Forty-two gentlemen have been educated at this estab­lishment, and twenty-two still remain in the ship-building department of her majesty’s service, of whom many, bound to the service under heavy penalties, were, for eight or ten years after leaving the school, employed as supernumeraries in the dock-yards, awaiting their first appointments as fore­men, although vacancies were during the interval conti­nually occurring. Three only have been promoted to the step next above that of foreman ; and, out of the last four­teen appointments to situations superior to that of foreman, only one has been conferred upon a member of the School of Naval Architecture.

The attempt has therefore most signally failed. For, from the comparative ages of the gentlemen of this establish­ment, and those of the officers who have been placed in these vacancies, there can be no rational hope that the ex­pectations of the Commissioners of Naval Revision, or of the members of the Councils of State, can be fulfilled ; and it may therefore now be said (in 1839), with as much truth as by the Report of the Board of Naval Revision in 1806, “no­thing certainly can be more surprising than that, in a nation so enlightened as this is, and whose power, importance, and even safety, depend on its naval superiority, matters so es­sential to the preservation of that superiority should so long have been neglected.”

The School of Naval Architecture was abolished in 1832 ; and we cannot write of the failure of this establishment without endeavouring to trace its causes, and to account for the strong prejudice which has existed against its members from the moment the first student’s name was recorded on its books ; a prejudice which has baffled them in every en­deavour to obtain just attention to their claims from each successive naval administration, and which has virtually de­prived the nation of the advantages anticipated by the Board of Naval Revision. That it is not in the failure of the stu­dents themselves to fulfil the conditions required of them, is evident, since the sole condition was that which we have quoted from the regulations, that they should complete the plan of education, “ and be certified by the professor to be properly qualified.” This the professor has officially complied with in the strongest terms. Nor is it that they are indivi­dually unfit to fill the situations which were guaranteed to them ; for many of them are possessed of the most flattering testimonials of efficiency, as thorough practical officers, men of business, and gentlemen of principle. We believe it to arise solely from this, that the foundation of the establish­ment was accompanied by the most mortifying and humiliat­ing reflections on the officers then filling the situations in the dock-yards, and, consequently, on all who rose to such situations from the working class of the yards. From these officers, to all of whom the very existence of the School of Naval Architecture has been a reproach, and a constant source of mortification, and to many of whom the advance of its members would operate as a bar to promotion, successive Admiralties have been contented to derive their information as to the success of that establishment, and the efficiency of its members. It surely would be expecting more than can be hoped from human nature in its most exalted state, to suppose such information could be given devoid of party feeling and of prejudice, or that men would voluntarily ad­mit their own inefficiency, and concede to those whom they must regard as their rivals for the favours of the Admiralty ; a merit equal, nay, on the very principle of the foundation of the establishment, superior, to that which they themselves possess. The First Lord of the Admiralty, therefore, for the time being, acting on information thus derived, annually asserts in his place in parliament, and believes his assertion to be correct, that these “ young men” (men between forty and fifty years of age) “ though gentlemen and men of education, yet want experience, and therefore cannot be promoted.”

The institution has however not been unattended with benefit to the service. The correct principles of naval ar­chitecture have become known and generally diffused ; and though the members of the establishment may not reap the reward, the merit is undoubtedly theirs, for it has been through their instrumentality and from their works. It cannot, either, be denied that the officers of the dock-yards of the old school have had their energies aroused, and have risen in the scale of educated society, from their rivalry with the members of the new. On an inquiry into their com­petency to fill the situations in which they have been placed, though there would be many instances fully to warrant as great animadversion as was passed by the Board of Re­vision on their predecessors, there would also be found among them gentlemen, men of talent, and of considerable acquirements.

In 1830, Captain, now Sir William Symonds, was appoint­ed to the office of surveyor of the navy, in consequence of having constructed a corvette, the Columbine, for her ma­jesty’s service, which was reported most favourably of after a trial cruize with other corvettes built from designs furnish­ed by Sir Robert Seppings and the late Admiral Hayes.

The appointment of a naval officer to fill the solitary si­tuation in the civil service of the navy which may be said to offer any great inducement to the exertions of the naval architect, was certainly of questionable policy. There are few clerks in the public offices of this country who do not early attain to salaries and retirements far exceeding those doled out to the highest offices in the engineering depart­ment of the navy, with this one exception ; and to deprive the naval architect of this sole incitement to exertion, can­not but operate injuriously to the service, besides the evil resulting from having the head of a department, who must be presumed to be not only totally unacquainted with the detail of the duties of his subordinates, but also necessarily to be un­qualified to perform a great portion of the duties connected with his own situation, and therefore to be dependent upon those from whom he is obliged to seek for guidance.

The office of surveyor of the navy, be it remembered, is an office of active operation rather than an office of super­vision, and therefore essentially requires to be filled by a professional naval architect.

Sir William Symonds is the first constructor of the Eng­lish navy who has been left unrestricted as to dimensions ; and he has consequently been enabled to introduce into the service, ships which undoubtedly bear very high characters in some very decided points of efficiency as men of war. He has also practically demonstrated the possibility of ships of war obtaining sufficient stability without the aid of bal­last, which is a very important advantage, and one which will yet be productive of essential benefit. But at the same time, being in error as to the true principles on which the stability of floating bodies is dependent, he has not obtain­ed these advantages without, in many instances, incurring a compensating disadvantage, from uneasiness of motion, and which appears to be a very general complaint against the ships of his construction, some of them being most marked examples of the uneasiness attendant on a stability which depends almost wholly on breadth at the load-water section, to the neglect of the form of the solids of immersion and emersion.

The opinions on which Sir William Symonds founds his system of construction have been explained by him, first in a brochure, printed, we believe, for private distribution, and then in an article, communicated by himself, in the United Service Journal for July 1832. To that therefore we refer our readers for information as to the principles upon which the fleets of England are now constructed. The following tables contain the dimensions of the various classes of ships which Sir William Symonds has introduced into the British navy ; also the dimensions according to which the ships of