

OITAWA LETTER.

Mr. Mulock's Carefully Prepared Impromptu Address.

It Took Mr. Fisher Two or Three Hours to Explain Away His Mr. Washington - A Case where Mr. Paterson was Milder than a Sucking Dove.

OITAWA, April 16.—The most important debate of the session was that which took place yesterday on the British budget and preferential trade. Some of the members supporting the ministers complained that the time was taken up with this discussion when the house should be in supply, and one minister protested that the whole discussion was impractical and inopportune. But the government gave sufficient evidence of its concern over the incident. No less than four ministers addressed the house in defence of the government's position. They were purely defensive speeches and I think that any fair minded member of the audience or any reader of Hansard will admit that as such they were failures. The government are placed in an awkward position by the British budget, which contradicts all their declarations and disarranges all their arguments. It is plain that the imposition of a British tariff is a subject which is being considered by the members of the government. It finds them unprepared and throws them into confusion.

Sir Wilfrid had much to explain. Mr. Maclean, who brought up the question, expressed the opinion that there would have been a Canadian preference in the British budget if it had been asked for it, but instead of asking for it Canada declared that she did not want it. Mr. German of Welland, a rather noisy speaker, who has returned to the house after ten years' absence, occasioned by a disqualification for personal breach of the peace by the courts, boldly asserted that the premier had never stated that Canada did not desire the return preference. It does not matter whether Mr. German believed what he was saying or not. The words Sir Wilfrid Laurier has in evidence and he still retains the Cobden Club medal which was given to him, for the reason that he did not ask for a return preference.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier says he is going to ask for a preference this year, or at least that he hopes to get it. The British government has adopted this new line of taxation, the field is clear now for negotiations in a new direction at London next summer. I do not despair that we may be able to lay down next summer in London the basis of a system that will improve the relations between Great Britain and the colonies and will establish freer trade between all sections of the British empire.

This is a much less sanguine statement than the premier made in 1896. At that time, speaking in London, Ont., he stated that the British ministers had shown a willingness to take up the question of an imperial preference. He pledged himself to go to London and ask for preferential treatment to Canadian products as against the goods of the rest of the world. The decision of the brilliant future for Canadian agriculture under such an arrangement. We know how beautifully this pledge was kept. The minister who made it was a few months later in London, under the auspices of the Cobden Club, advocating the same organization, and advising the British government never to tax the food of the people and telling them in the pleasantest of words that Canada wanted no preference on her products.

This discredits the premier's present undertaking. We do not know what he will say when he goes to London this time, but if he asks for a preference he will be asking for what he has already told the government there that we do not want. Yesterday's discussion was awkward for Mr. Fielding. He would not have been so awkward if he had asked for a preference before the British parliament had imposed the grain duties. But he and Mr. Paterson and the premier himself were obliged to admit that they had never communicated with the home government on the subject. The only colony which has given Britain a preference has been absolutely silent and neglectful in this matter. Every word that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach has heard from Canada would oppose his making an exception in our favor. He had first stated that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had not asked for it. He had next the record of our parliament in several votes that we desired no advantage in the British market. He had lastly the abrupt refusal of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to take up with the home government a discussion of imperial preference.

It was shown in yesterday's debate that this last reply of Sir Wilfrid's made very sore feeling in England. The British press was astonished at it. The contrast between the reply of Canada and that from the other colonies is painful to all loyal minds in this country, and it appears that the last message received from the home government says that a despatch will follow. That was weeks ago and Mr. Haggart wanted to know yesterday why the despatch had never been brought down. The premier replied that it had never been received. Mr. Haggart then observed that the premier's reply had evidently caused communications to be broken off. This appears to be the real state of the case.

Ministers contradict each other in a picturesque way in regard to the Canadian preferential duty. Sir Wilfrid said in London that this preference was our contribution to the empire and a sign of our gratitude for favors received. It was totally a free gift by a colony hoping for nothing again. Yesterday Mr. Fielding stated that the government had two purposes in enacting this measure. One was that it would be good for Canada and the other that it would lead the British government to give us a preference in return. Mr. Northrup in a really brilliant

address of twenty minutes, said that he could never decide what the real purpose of Mr. Fielding's extraordinary tariff was. He was happy to find that he was as wise as the ministers, no two of whom gave the same reason for it.

The leader of the opposition made a moderate, but strong speech. Other opposition speakers had contended that Canada had been childish in its reply to Chamberlain and indignantly refusing to fit out and pay the soldiers sent to South Africa. Sir Wilfrid Laurier took the ground that there was no connection between war and commerce, and declared that he would not discuss the politics of the empire and British trade as part of the same subject. Mr. Borden showed how intimately defence of the empire and the commerce of the empire are related. He pointed out that our own trade was protected by the British navy, that our own territory was protected by the British army, and that every dollar of property we invested in trade was guaranteed by the military strength of the empire. And Sir Wilfrid himself was a witness, for he declared in London that our preference was among other things a return for imperial defence. Moreover, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach is imposing this very wheat tax to provide money for war expenses.

But what Mr. Borden particularly wants to know is why the government of Canada is standing by and allowing the opportunity to pass. Why was not Sir Wilfrid in communication with Mr. Chamberlain about this budget? Whatever he might have said in former times he now professes to desire a British preference. Why did he not ask for it before the British tariff came down? Does he intend now to propose the exemption of Canada? Mr. Borden pressed these questions strongly, but he got no answer from the ministers except the answer that nothing had yet been said or done in the matter.

Mr. Fraser and some of the ministers insisted that the food duty now imposed, namely, was a temporary affair. There is nothing to show in the budget speech. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach does not say it is temporary. His argument is in the contrary direction, for he declares that the tax will be no burden on the British consumer, and that it was a mistake ever to have removed it. If the bread tax is brought back it will stay it could be defended on these terms. If it is a temporary measure the British chancellor was most unfortunate in his explanation.

A few weeks ago a speech of Mr. Gourley, the member for Colchester, was telegraphed over the two continents. Mr. Gourley condemned United States interpretation of the Monroe doctrine and declared that Canada should resist it even to the extent of fighting in the trenches. Some of the government organs, which were satisfied with Sir Wilfrid's statement that he would be willing to fight on the Saskatchewan against his own country were horrified at Mr. Gourley's declaration. Probably they will be shocked at the echo of the opposition side. Mr. Gourley is perhaps a little extravagant when he expresses the belief that the British empire will soon control the world, but it is a hope and belief that the British people will not condemn. He does not think that England had made the advance since the time of Cobden that it did before, or that it is bound to do in the future, and he rejoices that the reaction from Cobdenism which set in years ago is now found definite expression. The days of the little Englander are gone and now the English statesmen are a great deal larger than those who govern Canada. Mr. Gourley hopes that when Sir Wilfrid goes to London again he will not carry the message: "We are a little people and desire to remain so." He admires Sir Wilfrid as a representative of Canadian culture and good manners. He does not admire him as a statesman.

Today, according to Mr. Gourley, Sir Wilfrid's face, usually so sunny, is clouded with care. The news from England is troublesome and confusing to him. Mr. Fielding, whose votes would compete with the loud sounding waves and winds which beat upon the Nova Scotia coast, has had to take back a great deal. When he was not responsible for the dominion finances he could talk any free trade nonsense he liked. But now he is under restraint. Mr. Tarte alone is happy. Now was his great day. He has compelled his colleagues to give up much of the free trade heresy. Gradually they were getting clear of the belief that all the people of the world outside of England and all England except the followers of Cobden are arrant fools.

Imperialism, says Mr. Gourley, is reviving the English nation, which will soon be its old self again. What is wanted now is for every part of the empire to work together and build up a state such as the world never knew. A little more of the England of Mr. Gladstone and the empire would have gone to pieces, like ancient Rome or medieval Spain. There was a time when a Roman citizen would be protected to the farthest bound of the known world by Roman legions, but the time has come when a Roman citizen could be kicked and cuffed about Italy. And Mr. Gourley hopes that England will never again fall into the hands of those who for the sake of saving money or escaping danger and trouble, will bring degradation upon their country. He appeals to the French-Canadians, who he says have more to gain than the English-speaking people by imperialism, to take the lead in the new movement. If there is to be a Monroe doctrine south of us, teaching that this continent shall be dominated by the United States, we also should have a Canadian doctrine insisting that the hemisphere should be dominated by Canada. He does not advocate either doctrine, but one is fair as the other.

And this brings the subject back to the beginning. A British preference on Canadian products will increase the value of our lands, cause a rush

of immigration of the best people from countries that are now our competitors, and add to the Canadian population hundreds of thousands if not millions of people who are today counted against us. Such is Mr. Gourley's claim. There is nothing the matter with these doctrines of Mr. Gourley, and they are set forth here at some length because the member for Colchester was not very fairly treated after his first Monroe doctrine speech, and is entitled to a fuller report on the present occasion.

Mr. Fraser of Guysboro, whose free trade ideas are rather confused after this new action at Westminster, hardly knows what to say. But he must always talk, so he filled up a considerable time sneering at the idea that the people of the United States would all come over the line in a day or two after the adoption of an Imperial preference. He gave what he intended to be a humorous account of the United States people getting up in the night and boarding the first train which appeared, clothed in a chemise, in order to be first in this country.

Col. Hughes showed a disposition to interrupt at this stage, and Mr. Fraser paused to hear his criticism. "I was merely wondering," said the Colonel quietly, "how the train was going to get into the chemise."

S. D. S.

OITAWA, April 17.—Dr. Russell, M. P. for Hants county, N. S., has been asked his views on the newspaper readers' strike. It is hardly likely that he has changed his habits within the past week, and as a matter of fact he has been seen reading the Halifax Herald account of the settlement of the longshoremen's strike. He also seems to have had a conversation with Mr. Mulock on the subject. Having ascertained all the facts Dr. Russell calmly rose in the house to ask Mr. Mulock, who is minister of labor, whether there had been a strike in Halifax and if anything had been done about it. Of course he was not expected to do so, but he nevertheless rose and politely proceeded to read a carefully prepared statement, explaining that the settlement of labor through the deputy minister. Whether the whole performance had been rehearsed beforehand is not ascertained, but the play went off very well, owing to the careful study of the chief characters in the role. Dr. Sproule intimated as much, when he said that Mr. Mulock was like the rural celebrity presented with his own portrait, who is completely taken by surprise, who pulls out a roll of manuscript and proceeds to read an address suitable to the occasion. Dr. Russell had by kindly arrangement with Mr. Mulock enabled the postmaster general to present himself with an elegant bouquet.

Mr. Fraser, who acted as understudy for the occasion, found something in Dr. Sproule's remarks which suggested a reflection upon the capacity of Mr. King, and though it is not quite so much of a chance as he expected, he took the opportunity to read a long and generous article from the Halifax Herald in which a high tribute was paid to the deputy minister of labor. Incidentally Mr. Fraser remarked that the Herald was the organ of the opposition, and that it was the organ of the conservative party. The leader of the opposition observed that the Halifax Herald was not the organ of himself or of any party, but was controlled entirely by the owners, who would be the last to admit that anybody dictated a policy to them. Mr. Borden took occasion to pay his own tribute to Mr. King, who at least was frank enough to state in the columns of the Labor Journal that there was a large exodus from Canada to the United States at the same time that his own business was being conducted there, and his colleagues were loudly asserting that there was no exodus.

Mr. Fisher is quite a success as an obstructor, but on Tuesday evening some of his friends across the way offered a fair imitation of his method. They went very much into the details of the bill, and the last to admit that they were not quite so closely or tediously as the minister himself. They asked a vast number of questions, displaying after midnight and from that on towards morning an intense and insatiable curiosity into the merits and qualifications of Mr. Fisher. The last to ask a question is the man whom Mr. Fisher employs to furnish statistics of farm values, and proves that rural property always increases in price under a government and becomes unobtainable when the conservatives are in power. It is very amusing to hear Mr. Fisher in Ireland, and sometimes from there, wonder who goes around selling subscription books part of the time, and works out statistics for Mr. Fisher at \$5 a day, Sundays included, when he has no other job. This preposterous individual generalizes, sometimes from one or two statistics, and sometimes from always from the small percentage of properties that are transferred more than once, a list of conclusions as to the fluctuations of farm values throughout Canada. He calmly assumes that the price mentioned in the registry of deeds, without regard to mortgages and other incidentals, and without regard to improvements or depreciation, furnishes sufficient data for his summing up. Altogether he is about as amusing a cuss as Artemus Ward's kangaroo. It took Mr. Fisher two or three hours to explain him away.

Yesterday Mr. Fisher expounded silos and short-horns, subsoil plowing, horn flies and other matters of interest. It was like a farmer's institute, so Jabel Robinson said in the course of an expostulation which he addressed to the house. Jabel is a master granger and does not like to see the house of commons, which costs us several hundred dollars an hour, doing the work of a farmer's institute, especially as the committee on agriculture under the leadership of Mr. Fisher takes evidence on all these questions. But Dr. Sproule does not agree with Jabel. He says that Mr. Fisher is running experimental farms, building silos, buying and selling cattle, expelling horn flies, subsoiling ground, testing horn stocks. This is done at the expense of the country, and as a representative of the owners

of these properties Dr. Sproule is anxious to know how the thing worked out.

Col. Kaulbach is a farmer of no mean capacity and experience. He gave a very interesting report on the subject of reviving and resuscitating worn out properties. He told the house how successful he had been in building up a farm out of an unpromising estate that came into his hands, and gave some interesting experiences in raising and fattening hogs. Col. Kaulbach advocates the fashionable ox team which unwise farmers have discarded. They never quite abolished oxen in Lunenburg, and Col. Kaulbach tells Mr. Fisher that if he should come down to that country he would show him on his own farm a team of oxen which will travel about as fast as an ordinary horse team. If the ox hurts his foot he is still good for beef, and in any case he never becomes dead stock. It happened that a few hours before I had a conversation with the Hon. Mr. Fisher on some points on the same strain, and explained that his son had just been setting up a team of three oxen on their great farm at Wolseley. This team, fed with oats and kept lively by good treatment, will plow almost as much as a horse team without half the expense of their feed, no depreciation in value, and very much less charge for outfit.

Mr. Paterson has a little experience in the committee of supply yesterday. He was more gentle than a child. His roar was milder than a sucking dove, but that did not prevent Mr. Hackett from enquiring into the case of Collector Currie of Charlottetown, recently retired from active service. Mr. Paterson explained that Mr. Currie was retired by reason of old age, which, according to Mr. Hackett, is a mere sham and pretence. Mr. Currie is 67 years old, very strong and active for his years, and as Mr. Hackett states, not a bit worse as an officer than he was twenty years ago. Mr. Paterson seems to think that it is a very good age for a man to be set aside, especially when a grit is anxious to get his office, but Mr. Hackett confronted him with the fact that only two years ago Mr. Paterson himself appointed a man of the same age as Mr. Currie to the position of collector in St. John. Mr. Paterson Lockhart and Collector Currie were, according to the civil service list, born the same year, and Collector Lockhart has lately entered upon the duties of a much larger station than Charlottetown. The collectors of Toronto, Quebec and Halifax are all older than the officer who had just been retired. Mr. Hackett did not say so, but I find from the list that there are twenty-one collectors in the service older than Mr. Currie. Mr. Anderson of Sackville was when appointed only a year or two younger than Mr. Currie now, and there are several others who have been unloaded on the civil service at an age which Mr. Paterson declares to be a proper one for retirement. A year or two ago Mr. Gunn, at the age of 68, was appointed postmaster at Kingston, in place of a younger man retired on the ground of age. Just the other day a colleague of Mr. Paterson's, at the age of 71, was made a judge of the supreme court of Canada. Mr. Paterson himself is 63 years old, and according to his own theory, must be nearing his end. The minister of trade and commerce has almost reached the time when by the Paterson theory he ought to be fired out.

S. D. S.

OITAWA, April 18.—Mr. Sifton has delivered a budget speech on immigration. The minister of the interior is not a fascinating speaker and there was some difficulty in securing a quorum for the last half of his address. Mr. Wilson of Napanee, the member for Lennox, finds time in the midst of a marvellous life to look into matters of immigration and for the last two or three sessions has given the house the benefit of his researches in speeches that have attracted a good deal of attention. Yesterday Mr. Sifton briefly reviewed the results of Mr. Sifton's operation, pointing out that he was paying a great deal of money for very few immigrants. Mr. Sifton is only getting about five and six hundred people a year from Ireland, where he employs a half a dozen agents and spends about \$10,000 a year. The bill for last year was \$12,000,000, and probably most of those who came would have reached this country if there had been no agents. In fact, the late government, without keeping any agencies in Ireland, got more people than Mr. Devlin's staff is able to procure.

Mr. Devlin, the chief agent, who was a member of parliament a few years ago, had his salary increased about the time of the last election. No better explanation of the failure of his business in Ireland has been given than that offered by Mr. Devlin himself. In an interview with the Montreal Witness, which Mr. Devlin repudiated afterwards, but the accuracy whereof is supported by an affidavit of the Witness reporter, who says that he has been repudiated, Mr. Devlin's writing, the agent explained that his sympathy is with the Irish home rule party, and declares that he has never advised the Irish people to leave their own country. Mr. Sifton says he does not care whether Mr. Devlin sides with the Boers or the British are defeated in Africa. But it ought to concern him that Mr. Devlin's business is bringing immigrants to Canada, advises the people to stay at home. Of course Mr. Devlin says that he tries to get those to come to Canada who are going away. But why after all should an agent in Ireland be different from an agent in England or Scotland or Wales? Our officers in England freely advise Englishmen to come to Canada, and those in Scotland do the same. It may be all right for Irishmen to stay at home, when they can do a great deal better in Canada, but why should we pay for the immigration of people who do not need this expensive advice from us.

Mr. Wilson cannot find in Canada the immigrants whom Mr. Sifton says that he has brought. In his previous years the members for Lennox compared the immigration statistics with the farm entries and other returns, and concluded that not more than half



of Mr. Sifton's immigrants remained in the country. This year there is fuller information. We have the census giving the place of birth and origin of all the people in Canada last April. This return shows that the people brought from England and other British islands, as well as from the continent, are not nearly all here. Probably not half of them are in the country, though it has cost a great deal of money to get them.

Moreover, Mr. Wilson shows that a good many are here who ought not to be. He produces interesting reports from Washington showing that some forty officers of the United States government are employed to watch the courts of that country and keep out people who cannot support themselves or who are afflicted with loathsome diseases. We are generous and allow these people to be unloaded upon this country, and some who left Europe to go to the United States through Canada have been stopped at the United States border and still remain with us.

Mr. Sifton does not believe that the number of rejected people is as large as Mr. Wilson supposes. He says that only 132 who landed at St. John and Montreal bound for the United States were rejected by that country, and of these only 39 are now in Canada. Afterwards he concluded that there were a few more in St. John awaiting deportation.

Mr. Puttee, the labor member for Winnipeg, complains that laborers have been invited from England and other countries who are not needed in this country, and that last summer the high commissioner issued circulars promising nine and ten shillings a day and board to laborers for the Northwest harvest. Hundreds came from England, and finding the fact exaggerated, returned to their own country. Besides a great many thousands from eastern Canada were taken into Manitoba for the harvest and were handled so badly that a great many of them crossed the line into the United States.

Mr. Bourassa has also a complaint to make. When he was in Europe last year he found a map of the dominion in circulation among immigration literature. It was published by the government of Canada in 1901, and showed that the city of Montreal is on the south shore of the St. Lawrence and much of the country south of that river, including Montreal, is part of the United States. The county of the minister of agriculture was annexed to Vermont, and several other counties made a part of New York. He advised Mr. Sifton to issue another map re-annexing Quebec to the British Empire.

The member for Colchester delivered another characteristic speech. He wants the colonial governments and the imperial government to get together and decide that the whole of the large stream of immigration from the British Islands shall be directed to the colonies instead of foreign countries. If the United States has become a great country that is mainly due to the fact that Great Britain has sent millions of the most enterprising people to the republic. These saved the industrial development which now seems to threaten the dominance of the British Empire. Mr. Gourley does not believe that the British supremacy is or will be lost, but it would be very much greater if English people and English capital had not built up the United States. Ten years out of \$3,000,000 expended by the United States in railway construction \$3,000,000 were obtained in England, and Mr. Gourley begs the government and both parties to work together to divert this assistance hereafter to the Greater Britain.

In his plea for larger politics Mr. Gourley deprecated the expenditure of so much time in criticising small outlays of the government. There were loud cheers from the government side at this expression, but silence followed when Mr. Gourley observed that he thought it would be better to allow the population of hundreds of thousands a year, now evidently going on, to be continued rather than that larger interests should be neglected.

Speaking of population the public accounts committee got a little further in the investigation of the Yukon telephone poles scandal. Mr. Rochester, the contractor-employee, still refuses to tell how much the poles cost him, and every question that seemed to lead up to that discovery was quickly recognized and anticipated the witness by telling him that he need not answer. One would have thought that Mr. Tarte himself was a party to the contract to see the vigilance with which he watched to prevent the discovery of the amount which his own employe has made out of the government.

before he left Ottawa. On a previous day he swore it was \$500, but confronting with his own account books he raised it to \$200. From February till May they were together in the country. It does not appear how much they did, but probably not much, as they had only bought 300 telegraph poles. The wire Mr. Charleston, with proper paternal devotion, had purchased in Ottawa from his son, who had recently set up business in this town for the 300 poles \$3 each was paid to a Yukon company. Where they were delivered and under what difficulties does not appear, nor is it known what rake off there was in this transaction.

But 7,000 more poles were needed. Mr. Rochester was sent by Charleston to locate the route, and returned from Tagish in May, having seen what opportunity there was to procure poles along the route of the proposed line. Then it came to be known that he would cease to be an employe of the government and become a contractor. He swears that he did not tell Mr. Charleston what it would cost to provide the poles, but he agreed to resign his pay and furnish poles at \$2 apiece. About this time his pay for the three previous months was settled at \$200 per month and expenses. He continued to keep the government books, to live in the barge with Mr. Charleston, and to be maintained at the expense of the country. One Mr. Phillips took a sub-contract from Mr. Rochester to furnish the poles. Mr. Rochester seems to have made the acquaintance of Mr. Phillips before this and Phillips is mentioned in the government books as a "foreman." He (Phillips) supplied the poles to the government in the places required and on private terms.

Mr. Rochester did not have occasion to employ capital, for the government paid Mr. Phillips for the poles as they were delivered, and charged the amount to Mr. Rochester. An entry in Mr. Charleston's books shows that a sum of \$5,000 was paid direct to Mr. Phillips and charged to him, and that some weeks later the charge was transferred to Mr. Rochester. Mr. Rochester has a number of government stores as he went along and these were also in due time charged to Mr. Rochester. Apparently all that Mr. Rochester had to do was to keep the government books containing an account of his own transactions with the government and to receive the rake off, which is believed to be something over \$1 per pole.

About September the transaction was completed, and in the four or five months Mr. Rochester seems to have made over \$7,000. Then he suddenly became once more a government employe at \$200 a month, which was raised shortly afterwards to \$450 a month. When the Atlin Quessnelle line was completed, Mr. Rochester returned to Ottawa, and he has been here now several months, ostensibly finishing up the bookkeeping, and receiving while at this capital \$200 a month.

This is a pretty handy way to do business. Anyone else who wants to go out to the Yukon to speculate can do so by paying his own way out, maintaining himself there at an expenditure of a good many dollars a day, travelling by expensive passages, and obtaining capital at large interest from persons who may be willing to risk their money on him. Mr. Rochester has a better way. He goes to the country at government expense. He surveys his proposition while in public employe. He is financed by the department of public works. He is in public pay until the moment his enterprise begins, and resumes his salary the moment the contract is completed.

But from the country point of view there is perhaps something to be said. A public officer is supposed to work for the public, especially when he is receiving from three to six times the pay that private parties would give him. If he finds a way to buy supplies for the country at a reasonable price he might perhaps be expected to buy at that price for the public interest instead of buying cheap and selling to the public at a profit of 100 or more per cent. It is not expected that every public officer going about the country in the discharge of his duties shall be lying in wait for a profitable contract with the department he serves, in order that he may resign and take the profit for himself, afterwards resuming his salary. We do not expect Mr. Pottinger to watch a chance to buy rails for \$20 a ton and then resign for \$30. No doubt Mr. Pottinger could do this or something like it with rails or ties or locomotives. Like Mr. Rochester, he has while in public service a great opportunity to survey the ground as a purchaser from contractors and as a seller to the government. If any one, from Mr. Pottinger down or up, should engage in this business we should not expect to find members of parliament upholding him in it. Though of course we might be disappointed.

S. D. S.

The Roman Catholic Cathedral in London, now in course of erection, is 200 feet long and 156 feet wide. Apart from the site it has already cost \$750,000. The material used is red brick, with Portland stone courses, and its oriental decorative features suggest a mosque rather than a cathedral.