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I. Introduction

More and more people in Canada and other Western countries are now working at part-time, short-term and other casual jobs. These workers do not generally have job security or benefits. In the late 1800s, this was called "the casual labour problem," and it greatly troubled British social reformers, politicians and trade unionists (Stedman Jones, 1984). But economic recovery in the late 1890s, along with further industrialization, brought an expansion of full-time proletarian labour forces. This expansion continued right up to the 1970s, punctuated only by the Great Depression of the 1930s.

With the recent casualization of labour, people are now asking: What happened to full-time employment? Why do we see the current increase in casual labour? Moreover, why is it being promoted by many businesspeople and politicians as a positive thing? We are being told that this type of work will allow Canadians to use their entrepreneurial skills to improve the economy, to turn things around, to get rid of the deficit, and so on (Canada, 1994a; 1994b). Euphemisms such as contingent and non-standard labour are used to describe the phenomenon. And, like the euphemisms of "collateral damage" (murder of civilians) and "friendly fire" (being accidentally killed by one's own troops) used in recent imperialist wars, these new terms tend to deflect attention away from the human suffering that accompanies the casual labour problem.

The current debate over casual labour focuses on both the causes and character of this sort of work. Part of its qualification as both a social problem, in addition to its rapid growth, has to do with whether casual jobs are "good jobs" or "bad jobs." The short answer is that there are both. Newspapers like The Globe and Mail sometimes run advertisements for part-time employment for middle-level professionals, in health care for example, where the working conditions and remuneration are not considered "exploitative." And countries such as Sweden, because of a history of strong unions and social-democratic politics, provide legislation and cultural conditions that make part-time work more attractive.

Unfortunately, the working conditions of the majority of part-time and other casual workers throughout the world are not attractive. This can be taken as a given for most workers in the Third World. But the non-union, low-wage, insecure labour market status of most part-timers in the First World has earned their work the label of "bad jobs" as well. Both independent Canadian research (e.g., White, 1983) and a major Canadian Government commission investigating part-time work
(Labour Canada, 1983) found part-time workers often saying they feel "exploited." This feeling, given the material conditions upon which it is based, is a logical consequence of the current socio-economic restructuring which incorporates the casualization of labour.

What is most interesting is the question of why there has been such an increase in part-time and other casual labour in the developed countries in the post-World War II era. Most accounts present the phenomenon as a result of the growth of the service sector and/or the increase in numbers of women entering formal employment. A common business argument is that part-timers are hired to increase the number of staff during busy periods (CFIB, 1988; The Economist, May 22, 1993). Sometimes businesses will say that they hire part-timers because it is the choice of the employees. But given that employment conditions for many part-timers are sub-standard (see below), it becomes difficult to agree with the writers of the business magazine The Economist (May 22, 1993: 62) when they argue: "Many women, especially those with children, like part-time work."

It would seem that attributing the dramatic increase in part-time employment to employee choice, especially in a time of high unemployment and increasing poverty, is too simplistic an argument. In this sense it can be seen as part of the current neo-liberal ideology underpinning restructuring. Mainstream economists and business spokespeople have long tried to explain the problem of unemployment away as a matter of personal choice, and are doing the same with part-time work (Gates, 1999). The argument made is that people are rational economic actors who calculate their time in and out of the labour market in terms of a trade-off between maximizing income in relation to the desire for time to spend on family and leisure activities. In this scenario, unemployment is voluntary, and so is the choice to work part time.

But there must be more to it than this. After all, the service economy is not strictly a post-World War II phenomenon, and while family responsibilities might make part-time work a preferred option for many women, this is not sufficient reason for employers -- especially private capital -- to increase its use of part-time workers. While individuals may think they choose part-time work for personal reasons (a fallacy of the liberal notion of choice), the part-time option is itself the product of larger economic, political and social processes. Elsewhere I have argued that increasing part-time work is a product of corporate economic restructuring to promote labour flexibility and decrease costs of production (Broad, 1991; 1995). After the last (1990-92) major recession, The Economist
(May 22, 1993) reported that corporations were "shedding" full-time workers and hiring part-timers to take advantage of lower pay and benefits and to avoid unions.

With large corporations increasingly contracting out much of their production and doing less and less "in-house," business analysts began to speak of "hollow" or "virtual" companies. With neoliberal globalization, including its casualization and informalization of labour, we must beware of a coming "hollow society," with its "virtual citizens." Those whose narrow fixation on full-time labour at the centre of the world-system caused them to dismiss the importance of Marx's reserve army of labour spoke too soon.

This paper begins with a discussion of the trends and conditions in casual employment in Canada and other Western countries. This is followed by an examination of the post-World War II increase in part-time employment in Canada, and a profile of the part-time labour market, examining who works part time, in what industries and occupations, and under what kind of employment conditions. A case study of part-timers' conditions of work and life, based on interviews with part-time workers in Saskatchewan, reveals the human impact of the casualization of labour as poor wages, few benefits and sub-standard working conditions. The discussion is then expanded to examine the wider casual labour market in Canada. The final section of the paper offers some preliminary conclusions on how the casualization of labour is contributing to a degradation of work, to social and labour market repolarization and to expansion of the reserve army of labour.

II. Part-time and Casual Labour in Industrialized Countries

There is a contemporary casualization of labour throughout the core capitalist countries, most pronounced being the increase in part-time work. Data on the growth rates of full-time and part-time employment in member countries of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) show that growth rates for part-time employment has greatly outpaced those for full-time employment (de Neubourg, 1985; ILO, 1989; 1992; 1996; OECD, 1995). There are, of course, national variations, with countries of southern Europe, for example, experiencing relatively low rates of part-time work (less than 10%). But in other cases, such as France, West Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom, full-time growth rates have been negative. Throughout the OECD, part-time employment has again increased with the 1990-92 recession. According to the International Labour
Organization (ILO), roughly 60 million people now work part time in the industrialized countries. On average, one out of every seven workers in these countries holds a part-time job, most of them women and many without the benefits or protection given to full-time employees. In some of the OECD countries one-in-four workers are now part-timers (ILO, 1992; 1996). For comparative purposes, I will provide a general sketch of the casualization of labour in Britain and the United States and then turn to a more detailed discussion of casual labour in Canada.

British authors have discussed various modes of casual employ being used by capital to lower production costs and reassert capital's control over the labour market and the labour process (Mitter, 1986; Allen and Wolkowitz, 1987; Phizacklea and Wolkowitz, 1995). Mitter (1986) discusses a concomitant casualization and rise of what she calls a "new proletariat" in both new and old areas of the formal economy. The new proletariat is primarily female, and it is largely casual. As in the case of Canada (Menzies, 1989; 1996), we find a connection between technological change and the casualization of labour in Britain. Contrary to the notion that automation will improve workers' lives, so far "the impact of NT [new technologies] has been more pronounced in the casualization of work than in bringing automation" (Mitter, 1986: 22). Ironically though, "women are getting more jobs because, with the advent of NT, most jobs are becoming ill-paid, insecure or part time" (Mitter, 1986: 22). Looking at Britain, we see "the Third World in the midst of the First," with expansion of flexible and casual work, and the emergence of an acutely polarized labour market (Mitter, 1986: 139). These trends are particularly evident in the clothing and garment industries in the British Isles, which typify a degradation of work and a link to the new international division of labour (Mitter, 1986; Phizacklea and Wolkowitz, 1995).

In Britain, as in other Western countries, we find a steady increase in part-time work in the post-World War II period. Part-timers in Britain now make up one-quarter of the labour force and, as elsewhere, the majority of part-timers are women, with an even higher percentage than in Canada: 85 percent versus 70 percent (ILO, 1996). In their important historical study of British part-timers, Beechey and Perkins (1987) note a significant shift in the use of part-time labour between the 1940s and 1950s and from the 1960s on. In the earlier decades women part-timers were more apt to be found in manufacturing employ. Women were incorporated into the labour force during the war and immediate post-war boom years to make up for a shortage of male workers, and accommodation had
to be made for women's family responsibilities through part-time employment. Some employers were initially resistant to this, but as they witnessed the benefits of flexibility, lower costs and increased productivity from the new proletariat of female part-timers, their resistance waned (Beechey and Perkins, 1987: 22).

The expanded use of part-time labour became more marked in the 1960s, with increases in part-timers in manufacturing and even more so in services -- both public and private. In the state sector, women were recruited as part-time labour in the 1960s to help deal with a labour shortage. This had the effect of expanding part-time work in professional occupations such as nursing and teaching. But, for the most part, part-time work remained highly segregated between and within professions: "It appears that the association of the least desirable forms of work with part-time working, which was promoted by the Ministry of Labour during the war, continued throughout the post-war years" (Beechey and Perkins, 1987: 25).

In the 1970s part-time work continued to increase in the British service sector, along with women's labour force participation. But the 1970s and 1980s also brought economic crisis to Britain, with previous labour shortages in some areas giving way to high unemployment, "and moves on the part of many employers to restructure their labour processes" (Beechey and Perkins, 1987: 30). With these moves, part-time work became one of a number of modes of casual employ used by capital to achieve a more flexible labour force.

Along with part-time work, there has been a significant increase in short-term and temporary contract work throughout the British economy. There has been an increase in homeworking, or domestic putting-out work, in labour-intensive clothing and toy manufacture, but also in more capital-intensive work (cf. Allen and Wolkowitz, 1987; Phizacklea and Wolkowitz, 1995). Social scientists have noted a resurgence of homework throughout the West, in both new and old industries (Dangler, 1994; Fernandez, 1989; Leach, 1996; Sassen, 1994). In areas like textiles, homework is like a glimpse back into the early Industrial Revolution. In areas like electronics, it is hardly the glamorous post-industrial "electronic cottage" that people like Toffler (1980) describe. The picture is closer to Marx's (1867: 595) description of "so-called" domestic workers in the clothing industry as "an external department of the manufacturers, warehouses and even of the workshops of smaller masters." Marx noted the super-exploitation and vulnerability of workers in these positions, and
Allen and Wolkowitz (1987) note the same conditions for modern homeworkers, showing as well how homework is integral to capitalist production and to the current phase of capitalist restructuring.

With regards to numbers of industrial homeworkers, an exact estimate is probably impossible. Much homework flows into the informal economy, and there is a great mix of actual homeworking and outworking -- where workers are employed in small manufacturing shops doing the same kind of work that others are doing at home. Estimates are further complicated by the practices, in most official surveys, of including homeworkers with the self-employed. Like Canada, Britain has had a steady increase in the number of self-employed, according to British Census data. There is now more than one-in-ten Britons in the labour force who are self-employed (ILO, 1996). More telling, there is evidence of an increase in number of suppliers of homework in Britain in recent years, though again the exact extent is probably hidden by the informal economy (Allen and Wolkowitz, 1987; Mitter, 1986; Phizacklea and Wolkowitz, 1995).

Employers' use of casual labour is part of the shift to flexible production, allowing in particular for numerical and financial flexibility. We see the move towards "flexibility" as a way of "cutting costs or passing them on to other firms, state bodies or, as in homeworking, workers themselves" (Allen and Wolkowitz, 1987: 167). In the majority of cases, temporary work or short-term contracts are made available by employers according to their own requirements, and part-time hours are fixed according to production schedules and consumer demand. If they fit in with the workers' other responsibilities or with their preferences, this is coincidental (Allen and Wolkowitz, 1987: 166).

Turning to the U.S. labour market, we find a situation similar in Britain and Canada. There has been an increased use of part-time and other forms of casual labour in the formal economy in recent years. Though officially fewer than in Britain or in Canada, the proportion of part-timers in the U.S. labour force has been steadily rising over time, with 18 percent of U.S. workers now officially employed part time (BLS, 1998), but unofficial estimates suggest that more than one-in-five U.S. workers is employed part time (McKie, 1992; Tilly, 1996).

In addition to sectoral shifts in employment, work itself is being restructured. Part-time, homework, temporary, and other forms of "cost-free" labor are replacing traditional employment in both service and production. Such forms account for the expansion of employment in the United States (Kolko, 1988: 312-3).
The ranks of U.S. "contingent labor," including leased and temporary workers, involuntary part-timers, employees of subcontractors, and home workers, grew from 8 million in 1980 to 18 million by 1985 (Harrison and Bluestone, 1988: 45). It is estimated that contingent labour now comprises roughly one-third of U.S. civilian labour force (Harrison, 1997: 201). Part-time employment in the United States grew by 121 percent between 1970 and 1990 (Yates, 1994: 17). About one-quarter of U.S. part-timers are now involuntary part-timers (Tilly, 1996: 3). Between 1982 and 1990, temporary employment, including workers leased by employee-leasing companies, grew by 300 percent to total 1.3 million people. The numbers of temporary workers has continued to grow, with one U.S. temporary employment company, Manpower (sic) Incorporated, now being the single largest employer in the United States (Parker, 1994; Henson, 1996). The evidence shows that the increase in casual labour is tied to global restructuring and the hollowing out of U.S. industry. Moreover, "the corporate benefits of substituting temporary, leased, and part-time workers for regular, full-time employees are not restricted to bad economic times" (Harrison and Bluestone, 1988: 45; Harrison, 1997). As with Britain, in the United States we find an increased use of "the old technique of homework and sweatshops, made possible by an increase in the number of illegal immigrants" (Kolko, 1988: 314). But homeworking is increasingly used throughout and services industries (Dangler, 1994; Sassen, 1994; 1996).

Kolko (1988) relates the expansion of part-time and temporary work to the expansion of the reserve army of labour. Indeed, these trends appear to be part of a program for "zapping labour," as publicly enunciated by President Nixon's Assistant Secretary of Labour, Arnold Weber, in the early 1970s (Harrison and Bluestone, 1988: 51). In this context it becomes obvious how casual labour is useful to capital for cost cutting, union avoidance, and union busting. It is all part of the corporate agenda and state neo-liberalism which, since the early 1970s, have brought about what Harrison and Bluestone (1988) call a "great U-turn" from the Fordist social compromise between labour and capital of the mid-20th Century (see also Arrighi, 1990; Harrison, 1997).

The case of Sweden makes an interesting counterpoint to those cases where part-time work has emerged as a form of super-exploited labour. The proportion of part-timers in the Swedish labour market is high, with more than one-in-four workers employed part time. Most of these (81%) are women, more than in Canada though less than in Britain (ILO, 1996: 26). What makes the
situation of part-time employees stand out in the Swedish case is the history of social-democratic social policy which has benefitted part-timers.

There has been a steady increase in Swedish women's formal employment since 1970, along with a somewhat smaller increase in part-time employment (Sundstrom, 1987; 1992). In 1970, 38 percent of Swedish women worked part time, rising to 47 percent by 1982 and dropping slightly thereafter. Part-time employment in Sweden is high compared to Canada, probably for two reasons. First, legislation in Sweden has permitted part-timers with young children to work part-time without loss of seniority. This has prevented part-time work in Sweden from becoming synonymous with degraded labour. Second, a Swedish worker who works at least 17 hours per week, half the hours of a full-timer, "gets the same social benefits as a full-time worker but pro rata. Those working fewer hours lose some benefits, but all employees regardless of weekly hours are entitled to sick pay, old age pension, vacation, etc." (Sundstrom, 1987: 15). Such legislation has benefitted Swedish part-timers and, arguably, the productivity of the Swedish economy. But with recent centre-right and social-democratic governments further opening Sweden to globalization and backtracking on social policy, the future for Swedish workers looks less rosy (Hermele, 1993; Olsen, 1999; Ryner, 1999). How does the Canadian case compare?

III. Part-time Work and the Casual Labour Market in Canada

Statistics Canada first began to measure part-time employment through the Labour Force Survey (LFS) in 1953. At that time, part-time work was defined as average weekly employment of "less than 35 hours" at all jobs, and 197,000 people (less than four percent of the Canadian labour force) were found to be working part time (see Table 1). In 1975, Statistics Canada changed its definition so that part-time employment became average weekly employment of "less than 30 hours" at all jobs. Using the old (35 hour) definition, 12.9 percent of the labour force was employed part time in 1975. Using the new (30 hour) definition, 10.6 percent of Canadian workers were employed part time (Table 1). Use of the new 1975 definition would categorize 16.7 percent of Canadian workers as part-timers today. And use of the old (35 hour) measure would put those working part time at 24.0 percent of the labour force (Statistics Canada, 1998: 11). But Statistics Canada has recently made another significant change to its definition of part-time employment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Part-time Employment</th>
<th>Full-time Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual ('000)</td>
<td>As a % of Total Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975*</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976**</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,589</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* The Labour Force Survey was revised in 1975. The first figure is based on the old Labour Force Survey; part-time employment between 1953 and 1975 consisted of persons who usually worked less than 35 hours per week. The second figure is based on the revised Survey and since 1975 part-time employment consists of persons who usually work less than 30 hours per week.

** The relatively large Average Annual Percent Change in part-time employment between 1975 and 1976 is the result of Statistics Canada's recent changes to the definition of part-time work in the Labour Force Survey. Full-time and part-time distinctions are now based on the respondents' main or sole jobs, not total hours worked.
In recognition of the increase in numbers of "involuntary part-timers" (those who cannot find full-time jobs), "multiple jobholders," and "discouraged workers" (those who quit searching for work), Statistics Canada (1996) has developed a new definition of part-time employment to try to provide a better accounting of the extent of underemployment in the Canadian labour market. Whereas the old definition of part-time included hours from all jobs, the new definition lists as part-timers those who usually work less than 30 hours per week "at their main or sole job." With this definition the percentage of those working part-time increased from 17.0 percent to 18.6 percent of the labour force in 1995 (Table 1). This redefinition of part-time employment highlights the extent of the casualization process that has been occurring in recent years.

In fact, the adjustment resulting from the new definition by itself still probably underestimates the extent of part-time work. The official LFS figure, which had increased to 19.0 percent part-time workers in the Canadian labour force in 1997 while dropping slightly to 18.7 percent in 1998, is based on reference point figures. Statistics Canada also releases annual average figures, which have shown over 20 percent of the labour force to be part time, using the 30-hour mark (Gower, 1988: 17). Estimating the numbers of involuntary part-timers and discouraged workers is especially problematic, prompting Statistics Canada to reformulate the wording of questions related to these categories in the Labour Force Survey (see Statistics Canada, 1996). And those part-timers who are "self-employed" are categorized as self-employed by the LFS, not as part time. Moreover, the number of part-timers, and all casuals, would increase yet more if we included members of the informal labour force. Suffice to say that at least one-in-five members of the Canadian labour force is now working part time.

The important thing to note from Table 1 is the steady growth in part-time work over the post-war period. The figures show that the rate of increase has been subject to cyclical swings (cf. Noreau, 1994), but the whole period has witnessed a steady growth of part-time work overall (see Figure 1). As well, the increase in part-time employment may be somewhat understated because of the large growth of multiple jobholders, from 212,000 in 1975 to 723,000, or just over five percent of the labour force, in 1997 (Pold, 1990; Cohen, 1994; Sussman, 1998).
FIGURE 1

There has been a steady post-WWII growth trend in part-time work - to the point that around 1 in 5 workers are now part-timers (see text).

Significant to note, then, is the continued growth of part-time work over two decades of economic boom and two decades of economic crisis -- i.e., the increase in part-time work is more than a cyclical phenomenon. But, looking at Table 1, we do see an important trend related to economic cycles. With the recession of 1981-82 there was a decrease in full-time employment and an increase in part-time employment. From 1984 to 1989, there was an increase in full-time employment but gains in part-time employment continued. With the most recent (1990-92) recession, full-time employment declined but part-time employment increased again. This is an increase that has continued, as the labour market overall is subjected to more casualization. Even while the number of full-time workers has increased in recent years, the number of part-timers has risen as well. With respect to economic restructuring, a number of observers have commented on the significance of increases in involuntary part-time work -- more people looking for full-time jobs but unable to find them (e.g., Tilly, 1996). In 1975, only one-tenth of Canadian part-timers were involuntary, but now, over one-third are involuntary (Noreau, 1994; Dumas, 1996; Schellenberg, 1997).

IV. Who Works Part Time?
It is commonly held that most part-time workers are young, but data from recent studies show an increase in the number and proportion of older part-timers.³ "In 1998, the majority (58%) of part-time jobs were filled by 25-to-54 year-olds, up from 48% in 1978. In contrast, the share held by youths aged 15 to 24 fell from 40% to 33%" (Pold, 1999: 56).⁴ However, young workers (15-24) do have high rates of part-time employment, with 40 percent of young males and 56 percent of young females working part-time, compared to just eight percent of older males (25-54) and 26 percent of older females. The majority of young males generally work part time while completing their education; others, because they cannot find full-time work ("involuntary" part time). Young females, like young males, may also work part time while taking an education. But a significant portion are also forced into involuntary part-time labour.⁵

Clearly, women are over-represented among the ranks of part-time workers. In 1975, one-in-five women worked part time while only one-in-twenty men did so. Now, one-in-four women work part time but still less than one-in-ten men do so. Women have formed the majority of part-time
workers throughout the post-World War II period and continue to make up over two thirds of part-time workers. Both male and female part-time workers have increased in numbers in recent years; females, slightly more than males. The gendered patterns of the labour market are evidenced by the fact that men have a higher rate of involuntary part-time employment than women, this being tied to the business cycle. Involuntary part-time work tends to move in tandem with the unemployment rate, though not falling in tandem with unemployment rates in recent recoveries (Noreau, 1994; Schellenberg, 1997).

In Canada as in other countries, females aged 25 and older are more apt to be part-timers than males aged 25 and older. In terms of marital status, single males and females are both likely to work part time. Until recently, this has been primarily a factor of age, with most young single part-timers being students who do not want full-time work (Logan, 1994). However, the effects of high unemployment and labour market polarization on youth now makes part-time employment less of a "choice" for youth. The most striking differences in the correlation of part-time employment and marital status are those by gender. While more than one-in-five single males work part time, only one-in-forty married males do so -- perhaps because the latter are still expected to bring in the "family wage." On the other hand, three out of 10 single females work part time, as do one-in-four married females.

As noted above, we might surmise that fewer married than single females work part time due to family responsibilities, though perhaps even fewer would work at all if not for economic necessity, or more would work full time if quality affordable child care and good full-time jobs were available. Divorced, separated and widowed women are less likely to work part time than married or single women, for a variety of probable reasons. Single mothers with young children are less able, financially and time-wise, to work at all. Single mothers with older children are more able to work full time (and must, since over 70 percent of their ex-husbands default on support payments in Canada). And widowed women are usually older and not able to work due to age.

The relationship between work and women's family responsibilities is made clearer when we examine the correlation between family status and age of the youngest child. Women with preschool age children are more likely to work part time, especially those mothers living with a spouse. Single mothers with young children are less likely to participate in the labour force than are those
with older children, but those single mothers with young children who do work are most apt to do so part time.

Labour Force Survey data show reasons given by respondents for working part time. These data reveal that the majority of both males and females listed as "married" or "other" (divorced, separated or widowed) who work part time, state that they "do not want full-time work." The second most frequent answer given by all four of these groups is: "can only find part-time work." But the difference in spread between frequency of response for married women was three times as great as for married men and "other" men and women. Over half of married women state that they "do not want full-time work," as opposed to less than one quarter who "can only find part-time work." Less than half of respondents from the other three groups just mentioned "do not want full-time work," while just over one-third say they "can only find part-time work."

The third most frequent reason for working part time given by married women is: "personal or family responsibilities." This answer is given by almost one-in-five married women, slightly more than one-in-twenty "other" women, only one-in-one-hundred single women, and three-in-one-hundred married men. That married women stand out as the group most likely to state they "do not want full-time work," and the group most likely to give "personal or family responsibilities" as their reasons for working part time, leads one to surmise that it is likely family responsibilities that keep them from working full time (Logan, 1994). The reasons for working part time used in the LFS would have to be further disaggregated to show this. But other studies, especially those based on interviews and other interpretive data, suggest that it is family responsibilities that lead more women than men to work part time (see below and Labour Canada, 1983; Pupo, 1989; 1997; White, 1983). On the other hand, some might "not want full-time work" because the jobs they experience are so alienating.

The most frequent reason for working part time, which was given by two-thirds of single males and two-thirds of single females is "going to school" (Logan, 1994; Pold, 1999). The second most frequent response, which was given by one-quarter of single females and one-fifth of single males is: "can only find part-time work." Most of these respondents are young and confronting the job ghettos for youth frequently discussed in the news these days.
Considering part-time employment by industry, we see that part-time work is most frequent in the service industries as a group, especially in the retail trade and food and accommodation services (Pold, 1999). This is the case for both males and females. There are also high percentages of women part-timers in agriculture and in construction. But the numbers are deceptive, since few women in total are employed in either industry. As would be expected, the occupations with the greatest proportion of part-timers are also in the service sector, especially clerical, sales and service work. Clerical, sales and service occupations in which women tend to be concentrated also absorb a large share of male part-time employment, although relatively fewer men work part time.

High percentages of women employed in transport, equipment operating, and materials-handling work part time, though few women work in these areas. Women part-timers are also prevalent in professions, where growing numbers of women are employed. One-in-five women, but less than one-in-twenty men, employed within the managerial, administrative and professional occupational category are part-timers. We can observe in the Canadian case then, as in others discussed above, that part-time employment is the form of flexible employment most often utilizing female labour, whereas male labour is more often used in short-term or overtime flexible working arrangements.

The concentration of both male and female part-timers in service sector industries and occupations implies that there is something in the nature of this work -- generally seen as "women's work" -- that makes it a favourite for hiring part-timers. In other words, it is not so much family responsibilities or women's "demand" for part-time work that begets it, but the nature of the work in this sector. Of course, cultural values that cast certain of these jobs as women's work make them more amenable to casualization. But clerical work was not always seen as "women's work." In fact, it was actively "feminized" (Lowe, 1987), a structural process which is proceeding in other areas -- therefore the feminization of not just the labour force but of work per se (Fernandez, 1985; von Werlhof, 1984). Of course, for cultural reasons, it is easier to induce women to do feminized work; although, with long-term economic restructuring and massive unemployment, male standards are changing.

The service sector in general is where we find a concentration of female workers, part-time workers, and non-union, low-waged jobs. It was noted above that over 80 percent of formally
employed females work in the service sector. And while 25 percent of all employed women work part time, over 30 percent of women in the service sector work part time. We often hear that employers in the service sector like to hire part-timers to fit "flexible" schedules. In the retail trades, for example, it is cheaper to hire part-timers to work the busier "peak hours" and weekends than to have full-timers, who are accorded benefits and holidays not legislated for part-timers (Broad, 1997; Coates, 1988; Weeks, 1980; White, 1983).

It is evident that part-timers rank low on scales of worker rights and benefits (Labour Canada, 1983; White, 1983; Coates, 1988; Schellenberg, 1997). Hourly wage rates of part-timers in various areas of employment average only two-thirds to three-quarters those of full-timers, with women earning less in both full-time and part-time employment. Overall, more than two-in-five part-timers earn less than $7.50 per hour, while only one-in-ten full-timers earn such a low wage. While 60 to 70 percent of full-timers have workplace benefit plans that include pension, medical, dental, and paid sick leave benefits, fewer than 20 percent of part-timers have the same benefits (Schellenberg, 1997).

It is often suggested that part-time workers have lower pay and fewer benefits because they are not unionized. There has been an increase in union membership for part-timers, with membership rising from 418,000 to 462,000 between 1987 and 1997 (Akyeampong, 1998: 32; Mainville and Olineck, 1999). But while still less than 22 percent of part-timers are unionized, closer to 40 percent of full-timers are unionized (Galarneau, 1996). The breakdown by sex and industry is instructive, showing that male full-timers are more likely to be unionized than female full-timers. But these males are more concentrated in the goods-producing industries, related services (e.g., transportation), and public service professions, which tend to be more unionized than private services. Women part-timers are more apt to be unionized than male part-timers but, of course, most part-timers are female (Ghalam, 1993; Krahn, 1992; Akyeampong, 1998).

V. The Casualties of Casualization: A Saskatchewan Case Study

To examine the conditions of part-time workers in Saskatchewan and the extent to which the revised Labour Standards Act as passed in the Saskatchewan Legislature in 1994 might improve those conditions, we undertook a multi-year study of part-time work in Saskatchewan's two largest cities
of Regina and Saskatoon. The study involves interviews with part-timers working in a range of occupations in both the private and public sectors. Part-timers are being asked about conditions of employment, the impact of working part time on their personal and family lives, and about the impact of the revised Act on their work and well-being. Important provisions of the Act pertain to pro-rating of benefits for part-timers, advance scheduling of hours to limit the extent of on-call work patterns and giving part-timers at least one week's advanced notice of hours, so they can better arrange their work and family responsibilities. Allowance for breaks, length of time between shifts, and recognition of statutory holidays are also important provisions of the Act. Unfortunately, due to business opposition, some important provisions of the Act were not declared by Cabinet, and therefore were not included on the revised Regulations and put into effect (Broad and Mac Neil, 1995). Given space limitations, we can offer only a sampling of what participants had to say about their working and welfare conditions.

The majority of our participants are women from their mid twenties to mid thirties, many with young children. This pattern fits the national demographic profile of part-timers. Most have at least a grade 12 education, and many have some university or college education. As well, many are currently upgrading their education in hopes of gaining better employment. While our participants were not specifically asked about their levels of income, many have received some form of assistance in the form of loans, support from friends and family and, for some, social assistance or support from charities like food banks. Not surprisingly, the latter forms of assistance are most often used by single mothers.

The two most common concerns raised directly or indirectly by participants are the poor remuneration in terms of pay and benefits for part-time workers, and the problem of child care and family responsibilities. The latter problem includes both the inability to access child care, partly due to insufficient quality, affordable child care in Canada (Cleveland and Krashinsky, 1998; Lero, 1992), and difficulties in being able to plan family time. Balancing two or three part-time jobs, pursuing education, and carrying out family responsibilities is obviously hectic.

Most participants said they are not working part time by choice and would take full-time positions if available. Some qualified their answers, saying they like their jobs and would only move
to a full-time job with another employer if they liked the job, or if the pay was significantly better. One woman commented,

Because the labour pool is so big out there, I haven't been able to find full-time work. It's a sign of the times. It used to be that for every three jobs I applied for, I got at least one interview. Now, I can apply for 10 jobs and I may get one interview. ... As a part-time employee, you become a job hopper. In an interview I was asked, 'Why so many jobs?' But it doesn't take an expert to figure it out.

It appears that, despite the intent of the labour standards revisions, many workers still work on-call patterns. This may be either because certain employers gain exemptions or the Act is flaunted by employers and not enforced by government (see below). In fact, some participants have had their hours cut back while others, classified as part time by their employers, work full-time hours by picking up on-call shifts. One woman who holds two part-time positions, when asked if she would take a full-time job, stated, "I would take full time, but neither position has a full-time classification. They like to keep it that way." Another participant said, "They don't hire full time at Acme anymore. At Ajax [where she also works part time] they already have two full-time staff and say that's all they need right now. I would work full time if I could, but there really is no full-time work." Thus employers avoid legislation and collective agreements stipulating conditions of work and pay by substituting part-timers for full-timers.

Many participants volunteered that they earn only minimum wage or little more, with those holding more than one job stating that it is primarily for economic reasons. In fact, a few participants held a full-time job that paid such a low wage that they were forced to take on part-time work to supplement their income. Most of those stating they "choose" to work part time do so either because of family responsibilities or because they are studying. One woman said, "I work part-time because my day care costs are so high, and I can't afford to keep my children in day care for 10 hours a day. Right now I make $8 an hour, and it would cost me $9 an hour to keep them in day care." She added, "I used to work five nights a week and my kids were in day care at night, at school all day, and on the weekends they were with their father [she and he are divorced]. I had no time with them at all."

Child care responsibilities is one of the main reasons that women are the prime source of part-time workers. Similar to other studies of part-timers, many of our participants reported that
their biggest "hassle" results from lack of quality, affordable child care. Our respondents' experiences support the findings of needs studies showing a general lack of child care spaces in Canada. Beyond this, there is a problem of cost that leaves many low-wage workers unable to afford formal child care, so many are forced to rely on informal arrangements. To complicate matters even more, when children are sick and unable to go to day care, parents often confront the reality that many employer practices are not family friendly. For example, while sick leave for workers has become common, this usually does not apply to the need to care for sick family members. One of our participants said,

Single mothers can't use sick days when their child is sick. In my situation, I don't get holidays either, and this makes it difficult when my child is sick. I should be able to use my sick leave, or there should be something set up to provide for leave. I get hassled now for using my sick days, and my supervisor investigates. It's really hard when you have a child at home.

A number of participants said that there should be expanded child care programming, including more government child care subsidies for low-wage workers. Some suggested the need for more flexible child care for shift and night workers. One woman said, "I think day care should be a big part of any business. If you have a certain number of employees with children, and they work late hours, then their employers should fund day care centres." However, another woman questioned the whole idea of having so much late work. "Most people like to work in the day because they want their nights to spend with their families. They need full-time hours and want days because of their families."

Even when working part time by choice, participants still encounter difficulties because they are forced to work around full-timers' shifts, or because employers often give little consideration to the workers' own needs. Part-timers cited instances of employers either denying time off or not permitting shift changes for workers to attend to personal or family interests. One participant said,

We are not allowed to trade [shifts] and there are plenty of reprimands for requests. I have filled in a form two weeks in advance and she [the supervisor] wouldn't let me take the time off. When I needed time off for a funeral she wanted to see the obituary. When I call in sick she gives me a really hard time.

Another participant who had received permission in advance to take time off to attend her child's school play was arbitrarily denied the time off when the day came. Yet another participant
said, "Employers are not as family oriented as they could be. We negotiated two family days in our contract and it was very difficult. These family days are significant for trips to the hospital or to the kid's graduation." And another noted, "When you are single parent you have to work around your job. You need to take kids to doctors and school things. Better advance scheduling would help, instead of having to take time off and make the boss mad."

One participant summarized the dilemmas of not having sufficient advance notice of schedule or change of schedule:

You can't have a life when it's like that. With retail work, where the store is always open 9 am-9 pm, there is no reason people can't be scheduled for the same shifts every day. I think that better scheduling policies would reduce sick time, because people could schedule their life around hours that they work instead of having to take extra time off.

Interestingly, some participants did discuss the added stress of having to balance part-time jobs and other areas of their lives. One, in discussing problems of minimum wage, housing costs and child care, said, "It's impossible the amount of stress you have to deal with, and so many people are doing it!"

Related to the problem of scheduling is the problem of periods of rest for part-timers. One participant commented, "It's a fallacy to say that there is time off [for part-timers], because you work when there is work. If there is a set policy, the places don't follow it. In order to be able to work 90 percent of full time you have to work when it is available." Another said, "I think it would be nice if part-timers didn't have to wait and hope to pick up extra shifts. If I'm scheduled for 25 hours I might pick up two extra, but other shifts might be cut. I never know when I'm working." Others commented that the legislated eight hours between shifts is not really enough and, for those forced into multiple jobholding, the legislation is meaningless because it applies only to one job.

Another concern for part-timers is access to regular meal and coffee breaks. One participant said,

At Grocery Mart they usually make me take my break in the first hour and my lunch in 2.5 hours. I have come back and then worked for five hours with only a 15 minute break. It's a long shift, and I don't need a break in the first hour. We should be able to take breaks when we need them because otherwise you are tired and exhausted. They follow the law, but they use it to their advantage.
Another participant who works as a hotel banquet porter said, "I would like to see earlier meal times, because it is hard to work on an empty stomach and do physical labour like lifting, etc. Some nights I work 10 hours and haven't eaten or sat down. It gets hard." A woman who works at a night club noted, "At the bar I don't get breaks. There is no relief, and I am there from 9 pm 'til 3am." And according to another who works in the transportation industry, "They said they weren't paying us for breaks, they were paying for us to drive. But a break makes you a better driver. You don't get groggy behind the wheel, and you have less chance of accidents. You need that break!"

Maternity and paternity leave is another area that falls under labour standards. Most participants had little problem taking these leaves. But one noted that women are sometimes stigmatized for getting pregnant, adding, "Maternity is a physical, natural thing, and is not the woman's 'fault'!" The most serious concern for many participants, both male and female, is that women too often lose a job or seniority when they take a maternity leave. One participant suggested that the job should be guaranteed when a woman comes back. She should be guaranteed the same pay and level of employment, because it is her right to have a child. And another argued, "You should be able to accumulate seniority when you're off. If you're on workers' compensation or sick leave you accumulate seniority, but on maternity leave you don't. It's discriminatory!"

The question of provision of benefits proved to be an irritant for many participants. Provision of benefits is often dependent on the strength of a collective agreement, not on legislation. Many participants complained that just because they are part-timers -- many not by choice -- does not mean they do not have the same need for benefits that full-timers do. The question of some employers' evasion of labour standards regulations arose as well. A few participants were enraged to discover that, according to *The Labour Standards Regulations*, they were entitled to benefits that employers were not providing. The fact that employers are exempted from providing benefits to students also annoyed many. One woman indignantly stated, "Full-time students are not eligible for benefits because they supposedly aren't working to live, but just for spending money. *Excuse me! I'm 30 years old and have three children, and I'm just working for spending money?*" Another woman said, "Too many employers use part-time workers to avoid paying benefits. Not every job has paid sick leave and it should. Eventually we will all be working constantly for money, just like in poor countries like China."
When asked about the undeclared "most available hours" provision of *The Saskatchewan Labour Standards Act*, which would allow part-timers the right to pick up extra hours when they become available, most participants agreed that it should be declared. But there was some disagreement as to whether the main criterion for acquiring extra hours should be seniority, economic need, or something else. Some collective agreements make provision for employees to pick up extra hours by seniority. One participant said the provision should be proclaimed because it is the "decent" thing to do, adding that years ago most jobs were full time. Now they abuse part-time workers by the way they schedule them -- this must stop. You don't have much dignity when you work part time. There should be as many workers as possible scheduled full time. If government lowered the workweek to 32 hours then everyone would work. There would be more spending power in the community and less problems. At least schedule most available hours so that people can earn a living without working two or three jobs.

Another participant said that the provision should be proclaimed "for the overall health of the work force. If a person has worked long enough they should deserve a full-time job." And another participant simply stated that the provision should be proclaimed "because [former Saskatchewan Minister of Labour] Bob Mitchell said that he would."

When asked if their employment status and job security had improved since implementation of the revised labour standards legislation, most participants said they had not. Perhaps not surprisingly, those in unionized positions, and particularly where it is an activist union, tend to have more job security and better conditions overall. But the fact that greater numbers of people throughout Canada and some other Western countries are holding down more than one job, with increasing forays into the informal economy, suggests a deterioration of employment and income security in general. Many of our participants complained about pay rates and, in particular, the number of jobs at or near the minimum wage.

Issues of particular concern to women were raised frequently by participants. Child care was an important issue. But many also noted problems related to lack of pay equity and employment equity, and the continuing prevalence of sexual discrimination and harassment in the labour market. For one woman it was apparent that
women don't work by choice any more but by necessity. They shouldn't be discriminated against by what types of jobs they are offered. I think you should be able to get equal pay for equal work. We have a pay equity issue at work. We have a human rights class action suit against our employer. The food clerks get paid more than the cashiers do, and they hire only men for clerks and women for cashiers. We should be paid as much since our job is worth as much or more.

Another added that "the cashiers also do food clerks' duties without any extra pay. There is not much cross movement in the positions, and it is fought by management and fellow [sic] workers. We also have few women managers. Women seem to drop out of management running because of chauvinism and harassment."

Many participants argued that part-timers would be helped most if governments would increase minimum wages substantially and get back to promoting full-time employment,\(^{13}\) though a few also suggested that we should start pushing for shorter work time for all, so that people have more time for themselves and their families. One woman summarized the feelings of many participants:

Business is going to have to understand that we need to get back to a full-time working society. Laying off people with no concern for the economy and future spending won't work. It's a scary outlook to be 40 years old and unemployed and have to go back to school. And politicians who support big business are forgetting about people. We need money for government-subsidized day care. And employers who have bizarre hours should provide day care. I feel that there should be a provision in the Act where it guarantees a minimum number of hours a week. Without a minimum, it decreases your quality of life.

Another woman forcefully expressed the view of a number of participants with this recommendation: "Organize, organize, organize! We need more union shops, because employers would be required to provide a higher standard of living for everyone."

Our findings correspond to much of the research on part-time work which suggests that perhaps the two best ways to improve working and social welfare conditions for part-time workers is through 1) improved social policy and programming and 2) advancing part-timers' welfare status through trade union organizing and collective bargaining. In this essay I have noted that European countries have used vehicles such as labour standards legislation to improve conditions for part-timers, and I have discussed attempts made in Saskatchewan to use improved labour standards
legislation to benefit part-time workers. But the failure of the Saskatchewan government to implement the province's revised *Labour Standards Act* shows that the letter of the law is not a sufficient basis for promoting social policy reform. Governments and employers must also abide by the spirit of the law, and it is here that the Saskatchewan example falls short. This is revealed by responses to our interviews with part-time workers and by interviews carried out with trade union officials.¹⁴ In both cases, we found participants complaining that employers often ignore or flaunt provisions of the Act and Regulations and that government generally fails to enforce the Act and Regulations.

Trade union representatives who were interviewed for our study said they are very disappointed with the Saskatchewan government both for "watering down" and failing to enforce the legislation. Part of the problem is that the Labour Standards Branch of Saskatchewan Labour is short staffed due to government cutbacks and tight spending resulting from neo-liberal phobias about state deficits. Representatives from three different unions told us that their members who have phoned the Labour Standards Branch to complain about violations of the Act have been told to talk to their employers or unions about the problem. However, if an employee already has concerns about job security, she is not going to complain to her employer. Asking the union to get involved could also have negative repercussions for individual members of this precarious group of casual workers, and union involvement could result in a long torturous grievance process. One part-timer we interviewed said, "It would be nice if they would staff the Labour Standards offices properly to be able to look after all the complaints." Another said,

I don't feel that Labour Standards does enough to ensure that employers are complying with the laws. I don't feel that they do enough when a complaint is made. A slap on the wrist is not enough. The Branch should be there to protect people, but part-time workers are at the bottom of the wage scale and Labour Standards is doing anything *but* protecting workers. I don't even know why they have an office, because they don't implement what currently exists.

Many part-time workers we interviewed said that the revised Act had little impact on them because many provisions were already part of their collective agreement. Those working at non-unionized part-time jobs often said that provisions of the Act did not apply to their workplace, perhaps because it was too small or because employers simply ignored the Act. A few were more
generous, saying they thought the employer was not well informed about the Act. One participant, when asked if her employer supported the legislation, said, "What is common general knowledge they seem to support," but added, "I guess what they can get away with they will try."

VI. Casualization of Labour in Canada

To summarize, it is significant to note that, with cyclic fluctuations, there has been a steady increase in part-time employment over two decades of economic growth and two decades of global crisis. To account for this, we can note the confluence of two factors: (1) the great increase in women's formal labour force participation that creates a "demand" for part-time work, and (2) structural changes that create a demand for part-time workers, or a "supply" of part-time work. Women's need for part-time work cannot itself beget that work. There must also be a demand for part-time workers. That "involuntary" part-time employment has grown faster than voluntary part-time employment is an indication of structural factors at work.

Although the flexibility of part-time work may appeal to some labour force participants (particularly students and young parents), the fact that fringe benefits, job security, and career potential are typically limited, and that many part-time workers would prefer full-time employment, suggests that the larger beneficiaries of this major shift in the Canadian labour market are employers (Krahn and Lowe, 1988: 55).

The "restructuring" explanation for increasing part-time work is also supported by the fact that there is a growth in other forms of casual work. An oft-cited study by the Economic Council of Canada (ECC, 1990) noted the rapid growth of four forms of "non-standard" work: part-time employment, short-term work, own-account self-employment, and temporary help agency work. "Between 1981 and 1986, these four forms of non-standard employment accounted for about half of all new jobs; they now represent nearly 30 percent of total employment" (ECC, 1990: 12). The Economic Council added that its "analysis indicates a long-term trend towards more non-standard employment" (ECC, 1990: 13).

In the last two decades the number of self-employed in Canada has increased more than twice as fast as the number of paid workers. The self-employed now account for almost 18 percent of all workers, up from 12 percent twenty years ago. Partly due to layoffs in the public sector, the self-employed now rival the number of public sector employees across Canada, with 2.5 million self-
employed compared to 2.6 million public sector employees (Dumas, 1996; Statistics Canada, 1997c; Statistics Canada, 1999a). Whereas part-time work is more apt to be the domain of women, self-employment has been more the domain of men. But since 1975 the number of self-employed women has been rising three times as fast as the number of self-employed men (G. Cohen, 1988; 1994; Statistics Canada, 1997c). Self-employment has been common in resource production where most workers are male. But the recent growth in self-employment is in manufacturing production, and especially in services where we find predominantly women workers. Self-employment rates have tended to mirror trends in unemployment rates, suggesting that self-employment is often not a matter of choice.

Part-time work and self-employment are the two forms of casual employment with the highest growth rates in the formal economy, but the Economic Council of Canada also singled out short-term work (less than six months' duration) and temporary employment. Official statistics show one-in-ten Canadian workers to be a temporary employee (Grenon and Chun, 1997), but official statistics are "likely to underestimate the true extent of temporary employment, since self-employed workers (such as freelancers and consultants) are not counted. Evidence from Britain indicates that about 15 percent of temporary workers are self-employed" (Schellenberg and Clark, 1996: 3-4). As with part-time work, there is debate as to whether temporary work is employee or employer driven. Schellenberg and Clark (1996) discuss this debate and support the argument that increasing temporary employment is more driven by economic restructuring than by employee choice. Overall, when combined with other forms of casual labour, the growth of temporary employment is significant enough for Vosko (1999) to argue that we are seeing the "standard employment relationship" replaced by the "temporary employment relationship."

Temporary employment has become more noticeable partly because of the growing profile of temporary help agencies (Grenon and Chun, 1997). These are agencies which keep a roster of persons on file who can either be referred or contracted out to employers. While fewer than one-in-ten temporaries is a temporary help agency worker, the growth of such employment has quadrupled since the early 1970s (Schellenberg and Clark, 1996). With the growth of contracting-out in recent years some of these agencies have been booming -- especially in business services. The Drake agency published an eight-page supplement to The Globe and Mail (23/11/92), entitled "The Drake
Productivity Report," which lauds the benefits of outsourcing for employers by touting Drake success stories. The Economic Council of Canada found that temporary-help agency work tripled in the 1980s, with over 40 percent of temporary-help workers being engaged in that type of employment because they could not find full-time jobs. Most temporary-help workers were to be found in clerical occupations, about 70 percent being female. Wage levels were generally well below those for full-time workers and fringe benefits were usually minimal (ECC, 1990: 12). Of course, the wages of the workers placed by the temporary-help agencies is lower than average, partly because the wage excludes the supplying agencies' mark-up.

Statistics Canada data show a steady increase in "moonlighting" (multiple jobholding) in recent years (Charrette, 1995; Cohen, 1994; Pold, 1995; Sussman, 1998; Webber, 1989). In 1977, only one out of every 40 workers was a multiple jobholder. Now one-in-twenty workers has a second job.\(^\text{15}\) As with other areas of casual labour, moonlighting has increased faster than general employment growth, the number of multiple jobholders having more than tripled over the last twenty years (Sussman, 1998). Webber tells us: "The term 'moonlighting' conjures up a picture of a full-time worker in a nine-to-five job holding down a second, night-time job . . . . This picture may have been accurate twenty years ago but today's reality is much more diverse" (Webber, 1989: 21).

The data show a strong link between multiple jobholding and self-employment. Small business people and farmers, for example, generally combine self-employment with a wage or salary job. Nearly one-fifth of moonlighters are self-employed in their main job, and more than one-third are self-employed in their second job (Cohen, 1994). There is also an obvious link between moonlighting and part-time work. While in 1977 only 20 percent of multiple jobholders worked part time in their main job, by 1997, 35 percent did so. As well, the multiple jobholding rate among part-timers (at 10 percent) was more than twice that of full-timers (four percent). "Involuntary part-timers were even more likely to moonlight (12%), indicating that the inability to find full-time work may be an important motivation to hold more than one job" (Sussman, 1998: 25). This is certainly the case for many participants in our Saskatchewan study discussed above. But despite the connection between moonlighting and part-time work, over half of moonlighters tend to put in long hours of total weekly work -- over 50 per week (Pold, 1995; Webber, 1989). Again, we found this to be the case with many of the part-timers interviewed in Saskatchewan.
The relationship between the new moonlighting and the growth of the service economy is obvious as well (Sussman, 1998). Moonlighters are over-represented in sales and service occupations and under-represented in processing, fabricating and machine occupations. The former tend to be lower-paying jobs and the latter higher-paying ones, but many female moonlighters are education, health and social service professionals. This fact relates to another: almost one-half of multiple jobholders whose main job is part time has a post-secondary education, compared to only one-third of part-timers with only one job. "The over-representation of well-educated workers among these moonlighters suggests that some of our most highly trained people may be unable to find suitable full-time jobs" (Cohen, 1994: 34).

Relevant to discussions of households as income pooling units, we find that nearly three-quarters of all moonlighters live in families with at least one other worker. This degree of labour market activity is prompted by the need to help offset low wages, given that multiple jobholders are not generally high earners -- their average annual earnings being equivalent to those of single jobholders (Cohen, 1994; Sussman, 1998). As in the labour market overall, there is gender inequality with female moonlighters earning less than males. This is especially important given that one of the most striking features of moonlighting in recent years is the rapid increase in the multiple jobholding rate for women. In the mid-1970s, only one-quarter of moonlighters were women. Now, however, over one-half of moonlighters are women (Cohen 1994; Sussman, 1998).

Another dimension of casual labour is those "on the margins of the labour force," including people who are unable to work full-time due to health problems, family responsibilities, shortage of formal work, et cetera. Though obviously affected by the cyclical fluctuations in the economy, the number of these "marginals" has grown over the years. Statistics Canada (1997a) estimates the number of people who have dropped off the official roster to constitute about six percent of the labour force. Observers following monthly changes in the unemployment rate in recent years will note that when the unemployment rate has dropped, it is often reported that the cause is discouraged (unemployed) workers dropping out of the labour force, and therefore off the official roll call. Some of these people could, of course, be active in the informal economy.

The question of these "marginals" shows that the Labour Source Survey data should be taken as problematic, both for what they miss and the connections they fail to make. Data do not, of
course, speak for themselves. Insights must be drawn from them, such as a concurrent rise of part-time work and multiple job-holding. But the LFS is not structured to draw these links. And with the informal economy now estimated to comprise 15 to 20 percent of economic activity in Canada, other data sources must be called upon to see where multiple job-holders might be straddling the boundary of formal and informal work (cf. Mirus and Smith, 1989; Mirus et al., 1994; Ross and Usher, 1986). There is certainly mounting evidence to show that the informal economy has been growing in the old core countries of the world economy. Canada's Globe and Mail recently published two feature articles on the informal economy. One, published in the business section, deals with the connection between growth of the underground economy and Revenue Canada's concerns about tax evasion and, not surprisingly for the Globe, throws in the neo-liberal argument for tax cuts (MacKinnon, 1999). The other article, entitled "Garment work turns home into sweatshop: Thousands of people are stitching clothes in conditions reminiscent of Third World" (Ross, 1999), discusses the problems of women's industrial homework and sweatshop work in major Canadian cities.

As in other Western countries, there has been an increase in homeworking in Canada, primarily by women, in garment and clerical work. Recent Statistics Canada studies have noted the increase in homework, some of which is related to increasing self-employment in response to high unemployment (Perusse, 1998a; 1998b). In neo-liberal jargon home-based workers are sometimes called "homepreneurs" (Foster, 1996). With global competition and trade agreements, garment manufacturing companies are increasingly farming out production work to homeworkers through sub-contractors, called "jobbers." Many of the homeworkers are immigrant women, though not all, as a study of garment homeworking in southern Quebec shows that capital will use cheap labour as it finds it. In service work as well, Canada has experienced an increase in what has come to be called "teleworking" (Devine et al., 1997) -- a trend which has become significant enough to warrant a special issue of the International Labour Office's Conditions of Work Digest (ILO, 1990). This modern form of homeworking finds the worker outfitted with a home computer and modem, so that clerical work can be done at home and transferred electronically through telephone lines. The Canadian government introduced a pilot project in teleworking, praising the benefits for workers who can more easily balance work and family responsibilities.
However, the Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) has raised a number of concerns about the trend towards teleworking, in terms of working conditions, job security, et cetera. Homeworking is often done on piecerate terms and pays less than minimum wage. "Research by the union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE) shows that homeworkers are mainly immigrant women, paid as little as $1.00 an hour and rarely more than $4.50" (Yalnizyan, 1993: 5). And, of course, these workers receive no benefits because legal fiction classifies them as self-employed. The Toronto-based Ecumenical Coalition for Economic Justice (ECEJ) contends that, rather than allowing women to better balance paid work and family, homeworking leads "from the double day to the endless day."

Analysis of the experience of Canadian garment workers shows how the expansion of homeworking is related to global and industrial restructuring (Yalnizyan, 1993). Globalization of production and increased global competition, both accelerated by moves towards freer trade, have undermined the viability of many medium-sized Canadian garment manufacturers. The industry is outsourcing more production to low-wage zones and moving to a "pyramid structure" of production in Canada and other developed countries. This pyramid structure, with a few large retailers at the top, has led to a more fragmented industry, with a growing number of small firms and an increase in industrial homeworking. In Ontario, for example, "43 per cent of these firms operate with one to four workers; only 23 per cent of the industry operates in establishments with more than 20 workers" (Yalnizyan, 1993: 3). Most homeworkers are concentrated in large urban areas. UNITE estimated that by 1991 there were 4,000 garment homeworkers in downtown Toronto. However, the Ontario Ministry of Labour had only 70 homeworkers registered, giving a good indication of the extent to which this form of disguised wage-labour operates through the informal economy. The majority of the workers are immigrant women, with over 60 percent being Chinese or Vietnamese (Leach, 1993; 1996).

The garment industry is being restructured to provide a flexible labour force suited to the demands of just-in-time production, with an imperative to provide low-cost labour. In Canada, as in other countries, the role of the retailer is most significant in the pyramid structure (Yalnizyan, 1993; Petras, 1992). As the final purchasers, a few giant retailers dictate the terms of production, from contractors through sub-contractors, on down to the homeworker. This leaves even sub-
contractors as virtual employees of the core firm. Leach (1993: 72) cites the example of one woman who became a sub-contractor to a company in Toronto, but found she had no more security and was as much at the whim of the company as individual homeworkers. In this way the company externalized costs of production and constructed a flexible labour force. So,

through the different organization of the labour process between the in-house sewers (semi-skilled, section work), the company's own homeworkers (skilled, entire garment) and the subcontractors (skilled, section work), the company ensured access to a variety of production options, utilizing different levels of skills for different kinds of tasks (Leach, 1993: 73).

The beauty of this flexible production for capital is that it allows direct control of production for some work, but also the externalization of other production to cut costs. The results are a lack of security for both in-house workers and out-workers, increased polarization of the labour force, and more casualization of labour.

VII. Manufacturing McJobs

The foregoing profile of the growing casual labour market in Western countries reveals the links between part-time and other sorts of casual work and the larger pattern of structural change in the economy. This casualization of labour is intimately tied to the degradation of work and the feminization of work, all of which figure prominently in current economic restructuring. Contrary to the best scenarios of theorists of a post-industrial utopia, Allen and Wolkowitz (1987: 181) contend "that casualized employment does not constitute a solution to economic recession, but is in fact one of its symptoms." As noted above, even the Economic Council of Canada, hardly an institution given to criticizing the prevailing capitalist economic system, finds more "bad" than "good" jobs being created, both in terms of skill content and wages. The prospects for many workers appear to be for casual, at best semi-skilled work, and declining standards of living.

Many discussions of work in the late 1960s and early 1970s were based on the thesis of post-industrial society. Bell (1973) and others, still in the throes of the post-World War II economic boom, postulated shorter working hours, higher wages, and expanded leisure time as the norm. However, given a life of unemployment for some, casualization of labour for others, and lengthened working days for yet others, Bell's post-industrial society thesis would seem to be incongruous with
present facts (Davis et al. 1997). The evidence better supports Braverman's (1974) thesis of increasing alienation and exploitation of labour through degradation, deskilling (as a process, not an end state) and segmentation of work and workers (Menzies, 1996). The use of new technology to further deskill and segment work, the further internationalization of capitalist production, and the drive to cheapen labour through both globalization and erosion of labour's strength ("union busting"), feed into casualization as a way to disorganize labour. The fact that most new jobs are being created in a service sector which can be staffed by an already less unionized female labour force is a propitious circumstance for capital. But casualization of work in its various forms is not being restricted to women or the service sector (von Werlhof, 1984).

Given the degradation of labour and increasing structural unemployment, in a talk given in the mid-1970s, Braverman (1975) forecast a future of competition for employment that used to be taken only as "second" jobs -- the sorts of jobs that people would tolerate when "moonlighting" for extra money. It is increasingly only in these "McJobs" that work is readily available. This is also the conclusion of researchers like Menzies (1991; 1996) and Reiter (1995) who argue that capitalist restructuring, in the drive to increase productivity, is "manufacturing McJobs" in both goods and services production. Menzies (1991: 31) notes that "many jobs are becoming part time or temporary. Even if they are full time, they are referred to as 'turnstile' jobs because people exit at the same level they entered". What is significant about the McJob is that it is becoming the most plentiful of the types of jobs being created by the technology of the post-industrial information age.

The McJob is not so much a feature of a particular type of occupation or industry. It is symbolic of people's relation to the technology on the job: whether they are working with the technology or for it; whether they control it or it controls them. Increasingly, computers determine the work to be done, which means control is being transferred to the computer and those who control and programme it (Menzies, 1991: 31).

Sivanandan (1990; 1997) goes so far as to say that, rather than labour emancipating itself from capital in the sense anticipated by Marx and Engels, using the new technologies of the information age capital has emancipated itself from labour. Mies et al. (1988) would say that capital has emancipated itself from proletarian labour (cf. Davis et al. 1997). Advances in communications and transportation mean that capital can now roam the globe in search of cheap, docile labour.
Deskilling and segmentation of work, combined with use of robotics, means that capital needs smaller numbers of workers, who are more easily replaceable. And despite all the talk of "job enlargement," "job enrichment," "quality of working life" and so on, Frederick Taylor's principles of scientific management seem to endure (Silver, 1987; Rinehart, 1996). If standards of life and work are not to further erode, the labour movement, on the decline and on the defensive, has its work cut out for it.

British sociologist T.H. Marshall analyzed the struggles of workers and social reformers which led, in the 18th Century, to the expansion of "civil rights" and, in the 19th Century, to the expansion of "political rights" (Marshall and Bottomore, 1992). The 20th Century, according to Marshall, was the century of struggle for "social rights," to which Macpherson (1985) added "economic rights." These struggles for provision of social services, more equitable distribution of wealth, full employment, et cetera, were integrated into the programs of social-democratic and socialist political movements.

Central to the struggle for Marshall's package of "citizenship rights" were demands for equality and democracy (cf. Wallerstein, 1988). But these demands did not fit the interests of capital, which mounted an assault on labour and the social movements through what has euphemistically come to be called economic restructuring wed to the politics of neo-liberalism (cf. Marchak, 1991). As increasing numbers of people are being immizerated by corporate restructuring and state cutbacks, they lose their hard won citizenship rights, and society is hollowed out. "Neo-liberalism is, by definition, the denial of human rights," stated liberation theologian Pedro Casaldaliga in greeting participants to the Latin American Encounter of Indigenous, Black and Grassroots Movement, held in the Brazilian city of Salvador de Bahia from July 11-15, 1993 (Aleman, 1993: 30).

Meanwhile, the powers that be and their ideologues contend that the current restructuring is simply a technical matter. Neo-liberalism has produced a malaise which tends to resign people to a notion of mechanical forces of history. Ideas of qualitative change through human choice have been marginalized by the current neo-liberal discourse which advocates submission to Adam Smith's (1776) "invisible hand" of the capitalist market. The refrain of this discourse is "there is no alternative" to the market or, more often, "the deficit made me do it." This refrain caused University
of Toronto political economist Mel Watkins to remark: "It's a funny old world when you can choose between 50 kinds of light beer, but can have only one kind of economy." (Work, Fall 1992: 12) In truth, the shift from Keynesian liberalism to neo-liberalism in the 1970s was a matter of policy choice, not a matter of historical inevitability. There are, of course, alternatives which might take us beyond neo-liberalism, but that is the subject of another essay (Broad and Antony, 1999).
ENDNOTES

1. Perhaps because it was first implemented by the nominally conservative governments of Thatcher, Reagan and Mulroney neo-liberalism was initially misnamed "neo-conservatism." But despite elements of social conservatism, it became obvious in short order that its policy orientation was based more on the pro-capitalist laissez-faire ideology of classical liberalism than on principles of classical conservatism which, while accepting of social inequality, still incorporated a notion of society and social obligation. Even Adam Smith (1776), whose arguments about the liberating effects of the "invisible hand of the market" are used as gospel in the crusade against Keynesianism and the Left, understood the necessity of social responsibility. Neo-liberals choose to ignore this side of Smith.


3. The following data is taken from the sources listed in Note 2 above, and Statistics Canada Catalogues 71-201 and 71-220 for various years..

4. Some males over 40 years of age who have been laid off as a result of industrial restructuring may be taking part-time work due to lack of full-time work, but there does not appear to be a great increase in part-time work for this group. More tend to drift between temporary full-time work and unemployment.

5. We should take the distinction between "involuntary" and "voluntary" part-time work to be problematic in many senses (Noreau, 1994). If we had a different social order, which encouraged and allowed women to escape the more burdensome aspects of family responsibilities to take up educations and careers that were rewarding and useful, knowing that their children were well taken care of, would not more current "voluntary" part-time work have to be defined as "involuntary"?

6. See, for an account of this problem, the National Film Board video, "For Richer, For Poorer", 1986.

7. In 1997, men working full time, full year earned on average $42,626, while women working full time, full year earned only 72.5 percent as much or $30,915. In the same year, men classified as "other," which includes part time and short term, earned $13,821, while women classified as "other" earned only 78.6 percent of this - $10,870. See Statistics Canada, "Canadian Statistics - Average Earnings by Sex, Full-time and Other Workers", at http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/People/Labour/labor01a.htm.
8. At 25 percent in 1998, Saskatchewan's rate of part-time employment is higher than the national average of 19 percent (Pold, 1999).

9. In 1995, 20 part-time workers were interviewed in Regina, and in each of 1997 and 1998, 50 part-time workers were interviewed both in Regina and Saskatoon. A further 50 workers in each city are being interviewed in 1999. The original plan was to choose workers from lists provided by employers and trade unions, but employers we contacted were unwilling to discuss labour standards, let alone agree to having their employees interviewed. Consequently, participants were obtained primarily from lists of contacts provided by trade unions, supplemented by snowball sampling. This might suggest that the sample is not representative, but because The Saskatchewan Labour Standards Act applies only to places with 10 or more full-time equivalent employees, and provisions like pro-rating of benefits depends upon the existence of benefits for full-timers, which is more likely in unionized workplaces, our sample is most suitable to assessing the impact of the Act. Moreover, with the increase in multiple jobholding and the high turnover in part-time employment, we found that many participants either had or currently did work for unionized and nonunionized employers, both large and small, thus allowing insights into conditions in a variety of part-time worksites.

The author would like to thank Fern Hagen, Della Mac Neil, Michelle Moir and Sandra Salhani for their assistance with this research, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for funding the research. Thanks especially to the trade unionists and part-time workers who participated in the study.

10. To protect participants' anonymity no names are being used, and fictitious names are used for places of employment. Because most part-timers and most of those interviewed were women, the feminine noun or pronoun is used in most instances.

11. It is necessary to qualify our discussions of the notion of "choice". Duffy et al. (1989) note that the hierarchical and patriarchal nature of our capitalist society actually structures the choices made by people, and by women in particular.

12. We should point out, as those who have worked in child care or served on day care boards know, that despite the need for what seem to many users like relatively high costs, most day cares run on shoestring budgets. And while child care should be seen as one of the most important jobs in our society, it is an undervalued low-wage, low-status preserve for women workers. (A few of our participants are child care workers.) One 'joke' among female child care workers is that, when asked if their own kids go to day care, they reply: "No, I can't afford it, I'm only a child care worker."

13. Business often opposes minimum wage hikes, arguing that they will increase business costs thus producing more unemployment. But some recent empirical studies challenge that claim (Card and Krueger, 1995).

14. As noted above, business representatives declined to be interviewed for our study.
15. Note that these estimates are based on official statistics, which miss the way that moonlighting intersects with the informal economy.


18. See, for example, the case studies in "The Treadmill," National Film Board, 1986

19. UNITE notes that 80,000 jobs were lost in the Canadian garment industry since the Canada-U.S. FTA was enacted in 1989, and predicts more losses with NAFTA (*Canadian Dimension*, May/June 1993: 48).

20. Bell's post-industrial society has recently been updated in the guise of Drucker's (1993) "post-capitalist society".

21. "Fear of the masses" was stated plainly with the corporate-sponsored Trilateral Commission's pronouncement that the expansion of democracy was leading to a "crisis of democracy" (i.e., liberal democracy) (Crozier et al., 1975).

22. For example, those unfortunate enough to find themselves "without a fixed address" (homeless) cannot receive unemployment insurance benefits or social assistance.
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