The Bruns Photo Contest a competition of black and white prints

WHAT: * Anything that can be photographed

* Must be black and white

* Must be 5 x 7 or larger

* Must have name and phone number on back of

HOW: There will be no specific categories, all photos will be judged according to technical quality, originality and photographic effectiveness.

Although there is no limit to the number of prints a person may enter, there will be a limit of one prize per

WHO: Entrants must be students, staff or faculty of UNB

PRIZES: 1st Prize: \$25.00 gift certificate 2nd Prize: \$15.00 gift certificate 3rd Prize: \$5.00 gift certificate

Prizes donated by:



IF YOU DON'T HAVE DARKROOM TO DEVELOP YOUR PRINTS...

you are welcome to join the Bruns Photo Dept. on a full or part-time basis and have use of our darkroom facilities as well as instruction in darkroom techniques.

WHEN: Entries will be accepted from January 5, 1981 to January 30, 1981. Winning photos will be printed in the February 6th issue of the Bruns.

All entries can be picked up at the Bruns office after this

Entries must be addressed to: Bruns Photo Contest, Room 36, SUB.

JUDGES:



ROGER SMITH integrated his hobby of 15 years, photography, into his job as Scientific Technican in the Biology Department at UNB. After getting his M.Sc. he said, "I put my degree in a drawer and became a photographer." And he's been doing just that for seven years now! Working in all photographic mediums, Mr. Smith has had one-man shows in Fredericton and has won several awards for photographic excellence.



CLAYTON LEWIS is a photographer as well as Math Prof at UNB. He has studied photography at Cornell University and Ithaca College. In New Brunswick Mr. Lewis has had one-man shows in Fredericton, Saint John and Moncton as well as being published in various newspapers and magazines. Also well known as a teacher of photography Mr. Lewis has been co-ordinator of the Maritime Photographic Workshop three years and teaches about six photo courses a year.



If you have any inquiries please contact Anne Kilfoil in the Bruns Office, Room 35, SUB.

Acid rain: is prevention really more expensive than its effects?

THE QUILL

A neighbour who worked at a plywood mill in a town where I lived, once responded to my complaint about the nauseating clouds of air pollution issuing from his employer's factory by saying, "That sweetie, is the smell of money, and it doesn't bother me one bit."

That was years ago when most people thought pollution was merely unaesthetic and conservationists were eccentric bird-lovers with leftist sympathies.

That was before we began hearing about "acid rain." That

was before a shocking number of deaths, each year, began to be attributed to the effects of acid rain. And mos of all that was before people realized that acid rain would be costing us lots of money. The consumer and wage earner who had applauded the restraint shown by his boss in not ordering anti-pollution equipment to be installed (whose cost would have come out of his pocket in the form of extra overhead passed onto the consumer or subsidized by his taxes) has started to realize that there is no way of escaping these enormous costs. Not only will he be paying when the government decides to do some-

thing about preventing more acid also measurable in economic rain, but he'll also have to shell out retroacively in effect, in order to try to undo the damage that years of neglect of this problem

has accumulated. Almost every conceivable kind of loss is, in the philosophy of current social values, measurable in economic terms. With gruesomely accurate efficiency, our government's statisticians are burning the midnight oil in an effort to figure out exactly how much acid rain is costing us in lost crops, man-hours, medical costs, fish losses, death and property destruction. Will they be weighing those costs against its "benefits,"

terms?

Well, of course there aren't really any benefits of acid rain, to anyone. But the losses due to doing nothing about acid rain will be compared against the expense of doing something about it - an expense that is estimated to be enormous.

One thing that we can't do. according to economic theory, is shut down the polluting industries because of resulting unemployment and economic chaos. And quess what? It has been estimated that even if all the offenders were shut down tomorrow the problem

is so serious it would still persist for years and years.

It turns out that, what we purchase with our earnings, we pay for again in poor health (and, for some, early death) as a result of the unsafe manufacturing process. Then we pay once more, this time for cleaning up the acid rain.

If we really do want to be consistant, to discuss "emotional issues" like acid rain in economic

terms rather than "ethical" ones, then lets look at ALL the costs.

Reduce them to money terms, like the government does. And then add them up.