

Non-Canadian Publications

legislation before us helps to destroy this delicate balance in our society.

I would begin by referring to the words of an individual who was very concerned about his culture, a man with whose work I am sure all hon. members are familiar. I refer to W. B. Yeats, a great Irish poet and a great Irish nationalist who was concerned not only with revolutionary ideas but with Irish tradition, working in areas like the theatre, poetry and the other media. What he wanted was a new Ireland, for himself, his family and his descendants. But the idea I want to impress upon the House is this: as much as he was imbued with revolutionary thinking and as much as he wanted a new world, a new Ireland for his children, when it came to his concern for his own daughter he left his revolutionary tendencies aside and wrote:

And may her bridegroom bring her to a house
Where all's accustomed, ceremonious . . .
How but in custom and in ceremony
Are innocence and beauty born?

It was all well and good for Yeats to be a revolutionary thinker, but when it came to his concern for his own daughter he looked not for revolution but for security. I might set against this two lines he had written a little earlier:

For arrogance and hatred are the wares
Peddled in the thoroughfares.

This, I believe, is the trend in our culture today. We are losing respect for the past, we are losing respect for those things that have been handed down to us, and we are coming quickly to that point to which Yeats referred when he said:

● (2040)

For arrogance and hatred are the wares
Peddled in the thoroughfares.

—because we do not have that connection with the past anymore. I would suggest to hon. members that in our quiet moments what we are looking for is not change as much as security.

Let me suggest, Madam Speaker, that Bill C-58 disregards this need for security when it includes in its measures a provision such as Section 19(4)(b) which states:

(b) any publication the principal function of which is the encouragement, promotion or development of the fine arts, letters, scholarship or religion.

I see no reason why we should single out these areas which are the preserves of our culture and give us ties to the past and security to the present. There is no reason why we should work on them.

I would, with your indulgence, Madam Speaker, like to present a rather lengthy but, I believe, consistent argument as to why this motion of mine should be adopted, and why journals relating to fine arts, letters, scholarship or religion ought to remain in Canada unmolested.

This is an age of specialization and I have heard it said that a specialist is someone who knows more and more about less and less. In our society we are demanding specialization ever earlier each year. It used to be that no one had to major or know what they were going to major in until late in their university years. Now we require high

[Mr. Friesen.]

school students to know what their majors will be, and we are even beginning to require this of junior high kids, and pretty soon it will be that elementary school children will have to know what their majors are to be, and will have to know what they plan to do when they are adults.

More and more we are moving to this age of specialization. University students must specialize in their last years and become proficient in one field. The whole field of research forces the individual to focus on an ever-narrowing spectrum. There was a time when courses in biology, chemistry, physics, English, history and mathematics were enough and were sufficiently adequate. The more we discover about each field the more our curiosity became inflamed and, the more we gave closer and closer attention to the minutest detail. Now we have come to the place where there is no such thing any more as an insignificant detail. The microcosm today is just as important, if not more important at times, as a macrocosm, and perhaps even more mysterious and fascinating.

Years ago in biology one professor was doing research on one enzyme, and the guess at that time was that there were hundreds of enzymes to be studied. This man was studying only one. Now the study of biology is only at the beginning of the threshold of knowledge in that field and we are moving into areas of bio-physics and bio-chemistry, and on the other side into bio-mass. The more we specialize the more we are awed by complexities but also the more abstract we become.

Not too long ago a friend of mine was having trouble with her hand. She went to a general practitioner whom she usually consulted and that man sent her not to a specialist, not simply to a hand specialist, but to a specialist who specialized in the right hand. This is how abstract and how specialized we are becoming in our science today.

Where would we be today but for neurosurgeons, eye surgeons, aural surgeons, internal specialists, heart specialists, and maybe plastic surgeons? All of these specialist face the impact of extracting the area of specialization from the rest of the person.

It so happens that when patients visit doctors today they are no longer patients, they are cases. Social workers do not have people anymore, they have case loads. Doctors do not operate on people any more, they perform appendectomies, dentists perform extractions, psychiatrists treat manic depressives, paranoia, schizophrenia, etc. They do not treat people. We have become so specialized in terms of the ills of our society we are not treating people anymore, we are treating sicknesses. This is the threat of being professional. The organ demands all our attention till we forget the organism. The organism is so intricate we forget the psyche, and the psyche is so complex we forget the person. The astounding fact is that we are all three; we are body, soul and spirit. All three of these are related and all three need attention.

We have been so mesmerized by professionalism, with the abstract sections separated from the whole, that the parts too often have lost their meaning to the whole. I am reminded of a writer of some 150 years ago who found this particular situation facing his particular society. When he would have still thought it primitive he was already concerned with the complexities of his society when he said:

And he can read lectures upon innocence;