

value has been placed upon old buildings in Canada, even though ecclesiastical, and that with few exceptions, no attempt to preserve or adapt them to altered circumstances has been made. It seems to me to indicate an utter absence of veneration for the venerable, and an extraordinary ignorance of the resources and adaptability of church architecture, as well as an utter waste of good material which can only be characterized as reckless extravagance. It is true that we occasionally have an instance of a building being lengthened (the crudest possible phase of development) but that is an improvement which can be made only to a very limited extent, unless all rules of proportion and symmetry are set at defiance.

In thinking over this matter a very simple plan occurred to me by which an old church might be retained almost intact, and yet be enlarged to about double its original size, if necessary, and at a cost very much less than that of tearing down an old building, and setting up a new one; not that my ideas are new and startling but merely what has been done, in some form or other time and again elsewhere.

I have traced here (Fig. 1,) the ground plan of the smallest and most primitive style of chapel we have, and in Fig. 2 a full developed, cruciform parish church; with the very short transepts and apsidal chancel characteristic of churches of this province for at all events the last 100 years. My plan would be equally applicable to each style. This (Fig. 2,) was drawn in the original draught to the scale of 1-16 inch to the foot, and I have approached the proportions of the recently destroyed "paroisse" of Varennes. The body (nave and aisles) are 76 feet by 45, transepts 28 by 16, apse 36 feet deep making an extreme length of 136 feet inside measurement, and an extreme width of 72 feet.

A glance at fig. 3 will show the nature of my plan of enlargement; you see I retain the whole of the original body