In the climate of the Rocky Mountains, where the work under my direction has been executed, one half of the number of days during a season is lost through smoke, fog, rain and snow storms, and our experience is that it takes three days in the office to plot the work of one day in the field. Thus for every day's work in the field, there is another day lost, on account of the weather and three days spent in the office, or five days altogether.

Assuming that the plane table can be used in the field whenever the weather is fair enough for the camera, which is not the case, also that the topographer can plot and draw in the field as quickly as in the office, where he has every convenience at hand, the same survey by the plane table would require the same length of time at actual work or four days. To this we must add four days lost on account of the weather, or eight days altogether.

The cost of our parties in the field is $20.50 per diem: at office work the only expense is the salary of the topographer, $5.00 per diem. Summing up we find the comparative cost as follows:

PLANE TABLE.

8 days in the field, at $20.50 per diem $164

CAMERA.

2 days in the field, at	$20.50	per diem	.....	$41
3 " office, at	5.00	"	.....	15
				$56

This shows that the plane table survey would cost at least three times as much as the camera survey. In reality the difference is greater, because part of the work, as well on the ground as in the office, is executed by the assistant, an arrangement which cannot very well be made with the plane table. The figures above are derived from our practice; with more views or more detailed plotting, the difference in cost would be still more in favour of the camera.

If we analyse the causes of the superiority of the camera, we find that a very small portion of the topographer's time is spent in surveying operations. Nearly the whole of it is devoted to travelling for