

paign—and he urged that we should now insist that we would protect our own interests if China could not carry out her engagements.*

These, in the light of future events, appear reasonable and sensible proposals; but the Government of India, in pursuance of their policy of forbearance and moderation, would not accept them. They ordered Mr. White definitely to return to Gantok. They noticed that the returns of trade between British territory and Tibet showed a marked increase, and they hoped that the continued exercise of moderation and patience would gradually remove Tibetan suspicions as to our aims and policy.

A few months after this was written, in November of 1895, Mr. Nolan, the Commissioner of Darjiling, an officer who had for many years been conversant with the Tibetan question, and who held civil charge of that division of Bengal which adjoins Sikkim and Bhutan, and who supervised our relations with those two States as well as our trade with Tibet, visited Yatung, and had conversations with Chinese and Tibetan local officials. His report of the state of affairs there is one of the most interesting published.† He found that the imposition of the 10 per cent. duty at Phari was no new exaction, but had existed for a long time. He found, also, that the reason the Tibetans did not meet Mr. White in the previous summer to delimit the boundary was that they wished the general line of the frontier should be agreed upon, in the first instance, with reference to maps, and the ground visited only after this was done. But he found, too, that the Tibetans repudiated the treaty. The "Chief Steward," the sole Commissioner on the part of the Tibetan Government for reporting on the frontier matter, "made the important statement that the Tibetans did not consider themselves bound by the Convention with China, as they were not a party to it." He reported further, that the Tibetans had prevented the formation of a mart

* Blue-book, p. 44.

† *Ibid.*, p. 54.