mr. Eshkol, I suggest we hear from Mr. Waener about the proposals about the explanation of quantities; how we said we would go about developing the system.....

.../11

MR. TROXEL: So let's take the gross area, and assume that we are wrong and compare the total.

MR. GARDNER: I would like, if I may, to explain what I believe has been done in Jordan. We have engaged for the last year and one half experts who have found out that out of a total area in Jordan of valley, 950,000 dunams,- and they have calculated making allowances for housing, roads, ditches, and all the rest - that with very little pumping, practically all by gravity from the canal which starts level, there are 513,000 irrigable dunams, allowing for roads, canals, houses and all the rest. That fi ure constitutes very little pumping. Practically all the water flows down from the canal to the land which has been classified, sampled and analized. So that is the best authority that we can have, and this has been a very costly business, has taken a year and one half to do, and we have come to the figure of 513,000 dunam. Dividing the area into two sections, northern and southern sections, for purposes of water-duty calculations and making allowances for loss in transit on the basis that Mr. Criddle considers conservative - and more conservative than yours - only 35% is calculated as being loss, and not 40%. The 760 MCM against a preliminary calculation of 829 MCM. So we think that we are 69 MCMs to the better in respect to that calculation in Jordan, which is very hard for us now to upset. This construction has been issued with patient care by expert people and we can hardly go to Jordan now and say only 400 or 450,000, because this other figures plotted out on maps and diagrams. This is already a matter of professional judgements, not politics, not polititians. We told the experts to find out how much irrigable land is available on the basis of the economy in Jordan. They have not comeup with an answer which results in X cubic meters which relates to something else. That is the purpose of the excercise, and that is what they have done, and those water duty figures, we believe, are rather lower than the practice in the Yarmouk Triangle, which is the point which Mr. Troxel was just attempting to bring forth. I think it is important to know that and to understand the basis. This is our taking-off point, and the Arabgs in the Jordan are going to be bitter

MR. WIENER: According to the figures we received this morning, we are able to understand more easily yesterday's figures, since many of the discrepancies of yesterday's figures are clear today. I suggest the following approach to the problem: intead of a reduction of 3% which I fear nobody considers realistic from a technical point of view, we suggest 20% - I think it is really 25%. We feel that an area of 400,000 dunams (net) above and below the canal, for the Jordan portion of the Valley, would be a real figure. At one season only 400,000 dunams would actually require water. Larger areas than that will never be irrigated inthe Jordan Valley. If you accept this figure (600 mcm) we are sure that you also know that the water allocated to Syria on the upper Yarmuk is excessive as far as duty goes. We feel that as far as the lower Jordan valley is concerned, will be spilled - this is the limit that area could usefully absorb, and we feel that the water is there (224, your figure - let's accept it for the time, even though it is slightly below ours and considerable below the Maine figure) - the Yarmuk without Kinnereth, at least 400 mcm underground water, even with the storage reservoir of 350 mcm, in addition we feel that 200 mcm of ground water are there and should be allocated.
In addition, 15 mcm of return flow out of ....? brings us to 839 mcm - meter requirement of 650. There is no problem as far as lower valley is concerned. If we look back, re area duty, no right figures. 490 dunams, but net of 320 below canal, instead of 190. We now have 1,480 figure you claim. On the other hand, there were certain figures above canal not included in the Maine report - quantities allocated to Syria from the Yarmuk were much smaller, during the Ambassador's second visit. New claims were brought regarding Levanon and Syrian rights of the upper Jordan, and Jordan rights on the Yarmuk were added. A larger area above the canal than before was added. The figures in the Maine report almost seem
?
a total, but new areas included a figure of 15% which we thought too low, was

.../12

brought down to 3%. There are tow approaches to the problem: 1) if discussin absolute figure for Jordan without technical base; and 2) all figures based on technical and agreed data.

MR. GARDINER: What would you plans be for the entire stream?

MR. WIENER: To continue where I left off yesterday. We consider Lake Tiber should be a storage place for the Jordan river. We feel that the claims of Syria and Lebanon on the upper Jordan and on the Banias, without going into the figures at the moment, are justified and should be honoured:

Lebanon - 35
Syria - 20 on the Banias and
22 on the .....
Total 77

We think the figures excessive, but....

We consider that the rest of the water should flow down the Jordan until our diversion point and should be diverted to our canal, part of the water flowir down for storage in Lake Tiberias.

MR. GARDINER: What point of diversion at B'not Yaakov?

MR. WIENER: Leaving out the Huleh (which is not for discussion here) the flc of the Jordan outlet of Lake Tiberias is 498 (according to Cotton)... according to that Syria and Lebanon would be allocated 77. That would leave 421 of Jordan flow unallocated. We feel that the total quantity should be allocated to Israle for use for diversionl ower down and for the Huleh. To keep it sweet ,ould have to allow 233 MCM...

MR. BLASS: Less 70 MCM for...

MR. GARDINER: Is that 30 a proper reduction from the 431?

MR. WIENER: Yes.

MR. GARDIENER: You would have for Israel 391 plus 62 - equals 453. That is an interesting paradox - 453 against Mr. Johnston's 448.

MR. WIENER: That is without the Yarmuk. We fear your difficulty to sell... Much more should not be allocated to Jordan than they could possibly use.

.../13

The same quantity that will be allocated from the Upper Jordan to the Arab states hould be allocated to us from the Yarmuk. The quantity above present use we would use for development of the area...

That would cut down the opportunity for diversion of the Jordan waters? With the Huleh it comes to 530.

MR. GARDINER: That would give you a total quantity of 530:

	421	from the Jordan
minus	30	saline
	391	
plus	62	Huleh
	77	Yarmuk
	530	

against 448 proposed by Ambassador Johnston.

MR. WIENER: It is no good talking about different sets of figures. This does not include historic use and return flow from the Jordan. Yesterday we included these two figures.

MR. TROXEL: Assuming a diversion of 30 MCM, so that we would have some idea of the salinity.....

MR. WIENER: Need not worry about the salinity. It can be left at whatever level we want.

MR. TROXEL: I am interested in that... would like to get more information on that but we can defer it to later.

MR. WIENER: Take it for granted that I can prove it - later on - that we can keep the salinity to whatever level we want.

MR. TROXEL: What can you tell us about comparative costs, transferring construction costs from one side to another.

MR. CRIDDLE: Mr. Wiener says there will be 30 MCM of water diverted out. By the same reasoning you people claim that any Huleh water salvaged would be added to this account. It seems logical that if ruined it should be charged against youra account.

MR. WIENER: ..... The Yarmuk diversion alone makes the Jordan saline.

.../14

MR. CRIDDLE: Under the natural flow use our information (?)...

...30 MCM at the present time .... by the plan proposed you are ruining, or taking away, 30 MCM.

MR. WIENER: I would put it in the same category as evaporation.

MR. TROXEL: To use your plan.

MR. WIENER: We have deducted it there. The water has to be taken out to use our plan. In the figure I gave it is agreed to deduct 19 MCM from the Yarmuk.

MR. CRIDDLE: There is the same situation with the Jordan. Your claims to the Yarmuk are based on use of the triangle area. If you claim 77 MCM a year that gives a unit use of.... But your claim is based on the claim that you have been using it on the Yarmuk.

MR. BLASS: It is based on present use and riparian rights.

MR. BARNES: What is the water-duty?

MR. GARDINER: It would be helpful if Mr. Wiener continued and indicated the time scale for your operation. Also indicate more precisely how the 391 upstream would be used, (The up-river diversion), to be used either at B'not Yaakov or below.

MR. BLASS: Around Lake Tiberias, from the Jordan River and Lake Tiberias, in 1954 we used close to 100 million; and in 1955 it will be close to 120 million; water from the Yarmuk, Jordan and Lake Tiberias, not including the Huleh. South of the inlet...

according to the soils and the water-duty...

we have in this area at least 200,000 dunams. We will need up to 200 MCM. You cannot keep the people at the Lake and at the rivers short of water. There are now 28 settlements there, plus 18, plus 8 in later developments. About 60 settlements altogether, almost all of them established, and a good part of them irrigated.

In the Upper Jordan and the Huleh and the vicinity we think we will give them avout 150 MCM (pumping a bit to the hills of Galilee). The rest, plus the little bit we will have from the return flow we will divert to the Negev.

.../15

MR. GARDINER; You will have a total of 560 (plus 3o from return flow)
deduct 35o
leaves 210 for diversion to Negev.

MR. BLASS; It is not enough. We need more.

My figures are based on the assumption that we will get more. But we will have to cut down the amount for the area in the neighbourhood of the Lake and rivers and leave more for diversion to the Negev.

MR. WHITE; What is your present plan for getting the 210 to the Negev?

MR. GARDINER: How much do you expect to get for the Negev and how ~~much~~ do you expect to get it there?

MR. BLASS: To the Negev proper, from the Yarkon river - about 120 MCM
Additional quantities from wells on spot " 50 "
local floods " 60 "

Jordan and perhaps some additional water
from the north " 3oo "

We would like to have about 700.

How to do it? With a canal from B'not Yaakov to Beit Netafa, building a canal at Beit Netafa, which will cost a lot (we know that in Iraq a British firm built a dam, and after it was built got a contract..... for amount of £ Sterling..... for unforseen circumstances. We don't know how much it will cost, We know that we must have it. Gradually we will get the quantities.. first 20 million... until we have built it. But we don't know when we will finish it....(perhaps in 2o years). Then we will go down -- with a power station at Lake Tiberias. We will pump the water to Beit Netufa.

MR. GARDINER; How will you pump it - by power?

MR. BLASS; You are right. With our own power we can pump only 230. We will get additional use of off-peak power from the hydroelectric big scheme in the Mediterranean diversion. We will get the water by a pipe - line ..... wide --- prefabricated pipe....With the exception of fuel, all the other facilities exist.

MR. JOHNSTON; What will be the cost?

MR. BLASS; The conduit from B'not Yaakov to Beit Netufa will cost IL.35 million, with pumping and the power station . The pipe-line from Beit Netufa to the north of the Hill Faluja will cost about
..... 3o million

we will have to have some development at the Beit Natufa Reservoir

	about 2o - 30 millic		
end Reservoir at Wadi Sarar (near Latrun)	"	15	"
unforseen	"	50	"

Cost of diversion from Jordan.............................. IL 210 milli

MR. GARDINER; That is, 115 million Dollars for 350 MCM.

MR. BLASS; With a normal crop rotation, according to the knowledge of the settlements in this country, it will give 7oo,ooo dunams (175,000 acres) which would make a cost of 660. Dollrs per acre.

I know the American people are concerned about our expenditures for pumping in the whole country. According to our [illegible] calculations, if we will pump all our water according to the plan it will cost, per capita, abour IL.3.500 per year for fuel. That means that for family of four, IL 14. per year. It is a negligible sum if there is no other possibility. Of course we are installing pumps with the best equipment available. But if there is no other possibility that will not break us.

MR. GARDINER; What about the time table?

MR. WIENER; From the engineering point of view, it will take 5 years.

MR. WHITE: What is your Government's budget for the fiscal year? Assuming that level investment, how many years will it take(to fina e it)?

MR. WIENER; Taking into consideration what we are spending on other means of ...... The Yarkon development is already finished.

MR. WHITE: Based on what you planned to put into that segment of this program, how many years will it take?

MR. ESHKOL: It depends on our resources.

MR. JOHNSTON; Without American participation, how long would it take you to do this development?

MR. ESHKOL: It depends on how much the Jewish people will give us.... say lo years.

MR. GARDINER; This would be, I understand, at the expense of Tiberias (area) consumtion. You have 200 and you need 300.

MR. WIENER: We would have to cut down on our allocations to the settlements in the Tiberias area....

MR. BARNES: Leave the 3 Arab States.....399

530 to 470.....

.....

MR. TROXEL: A good thing to think about. Would this be a reasonable point to review the technical requirements. I am not persuaded..... Mr. Wiener made the interesting point that the salinity can be controlled at any level they wish.

MR. GARDINER: I should like to ask a question. Talking about the Yarmuk, how large a dam do you envisage on the Yarmuk? There are various ways to look at it. Forget about politics for the moment. If you want the largest amount of water available you view it from the point of view of nature. But if you want to run against nature, you have to make different calculations. Mr. Criddle has calculated that 118 MCM could result in a controlled flow (after taking the allocation to Syria into account) of 277...

MR. CRIDDLE: With Israel (getting 21 MCM 1075

Syria 59..... - 62 (Huleh)
1013

there would be available 277. - 430 historic use to be added
583

The average flow is 475
spill is 20 ?
Syria - 112 out of 475 42½% of river flow without Huleh.
.....
Jordan 277.

MR. JOHNSTON: ...

MR. ESHKOL: Kinnereth is an Israel Lake....
Disxussion of June 28 table.

MR. KOLLEK; Our susceptibilities with rggard to the Sea of Galilee are quite considerable. At this moment, if we were faced with the question; money or the sea of Galilee, we would say; the Sea of Galilee. We do not know what we would say if we were faced with the question; water or the Sea of Galilee.

MR. JOHNSTON; That is what you should face; water of the Sea of

MR. JOHNSTON;(cont'd) I would not like to break up this meeting until we decide on what we are here for. We want to do what we can to help you in Israel. The U.S. has no desire for the territory, for concessions - we only want stability in the area. Personally, the more we can benefit Israel the more I would like it. I would like to see Israel with a stable economy, able to operate on its own resources, as a member of the community of nations.

We have a problem, however, to see to the Arabs. You gentlemen know this is not easy. For if we so not help them there will flow from it a whole xxxixxxx series of circumstances. If you don't have an agreement on the use of the waters of this stream and someone uses it unilaterally, I don't know what the consequences will be. Nor will it contribute to stability if there is a major conflict here. If Israel has to devote a larger share of her budget to defence it is not going to help the situation at all. If we could do it and have peace I would be delighted to give all the water to Israel, because I know she needs it. But we want stability and the interest of the U.S. is to attempt to achieve that stability. We want to avoid a conflict our here, and are willing to put up some money for that purpose. I think there has been a feeling sometimes that xxxmaybe we had some other purpose in mind, but we have not. In the whole context of the discussions he here, we must be in a position not to throw water away. If you can prove it to us that we are throwing away water we will make every effort to prove it to the Arabs. Water in this area is precious. At the same time we cannot sell to Jordan, - because her sources of water are far more meagre than yours and she has less possibility inggetting it even in the future - we cannot sell them a bill xxixxxx of goods unless it provides for them adequately. We must have something that I can sell to the Arabs, so that we

can have stability in the area. I can agree with some things that Mr. Blass said. A country wigh as meagre resources as Israel, where the chief resources can be agricultural.. I can agree that the cost involved is not excessive. But you do not want to destroy what you have through endless conflict. I want to avoid that. You can destroy what you have boilt up. I do not think it is any secret that the orhter side are very bitter aboub Bnot Yaakov, and have threatened all kinds of military retaliation. And it will increase... and that is the important point. The fact that you have large armed forces...

I want you to try to look at it from the American point of view, trying to sell it to the Arabs. Could you sell it to the Arabs on some hypothetical deduction? Did you think you could? And yet we have got to do it if we are going to get peace out here. The consequences that will flow from lack of selling it to the Arabs can be terrific.

I fully share your desire to build up your country. But you must look at the other side of the coin, - if you don't get a settlement, what will be the consequnces.

Mr. Blass says that the amount of water you will get is not enough.

That may well be.

We have got to get an agreement. It woule be very simple for me to say that we cannot do anything about it. As long as there is any hope of solving the problem, we want to do it.

(Here Amb. Johnson asked that no notes be taken).

MR. ESHKOL; We really appreciate your words. We are a nation in the making. Our agricultural basis is 14% of 15%. I know that in the U.S. you have large reserves of cotton erc. But for a nation in the making a CM of water more or less is very importan

If it were only for industry or for commerce... we would say let our people stay where they are, or go to Canada... I am sure there is ample water to irrigate all the land there is.

MR. JOHNSTON: If you can prove that to us..

MR. ESHKOL: We will try to do so. For me it is an axiom that to deduct 3% (the difference between the gross and the net) if we want to resettle people, is rediculous.

MR. JOHNSTON: We don't want to waste any water. If you think 3% is not the right figure, we can get in touch with the people again. If it is proved to our satisfaction that the figure is incorrect we will fight to get it changed.

MR. ESHKOL: The same is true of underground water. Knowing the tremendous importance of having a population of 2 million, with agriculture as basis... of course I am listening to your words and will submit them to the Cabinet and to our people. This is why we came back this morning to try and begin again. After all the difference in MCMs is not great . We shall think it over until our next meeting Saturday night.

MR. JOHNSTON: From my point of view, I think the discussion was very important.

(End of Session).