CHAPTER – I

PROVISIONS IN RELATION TO INTER–STATE WATER DISPUTES AGREEMENTS ACT, AMENDMENTS UP TO 1892

The Cauvery hailed as one of the seven sacred rivers of India is also called as Southern Ganga. The Cauvery rises in the Brahmagiri range of the Western Ghats in Coorg district of Karnataka at an elevation of 1,340 m. After flowing 802 km through three States namely Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, it joins the Bay of Bengal at Kaveripatnam as a small stream, all its water being utilized higher up. The Cauvery river travels 381 km in Karnataka, 357 km in Tamil Nadu and for some distance it forms as a boundary between the two States. The river Cauvery has a drainage area of 87,900 sq.km. The State-wise distribution of drainage area is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Area (sq.km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>44,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>38,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>2,930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cauvery splits again into two branches the Cauvery and the Vennar. The great Thanjavur delta is fed by these two rivers. The total cultivated area is 4.2 million ha. and forms 77% of the cultivated area of the land. The percentage of irrigation is 44%.¹ Harangi, Hemavathi, Shimsha, Arkavathi, Lakshmanathirtha and Swarnavathi are the major tributaries joining the river Cauvery in the Karnataka territory. Kabini which drains the eastern slopes of the Western Ghats in the northern Malabar district of Kerala State flows through Karnataka and joins the river Cauvery. At the place where Cauvery enters the Tamil Nadu State limits the Mettur reservoir has been formed. Bhavani, Amaravathi and Noyil are the tributaries to the river in the Tamil Nadu State. Cauvery is thus an inter-State river

with an unique characteristic geographical layout in that its upper hilly catchment lying in the Karnataka and Kerala States is influenced by the dependable south-west monsoon during the months June to September, while its lower part lies in the plains of the Tamil Nadu State served by the not so dependable north-east monsoon during the months October to December. The two parts of the catchment may be taken as meeting at the Hogenekal falls just above the Mettur reservoir, where the river narrows down to form a single defined neck. This practice of irrigation under Cauvery was continued year after year, during the Cholas period, Maratha and Nayaks periods and the British who came to rule the country in the seventeenth century. We have not made extensive surveying operations and failed to prepare maps and plans showing the mountains, rivers, towns besides the topography of the country. It is due to the non-advancement of scientific knowledge and technical knowhow and utilization of scientific instruments for the betterment of the society and country. We do not know the catchment area of each and every river or about the rainfall that occur regularly or the yield of water and the run off from the river systems and we assessed the flood flows in the rivers only by making local enquires about the flow details in the rivers and assessing with reference to the cross sectional area of the stream or river at that point. This was the state of the knowledge and facilities and records available when the 1892 Agreement was concluded between the Princely State of Mysore and the British ruled Madras Presidency.

The fact that objections were raised for repairing the irrigation tanks in the Princely State of Mysore during 1870 to 1890 was due to the anxiety that the flows if impounded on the upstream area of Cauvery basin will adversely affect the lower down ayacut was due to the non-availability of the hydraulic details of the basin.  

---


3 Natarajan, (Rtd.) Chief Engineer, Trichy.
From the Instrument of Treaty of the year 1799 and Instrument of Transfer of the year 1881, it is apparent that the East India Company and the British Government, while handing over the possession of the Mysore state to the then Maharaja had put several conditions. It should be relevant to refer to Article 6 and 14 of the Treaty of 1799.

**Article 6**

His Highness Maharaja Mysore Krishna Rajah Odaiyar Bahadoor engages that he will be guided by a sincere and cordial attention to the relations of peace and amity now established between the English East India Company and Bahadoor. And for securing the object of this stipulation it is further stipulated and agreed that no communication or correspondence with any foreign State whatever shall be undertaken by His Highness without the previous knowledge and sanction of the said English Company Bahadoor.

**Article 14**

His Highness Maharajah of Mysore, Krishna Rajah Odaiyar Bahadoor hereby promises to pay at all times the utmost attention to such advice as the company’s government shall occasionally judge it necessary to offer to him, with a view to the economy of his finances, the better collection of his revenues, the administration of justice, the extension of commerce the encouragement of trade, agriculture and industry or any other objects connected with the advancement of His Highness’s interests, the happiness of his people and the mutual welfare of both State. Similarly in the instrument of Transfer of 1881 by which again possession was handed over to the then Maharaja, several restrictions and conditions had been put.

The Maharaja Chamarajendra Odaiyar Bahadur and his successors (here in after called the Maharaja of Mysore) shall at all times remain faithful in allegiance

---

and subordination to allegiance and subordination to her Majesty, the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and Empress of India, her heirs and successors and perform all the duties which in virtue of such allegiance and subordination may be demanded of them.

The Maharaja of Mysore shall abstain from interference in the affairs of any other state or power and shall have communication or correspondence with any other state power of the agents or officers of any other state or power except with the previous sanction and through the medium of the Governor General in Council. The Maharaja of Mysore shall not employ in his service any person not a native of India without the previous sanction of the Governor-General in Council or dismiss from his service any person so employed.

In the event of breach or non-observance by the Maharaja of Mysore of any of the foregoing conditions the Governor-General in Council may resume possession of the said territories and assume the direct administration there of or make such other arrangements as he might think necessary to provide adequately for the good Government of the people of Mysore or for the security of British rights and interests within the province. The aforesaid Instrument of Transfer on face of it vested several powers in the Governor-General in Council including to resume possession of the said territories and to assume direct administration thereof.

On the basis of these clauses it can be said that British crown was exercising its paramount power over the ruler of State of Mysore and the latter had to act within the constraints prescribed under this instrument.\(^5\)

The origin of the dispute between Karnataka and Tamil Nadu on the sharing of the Cauvery waters can be traced back to the year 1807 when there was correspondence between Madras and Mysore on the letter's use of waters in the

portion of the Cauvery basin in its territory to the possible detriment of the interests of Madras.\(^6\) In the matter of Cauvery waters two more parties have been included partly on the merit of their claims based on their coming within the Cauvery basin and partly in reconviction of their riparian rights of the three tributaries of the Cauvery. The Kabini and Pambaram take their origin in the Kerala state. The Kabini, of which sources are in the north and south of the Wayanad district in Kerala has four important tributaries the Panamaram, the Mananthavadi, the Badali and the Noolpuzha. The Panamaram which has its own four tributaries joins the Mananthavadi to form the Kabini river close to the eastern border of Kerala the river Bavalipuzha merges with the Kabini which runs through the border of Kerala for 12 km. and takes a turn to flow into Karnataka to be a tributary of the Cauvery. The total drainage area of the Kabini is 2,070 sq.km. of which 1,920 sq.km. or 92.75 per cent is within the State of Karnataka. The third tributary the Bhavani River originates from Bhavani arbetta in the Nilgiris district of Tamil Nadu. After 13 km. of its course in Tamil Nadu, it enters Kerala and flows southward for nearly 29 km. to the point of Mukkali and takes a meandering course around the Malleswaram peak. The river flows from Mukkali north east and at Kalkandiyur enters Tamil Nadu. The Siruvani has been extracted from Kerala as a gift for the supply of water to Coimbatore and the Varagar which has been unilaterally diverted by Tamil Nadu are the tributaries of the Bhavani. In Kerala the Bhavani has a drainage area of 562 sq.km.\(^7\)

The Pampar the third east flowing river of Kerala is another tributary of the river Cauvery. Its source is the Benmore tea estates in the Devikulam taluk in the high ranges of Kerala known also by the name Thalayar. In its upper reaches the river is replenished by a number of small streams among which are the Irvikulam, the Myladi, the Tirthamala and the Chengalar. The bed of the river is steep from


Kovikadavu and after completing its 30th km it enters Tamil Nadu. Another river the Thenar or Vattavada originates in Kerala at an altitude of 1,920 meters, after a 13 km.-run northward turns north east and flows into Tamil Nadu to join the Pampar to form the Amaravathi River a major tributary of the Cauvery. The total catchment area of the Pampar and the Thenar together in Kerala is 384 sq.km. The total drainage area of these four rivers including the Thenar is 2,866 sq.m. in Kerala and therefore the States claim for a share of the Cauvery waters in not confined to Karnataka but more in terms of Tamil Nadu which has arbitrarily diverted the Varagar and the Pampar which together with the Thenar forms the Amaravathi river in Tamil Nadu.

As early 3rd century a Tamil King Karikal Chola built a masonry dam (Kallanai) over the river Cauvery where now the Grand Anaicut stands and diverted its flow into five canals to form a delta region in the Thanjavur district. One of the deltaic branch of the river flows through Karaikal a former French territory administered as a part of Pondicherry which under its lower riparian rights has become a party to the Cauvery dispute. In 1800 at the initiative of Diwan Poornayya, some irrigation schemes were implemented in the Cauvery basin but they were not looked upon favorably by the Government of Madras. From 1807 Communications were exchanged between Mysore and Madras. In 1892 an agreement was concluded between the two governments to share the waters of Cauvery many provisions of which were adverse to the interests of Mysore. Apart from imposing on Mysore restrictions as to the utilization of the Cauvery waters the Madras Government had made it a rule that without obtaining its prior permission no irrigation work should be undertaken by Mysore in the Cauvery basin.

---

There were disputes as long back as 1807. But decades passed uneventfully. The British controlled both Mysore and Madras for a short period in the middle of the 19th century. During their regime numerous plans were drawn up for the utilization of the Cauvery waters by both states. However, the drought and subsequent famine in the mid 1870 put a hold on the implementation of these plans. The plans were revived by Mysore in 1881 by which time Mysore was back in the hands of the Mysore kings while present day Tamil Nadu continued to remain a part of the Madras Presidency.9

A dispute had been raging over the upper and lower riparian rights of the Cauvery in Mysore and Madras, respectively, since 1807. The river has been the subject of dispute between the ryots of Mysore and Madras (Tamil Nadu). In the absence of scientific or internationally accepted clear cut directions or conventions, the dispute over the sharing of river water had been dragging for a long time in South India. The irrational importance of the surplus waters of the Cauvery was realized by the Engineers in the early decades of the 19th century. Hence investigations were made for the scientific use of the water. When the Government of Madras was finalizing the proposals for the construction of a storage reservoir across the Cauvery on modern lines, the Mysore Government as an upper riparian State realized the importance of those proposals in their state also. When identical proposals were in the offing interests clashed. The dispute on the question of utilization of the waters of the river Cauvery between the Madras and Mysore Governments goes as far back as 1807.10 Correspondence took place in this connection between Madras and Mysore Governments. The rights of Mysore to the improvement of their river works, so far as they did not prove detrimental to the then existing irrigation in the Thanjavur delta, would

---

9 India Vision 2020 for the People of India by the People of India.
10 Mysore-Madras Cauvery Arbitration, 16th July 1913 to 13th May 1914, Exhibits filed by the Mysore Durbar, P. 1.
appear to have been recognized. A controversy again rose in 1871 regarding the extension of the Cauvery channels in Mysore. The extensions made by Mysore conflicted with the claims of the Madras ryots irrigation lands lower down the banks of river. The correspondence that then ensued cannot however be traced in the records, though it is believed that the dispute was settled at least for the time being then in favour of the Mysore ryots.

After that it was felt that a permanent solution was needed to settle the controversy. Steps were taken by both the Governments. So in 1890 a conference took place between the representatives of the Madras and Mysore Governments, which ended inconclusively. However negotiations between Madras and Mysore Governments continued till 1892 when an agreement was reached.

It appears that up to the nineteenth century, irrigation was based on the run of the river and constructions on it were only of a regulatory or diversionary character because the water flowing from the Cauvery river along with water supplied by tributaries were sufficient to irrigate the lands under cultivation in the then state of Mysore and the State of Madras who were mainly utilizing the water.

However with an extension of areas put under cultivation by the aforesaid two states, dispute relating to sharing of the water of Cauvery arose and took a serious turn. It may be mentioned that the then state of Mysore was a Princely State. In the late nineteenth century the Mysore Government while purporting to restore their old irrigation works wanted to build a number of irrigation works for the benefit of new areas. These constructions were to be made on the rivers and streams emanating and passing through their state. Apprehending that such constructions by the Government of Mysore will diminish the water flowing into the State of Madras, took up the matter with the Government of India under letter

\[11\] Appendix A, Letter dated Fort St. George, 14\textsuperscript{th} Feb. 1807. 
\[12\] Ibid. 
\[13\] Ibid. 
\[14\] The Madras-Mysore Agreement of 1892, P. 1.
dated on 11th June 1890. The Secretary to the Government of Madras Public Works Department forwarded notes of discussion at the conference between the officers of the Government of Mysore and the State of Madras held on 10 May, 1890 and requested the Government of India to consider as to whether some general principles should be arrived at as to the extent to which Mysore Government may divert to its own purposes water which flows to Madras territory. From the notes of discussion which had been enclosed with aforesaid letter it appears that the then Mysore Government was asserting its natural right to full use of all the water in its territory subject to the condition that Mysore should not injuriously affect the enjoyment of the acquired rights by Madras or materially diminish the supply to Madras works. There was also a controversy as to what shall be the meaning of the expression "Materially" diminishing the supply to Madras works as was being asserted on behalf of the Government of Mysore. It may be stated here that in the notes of discussions at the conference held in Ootacamund on 5th May 1890, the Diwan of Mysore the follows as:

Mysore has a natural right to the full use of all the water in its territory but such natural right is limited by the rights to supply which have been acquired by prescription on behalf of works in Madras. In exercising its natural right Mysore may do anything which does not injuriously affect the enjoyment of its acquired rights by Madras or materially diminish the supply to Madras works. The Madras rights extend only to the supply which has been actually turned to account for irrigation. All the rivers flowing from Mysore into Madras pour an unused surplus into the sea. Mysore may intercept and take measures to utilize such surplus, in view of its interest in it and to prevent the growth or enlargement of the Madras prescriptive rights; might as well claim to be informed of and object to new works constructed in Madras for utilizing the river flow as Madras might in regard to what is being done in Mysore.
In the conference the Diwan of Mysore categorically stated that the works of irrigation till then undertaken or under projection for future by the Durbar, would not be believed to materially affect the existing irrigation works beyond the frontier. The objections from Madras authorities had always received and would always continue to receive due and respectful consideration from the Durbar but it was desirable that some definite rules should be prescribed by the Government of India for the guidance of both the parties. On 12th November 1890 the Government of Madras wrote to the Durbar of Mysore clearly stating there in that the proposed Rules 1 to 3 are more favorable to the State of Mysore. The Rules proposed by the State of Mysore and the counter suggestions made by the Government of Madras were discussed threadbare between the two States as is clear from the correspondence filed on the record viz. Letter dated 12th May 1891 Letter dated 29th June, 1891 and letter dated 7th July, 1891.15

The Mysore government are now constructing a large tank across one of the principal affluent of the Chitravati about 2 miles east of Periasamudram in a direction 48 miles from abents on a western bund of the tank abents on a western spur of the hill marked Chikapille which is a trigonometrically station.16 Notes of discussion at a conference held at Ootacamund on 10th May 1890 to consider pending irrigation disputes between Madras and Mysore.

The following gentlemen were present:

1. Sir Oliver St. John, K.C.S.I.R.E., Resident in Mysore
2. Hon'ble H.E. Stokes, Member of Council of Madras
3. K. Seshadri Ayyar, Diwan of Mysore
4. Colonel Bowen, Chief Engineer, Mysore
5. G.T. Walch, Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras.17

16 G.O. No. 242, Revenue Department, 17th May 1889.
17 G.O. No. 323, Public Works Department, 1921.
G.T. Welch, Ag. Secretary to Government, Public Works Department to the Chief Engineer for irrigation with copy of letter from G.T. Welch, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras, PWD, to the Secretary to the Government of India PWD dated Ootacamund. On 11th June 1890 I am directed to forward for the consideration and orders of the Government of India the accompanying copy of the proceedings of this Government No. 323 I dated 11th June 1890 embodying notes of discussion at a conference held at Ootacamund on 10th May 1890 to consider pending irrigation disputes between this government and the Mysore Durbar.

The Governing Council considers it of very great importance to the interests of Madras irrigation works that some general principles should be arrived at as to the extent to which the Mysore Government may divert to its own purposes water which now flows to Madras territory and feels work there in the disputes actually pending are not unimportant but the injury done to the works concerned is nothing compared to what might accrue if the Mysore Government, which it is believed is engaged in active prosecution of schemes for the improvement of its irrigation works, were to store or divert the waters of the larger rivers which on almost all sides flow from the Mysore plateau to Madras territory. It will be seen that even with regard to the disputes actually on hand the attitude of the Mysore Durbar is such as to preclude all hope of their yielding due consideration to Madras interests. I am therefore to solicit the interference of the Government of India in bringing such pressure to bear on the Durbar as will secure the interests of Madras.18 (Letter from the resident in Mysore to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras Dated November 21, 1890-N 3868 / 346-90).

18 G.O. No. 324, Public Works Department (PWD), 1890.
1. The Mysore Durbar asks for a copy of the Madras Public Work Department’s notes of discussions at a conference held on May 10, 1890 to consider pending irrigation disputes between the Madras Presidency and the Mysore State and of the covering letter to the Government of India.

2. I presume there is no objection to giving these copies but I want to make sure before doing so.

3. As I have received only one copy of each of those papers from the government of India, I have the honor to request that a few spare copies may, if available be furnished to this office.\textsuperscript{19}

In 1891 the then Diwan of Mysore in his address to the Representative Assembly made a reference to the subject and said that the differences between Mysore and Madras authorities regarding the full use of its drainage areas were being sorted out and the matter had been referred to the Government of India. The irritants stalling the progress of irrigation in the Mysore tracts bordering upon Madras Presidency were being removed.\textsuperscript{20}

Curiously enough the subject was raised most vociferously by an English member of the Assembly in 1891. Elliot of the Planters Association said that Mysore should have full use of the water of the Cauvery for irrigation and should be free from interference on the part of the Madras Government as long as the water was restored to its original channel. He argued very forcefully by pointing out that it was once proposed that Mysore should be annexed by the British so that it would become part of the Madras Presidency. Elliot indignantly asked whether the Madras Government would have discriminated against Mysore with regard to the supply of water if it had been a part of the Madras State. Such a policy would be, in Elliot’s words, as impolite as would be wrong Elliot argued that when water was transmitted to great lengths it would be subject to evaporation and downward

\textsuperscript{19} G.O. No. 743, Public Works Department (PWD), Dec. 12\textsuperscript{th} 1890.

percolation. This would diminish the resources of a government in its fight against famine. Elliot wanted the Mysore government to uphold its right to use the water falling within its territory without allowing itself to be led away by quotations in books on international law relating to the riparian rights of the European nations of the Rhine. He quoted Sir Oliver St. John, who was reported to have retorted that he supposed Mysore, would soon not be allowed by the British government to plant a tree in case it might precipitate moisture which would otherwise pass over Madras Presidency. He went on to say that irrespective of the question of rights and obligations the indisputable fact remained that to prevent the use of water where it fell, was to allow much of it to run waste benefiting neither party. However there was no answer from the government to the particular point raised by Elliot. The Diwan probably did not like to embarrass the Government of India or the neighboring Government of Madras. Hence the Diwan failed to tackle the basic issue and the problem was left to be solved with the passage of time. The Cauvery river originates in Karnataka and flows through the states of Karnataka and Tamil Nadu before entering the Bay of Bengal. It has a number of tributaries in both the states of Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. However almost 75 per cent of the water flowing in the river is contributed by Karnataka.\textsuperscript{21}

The first flood of which there is any record, occurred in March 1853 and accompanied by a violent hurricane. An immense volume of water came down the Cauvery and the river got swollen further by heavy local rain over flowed the banks of the various channels leading from it and covered the greater part of the delta. In many places, to use the words of the collector, water stood for some days four and five feet deep over the high roads. Fortunately there was little or no loss of life but the destruction of property was great. The roads and the embankments of rivers and channels suffered very severely. The paddy had just been reaped and large quantities which were lying on the threshing floors were

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., P. 38.
either washed away or spoiled. Over 75,000 cattle and nearly 1,00,000 sheep and goats were drowned and the wind caused immense destruction of houses and fruit trees. More than 41,000 houses were destroyed and in villages more than three million fruit trees were ruined. On the whole the damage was heaviest in the Mannargudi and Tiruturapundi taluks. In the west and north of the Thanjavur district it was comparatively light and in Pattuikkottai the storm was hardly felt at all. The season prior to the disaster had been unfavorable and the ryot’s losses in the two years were computed at over seventeen lakhs of rupees. Remissions of revenue amounting to over two and a half lakes were granted. At this time the constructions of the Tranquebar-Tirmulavasal canal was in contemplation and the collector urged its early commencement to provide work for the people who were suffering from high prices. This is the only case of anything resembling a famine work in the history of the district except those instituted during the great famine of 1876-78.

**Hurricane and Flood of 1859**

Another hurricane and flood took place in April 1859. Fortunately at this time there was very little grain on the threshing floors and the damage was consequently confined mainly to the breaching of the river banks and the destruction of houses and trees. At sea the hurricane caused lamentable loss of life and property. More than 30 vessels were wrecked between Tranquebar and Point Calimere. The most serious disaster was the foundering of the British Baroque Monarch with 20 coolies on board. It collided with another vessel and both came ashore, nearly all the coolies being drowned.

**Cyclone of 1871**

The next cyclone took place in 1871 on November 6th and 7th. It was more violent on the coast than in the interior and its centre was Tranquebar where the loss of houses and trees was large. At Nagapattinam the roof of the railway station was blown off. The rainfall on this occasion however was not particularly heavy
(it ranged from 4 inches at Shialy to 10.6 inches at Kumbakonam) and there seems to have been no losses from floods. Another high flood occurred in July 1874. On the 16th of that month the water at the Upper Anicut rose to a height that had not been reached for 15 years. Fortunately however those banks of all the rivers in the district had recently received a great deal of attention. The damage done was therefore, comparatively speaking, insignificant.

The consequences to the flood of November 1880 were serious and resulted in the remission of two and a quarter lakhs of land revenue. Over 29 inches of rain fell in the month of November in the east of the district. The taluk which suffered most was Tiruturaipundi. The flood is said to have been the highest then known. Breaches occurred throughout the delta and the damage and roads were destroyed far and wide and several towns were inundated. In Pukulam a suburb of Thanjavur a whole street of thatched houses was leveled to the ground. The seven hundred houses were destroyed in Thanjavur itself and in the Nagapattinam taluk the whole village of Muttam was swept away though the inhabitants managed to save themselves in boats. The collector described the disaster as a complete and utter collapse of the whole delta irrigation scheme and one of its results was that the urgent need for further protection from floods was clearly perceived. Another but less serious inundation occurred in July 1882. Heavy rains in Mysore and the Nilgiris brought a great flood down the Cauvery, and on the 10th the river began to rise rapidly. The greatest danger was experienced in the town of Kumbakonam. By the afternoon of the 11th the Arasalar had burst its banks and had spread over a large part of the town and the most strenuous efforts were needed to prevent the Cauvery from doing the same. The latter river was flowing at a height six inches above that reached in the great flood of 1880. It was estimated that three hundred houses were destroyed in these floods. No lives however were lost Numerous wide breaches occurred in the larger channels throughout the delta and one of the roads in Thanjavur taluk was flooded to the length of a mile and was impassable
for ten years. The loss to the ryots was not so great as might have been expected since the flood occurred in the early part of the cultivation season and there was time to grow another crop. The season of 1884 like that of 1853 was doubly disastrous. The south west monsoon failed and the north-east rains were unusually heavy. The average rainfall in the east of the district in the months of October, November and December total to 66.41 inches and in Tiruvarur and Nannilam over 21 inches fell in one day (November 3rd). The rain was incessant as well as heavy so that all the principal and minor rivers in the east burst their banks in all directions. A large number of villages were completely under water for days and even weeks together and the crops over extensive areas in all the taluks except Thanjavur and Pattukkottai were destroyed. It was found necessary to remit revenue to the extent of more than six lakhs of rupees. Of this over lakh was granted for crops withered from want of water caused by the breaches in the channels. Besides the damage to crops a great number of houses and trees were destroyed. The taluk which suffered most was Tiruturaipundi where to use the collector’s words the damage done to private property was quite incalculable. The floods were followed by cholera which literally decimated the inhabitants of many of the already impoverished villages. An unusually high flood occurred in the Cauvery delta on the 11th October 1887. New regulators on the Cauvery and Vennar had however been lately constructed and they saved Government and the ryots from the serious losses which might otherwise have occurred. The actual damage caused was trifling. The taluks of Sirkali and Mayavaram were flooded by a deluge of rain at the end of 1891 (without however suffering much harm) and two years later another flood covered much of the south of the delta. The immediate cause of the latter disaster was a tremendous downpour towards the end of November. In the south of the Pattukkottai taluk 25 inches fell in 48 hours and the bunds, the rain fed tanks which cover the face of the country were swept away wholesale. The Vennar breached in several places and wide tracts of country from
Thanjavur town to the sea were under water for three days. The low parts of in the town were submerged and many people were saved by boats.\textsuperscript{22}

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter political No. 636 dated the 16\textsuperscript{th} December 1890. I have the honor to forward the formal acceptance of the Government of Madras a copy of the rules and schedules regarding the restoration and construction of irrigation work in my State prepared by the Mysore Durbar which embody the arrangements which have been come to in an informal manner both by personal discussion and demi-official correspondence between the Chief Engineer, Madras Irrigation Branch and the Chief Engineer in Mysore.

I shall be glad to be informed if the Madras Government Agreement with the rules proposed. A copy of Colonel Bowen’s letter on the subjects enclosed for information.\textsuperscript{23} On 7\textsuperscript{th} July 1891 the Government of Madras PWD after examining the proposed rules by the Government of Mysore suggested alterations and additions which according to the state of Madras were necessary for regulating the flow of river Cauvery.\textsuperscript{24}

In reply thereto on 20\textsuperscript{th} July 1891 the Government of Mysore expressed its views on the modifications suggested by state of Madras. The State of Madras expressed its views by communication dated 27\textsuperscript{th} July 1891. Thereafter the relevant correspondence between two States are dated August 8, 1891. Ultimately by letter dated 17\textsuperscript{th} March 1892 the state of Madras accepted the rules and schedules in connection with the restoration and construction of irrigation works in Mysore forwarded to them on behalf of the Government of Mysore. By letter dated 22\textsuperscript{nd} March 1892. The Secretary to the Government of Madras PWD forwarded to the Secretary, Government of India the proceeding from which it appeared that an agreement had been arrived at between the Madras Government

\textsuperscript{23} G.O. No. 162, Public Works Department (PWD), Irrigation, 18\textsuperscript{th} February 1892.
and that of Mysore as regards the irrigation questions which had been under
discussion for some time past the agreement between Mysore Government and
Madras Government was entered into on February 1892 in the form of Rules
known as Rules defining the limits within which on new irrigation works are to be
constructed by the Mysore state without previous reference to the Madras
Government.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., P. 4.