

## Remembering “The Dawning Age of Leisure”: Visions of Work, Time, and Technology During Canada’s Long 1960s

*Peter A. Stevens, York University*

Between the late 1950s and the early 1970s, Canadian commentators grew alarmed over a grave new threat that they detected looming on the national horizon. In the popular press, academic journals, and National Film Board (NFB) films, these critics warned of dire consequences for Canadians if the country did not take action and prepare adequately for the coming danger. What worried these observers was not, as one might expect, the threat of nuclear Armageddon, or environmental disaster, or even the challenges to authority posed by the social turmoil of the 1960s.<sup>1</sup> No, the source of their fears was something far more ominous: the spectre of too much free time.

In fact, this “leisure crisis” had been decades in the making.<sup>2</sup> During the first half of the twentieth century, social scientists had produced numerous studies proving that, contrary to popular perception, industrial productivity actually *increased* when the workday and the workweek were reduced.<sup>3</sup> These findings had dovetailed with arguments put forward by the labour movement, which since its inception had been fighting for shorter hours for workers.<sup>4</sup> By mid-century, legislatures from coast to coast had responded by passing laws that instituted paid vacations, mandatory retirement, and restrictions on the workweek. In some cases, unions had won further limits on work at the bargaining table.<sup>5</sup> The overall result was that Canadians were spending less and less of their time at their places of employment.

By the postwar years, this trend seemed destined to continue, especially because of the changes in manufacturing that collectively came to be known as “automation.” Thanks to reindustrialization during the Second World War, and the adoption of new technology such as robotic machinery, factories could produce greater quantities of goods while requiring less input from humans.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, the need for workers was expected to diminish dramatically. According to one widely-cited estimate, by the year 2000, “two percent of the ... population will be able to produce all the goods the other ninety-eight percent can possibly consume.”<sup>7</sup> As a young Peter C. Newman confidently proclaimed in the pages of *Queen’s Quarterly* in 1959, “Canadians now stand at the edge of an age when scientific achievements will be rewarded by a spectacular increase in leisure time.”<sup>8</sup>

By the 1960s, the spectacle of cultural authorities fretting over Canadians’ leisure time was hardly new. As Craig Heron has shown when writing about workers who are off the job, religious groups, business leaders, and other middle-class arbiters had been policing leisure time since the mid-nineteenth century. These promoters of “rational recreation” aimed to steer working-class people away from

drinking, gambling and other vices, and towards amateur sport and church-oriented activities that were thought to build character and strengthen morals.<sup>9</sup> For the commentators of the 1960s, however, questions of morality were of less concern than the sheer quantity of free time that Canadians would soon have at their disposal. Using forums that were based in central Canada, but which sometimes reached a wider English-Canadian audience—universities, mass media, the NFB—these critics sought to alert their fellow citizens to the abundant leisure time, and the attendant hazards, that apparently lay ahead.

Many postwar observers drew lessons from history, and they projected into the future those patterns that they divined in the country's past. "Canadians worked a 68-hour week in 1870, [and] a 47-hour week in 1940," explained one magazine article; "Today they average 40 hours per week on the job."<sup>10</sup> The obvious conclusion was that Canadians' work weeks would only continue to shorten during the decades ahead. In 1957, for example, the Gordon Commission forecast that by the late twentieth century, the average Canadian work week was going to have been reduced to as few as 30 hours per week.<sup>11</sup> Other sources went even further, claiming that by the 1980s, the typical wage-earner either would work just twenty hours per week, or would have a work schedule that entailed six months on followed by six months off.<sup>12</sup> Women also stood to enjoy increased leisure time, since new technology within the family home was expected to reduce domestic work for housewives.<sup>13</sup>

But what did this "dawning age of leisure" mean for Canadians and for Canada?<sup>14</sup> For generations, North American society had been governed by the Protestant work ethic, a philosophy that glorified hard work and viewed leisure as a source of evil.<sup>15</sup> Now, however, the day was fast approaching when society would be shaped more by leisure than by productive work. The question was, as the Protestant work ethic receded in importance, what was going to replace it as the guiding principle of North American civilization? As one commentator put it, using prevailing racist stereotypes about First Nations people, what did it portend now that Canadians were adopting not only canoes and lacrosse, but also "the Indian's care-free attitude toward time?"<sup>16</sup>

For many authorities, the issue was vitally serious, for what was at stake was nothing less than the fate of Canadian society. "If we are not careful, what will happen is that men and women will have a great deal more time free from work than they know what to do with," warned philosopher A.R.C. Duncan of Queen's University. "The danger is that they may turn simply to play and the watching of play, and then deep-rooted boredom may set in, and with boredom a really dangerous kind of political discontent may develop which might well spell the end of democracy as we know and value it."<sup>17</sup> Newman agreed, declaring that "The manner in which we utilize this extra leisure could either vitalize or destroy our society."<sup>18</sup> Not to be outdone, another journalist noted that "The inability to cope with leisure has been part of the reason for the collapse of many past civilizations, including ancient Rome."<sup>19</sup> Ultimately, then, the leisure crisis revolved around one key point:

as the hours of work continued to diminish, would Canadians simply kill time, or would they choose to spend it wisely?

Not all commentators viewed the coming age of leisure with dread. In fact, some were enthusiastic about it, arguing that with more free time on their hands, Canadians would be able to immerse themselves more fully in consumer culture. One article, for instance, pointed out that the four-day work week would effectively transform every weekend into a long weekend, thus leading to a significant increase in pleasure travel.<sup>20</sup> Similarly, the links between leisure and shopping were clear. As early as the late 1950s, Canadians were spending approximately \$3 billion a year on leisure-related goods and services, including "hunting and fishing licenses, pleasure boats, golf clubs, tennis rackets, sports cars," and scuba-diving gear.<sup>21</sup> Ten years later, this sum had grown to \$5 billion, as Canadians scooped up televisions, stereo systems, snowmobiles, downhill skiing equipment, and other new products.<sup>22</sup> Writers salivated over the future of commodified leisure, conjuring up visions of "submarine racing[,] airborne lacrosse," and other fantastical recreational activities that would not have been out of place in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*.<sup>23</sup> From this vantage point, new technology would soon transform the world of play much as it had already revolutionized the world of work.

Not surprisingly, business-oriented publications were especially alert to the many financial opportunities presented by the coming age of leisure. According to the *Monetary Times*, there were sizeable profits to be made due to the "democratization and commercialization of leisure."<sup>24</sup> As evidence, the magazine profiled several companies that were investing in hotels, resorts, and other tourist attractions that promised to benefit from Canadians' ever-increasing leisure time.<sup>25</sup> Likewise, *Canadian Business* ran articles exploring growth areas in what it called the "leisure industry," a phrase that removed any distinction between free time and consumption by collapsing the two terms into a single concept.<sup>26</sup>

These celebrations of materialism only confirmed some critics' worst fears, however. "Leisure should be oriented towards being and doing rather than having," asserted one analyst, before launching into a diatribe against the advertising industry.<sup>27</sup> Another writer agreed, using phraseology that betrayed the class-based nature of his concerns: "If we ... put the large, less gifted majority of people out of work, while providing them with ample material goods, the outcome can be nothing else but a catastrophe."<sup>28</sup>

For those who held such views, nothing symbolized the dangers of commercialized leisure more than the television. Throughout the postwar period, studies found that on average, Canadians spent as much as 50 per cent of their spare time watching TV.<sup>29</sup> Some observers were untroubled by such statistics. "Television, like its predecessor the radio, has aided cultural advancement for most," argued Harold Brain, the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation in Sault Ste. Marie. "Sports events, drama, local and foreign news, education and entertainment of all kinds is available at the turn of a knob. For many it has been a base for improving the art of conver-

sation. Television has taught people to be more selective.<sup>30</sup> More commonly, however, critics assailed television for providing passive entertainment that was aimed at the lowest common denominator. As sociologist Harold Wilensky told an audience at Laval University in 1967, not only did television seduce viewers with images of unnecessary consumer goods, but it dispensed only “mass culture of mediocre quality.”<sup>31</sup>

To Wilensky and others like him, excessive television watching was a slippery slope that ultimately led not only to personal debauchery but also to social destruction. People got hooked on television just as surely as they got addicted to alcohol and cigarettes.<sup>32</sup> The problem with television and other passive forms of leisure was that they left viewers bored, unmotivated, and ill-equipped to defend democracy. “A danger for man and society is that with too much stress upon play and entertainment, man may turn into a spectator-creature, or a purely play-desiring irresponsible [*sic*],” claimed Peter Angeles, a philosophy professor from the University of Western Ontario. The inevitable outcome would be “melancholic degeneration, viciousness[,] destruction-for-the-hell-of-it behaviour [, and] political discontent.”<sup>33</sup> Journalist Harry Bruce struck a similar note, writing in *Saturday Night* magazine that Canadians were in danger of “sink[ing] into endless television watching, idle sports, crushing boredom, despair, and, finally, resignation in the face of tyranny.”<sup>34</sup>

What, then, was the solution? If passive leisure was the poison that threatened Canadian society, what did these anxious observers offer as an antidote? The first step, they suggested, was for Canadians to rethink what they meant when they talked about leisure. The unhelpful legacy of the Protestant work ethic was that leisure was often equated with loafing and sloth. But as one expert insisted to a group of adult educators in 1968, leisure must not be “equated with non-work or idleness. It is a specific state of being one’s self—of having time and opportunity to pursue one’s interests. Idleness on the other hand is the abuse of leisure, having the time and opportunity but not employing them to pursue one’s interests—frequently because one has no interests.”<sup>35</sup> Another article developed the idea further:

The man at leisure is engaging all of his abilities and skills. The difference between that condition and conventional work lies in the fact that he has chosen to do so, and is thereby much more morally engaged than the man who does it just for pay. In short, leisure does not mean doing nothing, it means doing something or things out of your own free will, and it also involves doing them well.<sup>36</sup>

True leisure, in other words, entailed neither laziness nor emptiness; rather, it involved active, voluntary pursuits that would bring pride and meaning to individuals’ lives, thus filling the void that had been created by the mechanization and automation that had devalued paid work.

Once Canadians had reconceived of leisure time in this way, they would be free to pursue whatever paths they believed might lead to personal enrichment and self-actualization. For some people, this might mean athletics, gardening, or outdoor recreation; for others, it might mean music, cooking, handicrafts, or some other hobby. The important thing was for people to use their growing leisure time in a mindful, deliberate fashion that would enable them to discover their interests and find meaning. As one author put it, leisure

is or should be responsible ... We all share the responsibility of personal growth, that is[,] the personal development of our faculties and talents, of our capacity for enjoyment, creativity, and understanding. Accompanying this personal growth is an appreciation of truth, beauty, and love in people, art and nature. We all have different capacities and talents, yet we share a common responsibility to develop them to the limit of our potential.<sup>37</sup>

Critical to this vision of responsible leisure was education. The most common suggestion made by participants in the debate over leisure was for people to embrace the Liberal Arts. One *Canadian Banker* article told readers that they should immerse themselves in the study of religion, history, philosophy, and literature. Another piece reminded subscribers to *Saturday Night* magazine that the proper function of universities was to help students search for meaning, not to prepare them for careers.<sup>38</sup> But nor was formal education the only possible route to fulfilment. Commentators called for guidance from "professional recreators" and "leisure counselors" who could teach citizens how to use their leisure time productively.<sup>39</sup> They also saw a role for the state. In addition to promoting Canadian culture through bodies such as the Canada Council, governments should promote responsible leisure by improving urban recreation facilities and making wilderness areas more accessible. If they did so, critics argued, "The result will be Canadians who are better entertained and more culturally aware."<sup>40</sup>

Historians who have examined Canada's postwar cultural landscape have described a sharp divide between a wealthy, well-educated elite who believed they knew what was best for the nation, and the wider masses, who were eager consumers of the new mass culture that became available during this period.<sup>41</sup> Clearly, this same schism was evident in the postwar discussion of Canadians' increasing leisure time.<sup>42</sup> Though the intelligentsia who fretted over the leisure crisis claimed to be concerned about all Canadians, the automation that lay at the heart of their anxiety clearly had its greatest impact on factory workers.<sup>43</sup> And while these opinion-makers expressed empathy for the working man, their own privileged backgrounds shone through in both the nature of their concerns and the solutions that they proposed. Arguably, what most worried middle- and upper-class observers was not simply that workers would have more free time, but that they would be freed

from the discipline that work imposed.<sup>44</sup>

Canadian workers themselves had a rather ambivalent response to the prospect of a dawning age of leisure. At first, this ambivalence seems surprising. After all, organized labour had been lobbying for a shorter work-week for generations; now it seemed as though the dream of more free time was finally going to be realized. But unions and their members did not necessarily share popular commentators' excitement about postwar changes to the production process. As they realized, it was entirely possible that automation would lead not to a shorter work week for all workers, but rather to layoffs, and a greatly reduced workforce.<sup>45</sup> In other words, working people increasingly faced the possibility of what Juliet Schor has called "involuntary leisure" in the form of unemployment and underemployment.<sup>46</sup> It is hardly surprising, therefore, that their enthusiasm for automation was rather muted.

Simultaneously, however, workers acknowledged the apparent expansion of free time, and significantly, they sought to define this phenomenon in their own terms. Working-class observers did not necessarily dispute the idea that hobbies and other leisure activities could provide workers with a much-needed sense of purpose and meaning. But they also contended that with less time on the jobsite, workers could increase their involvement in unions, credit unions, and cooperatives. A shorter work week would also enable more working-class people to enter electoral politics.<sup>47</sup> Clearly, then, wage-earners could use their growing leisure time in distinct working-class ways—a theme, of course, that has animated much of Craig Heron's scholarship.<sup>48</sup> "The argument that workers do not know what to do with their time off is indefensible," asserted the Canadian Research Director of the United Steel Workers. "Our people have been able to develop much better habits of life as they have gone from the seventy to the forty-hour week."<sup>49</sup> More subtly, another union official challenged middle-class decrees that leisure time ought to be devoted to respectable personal development. "It is up to the individual," he said, "to decide whether he wants to 'have fun' or 'improve himself' or just lie in the sunshine and give no thought to the matter."<sup>50</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

Decades later, postwar predictions that too much free time might lead to the collapse of Canadian civilization seem laughable, not least because the coming age of leisure never actually arrived.<sup>51</sup> Far from declining, the average Canadian's annual hours of paid employment dramatically increased during the last quarter of the twentieth century, thanks in part to the growing numbers of women who entered the workforce.<sup>52</sup> Meanwhile, globalization and offshoring have eliminated most well-paid, stable manufacturing jobs, forcing many Canadians to cobble together two or more low-paying part-time jobs in the service sector. The challenge that confronts far too many Canadians today is not an excess of free time, but poorly-compensated, precarious employment.<sup>53</sup> Nevertheless, there was widespread agreement during the long 1960s that "the threat of leisure in Canadian life is a very real one."<sup>54</sup>

The assumptions that informed this belief, and the factors that prevented the prophesied age of leisure from materializing, help to illuminate Canadian attitudes towards work, time, technology, and consumer culture during the second half of the twentieth century.

Historians have argued that in the United States, organized labour had basically abandoned the fight for increased leisure time by mid-century, instead emphasizing high wages and full-time employment as part of the postwar settlement.<sup>55</sup> In Canada, however, the story was slightly more nuanced. While some scholars have maintained that Canadian unions joined their American counterparts in prioritizing high wages and full employment, others have suggested that, comparatively speaking, part-time employment and shorter hours of work remained attractive options in Canada due to the presence of a more generous social safety net.<sup>56</sup> Amidst the postwar discussion of increased leisure time, Canadian labour leaders reaffirmed their commitment to the goal of attaining full employment.<sup>57</sup> But they also continued to celebrate the longer paid vacations that unions had won through collective bargaining, even while categorizing such gains as "fringe benefits" that were of secondary importance to "decent wages."<sup>58</sup> And the Canadian Labour Congress continued to advocate a shorter work week as a means of spreading work around and reducing unemployment.<sup>59</sup>

While unions focused on the uneven distribution of work, most popular commentators worried instead about the uneven distribution of leisure. Automation would inevitably reduce the work of factory hands, they fretted, but it wouldn't lessen the burden for managers and other brain workers. The dilemma, one writer explained, was that "the leaders of society, the most lavishly educated and talented, may have to work murderously long hours, while all the millions we once called 'the unwashed' will be free all their waking hours to pursue whatever studies or idle distractions strike their fancy."<sup>60</sup> As we have seen, critics had few doubts about the devilish work to which these idle hands might be put: "There is great fear that most of our citizens, freed from what they have to do, will have resources to do nothing except to lapse into boredom or some form of anti-social behaviour."<sup>61</sup> Such comments get to the crux of analysts' seemingly-irrational distress over the predicted expansion of free time. The problem was not so much leisure itself, but the fact that too much of it would accrue to the wrong people. In raising the alarm over the dawning age of leisure, postwar observers gave expression to growing bourgeois fears of a working-class that no longer had to do much work, and that was released from the discipline that employment imposed.

In retrospect, it is clear that they need not have worried. Despite one postwar writer's claim that increasing leisure was "an indisputable fact," there were some dissenters from this view, among them John Kenneth Galbraith.<sup>62</sup> Galbraith agreed that automation would increase productivity, since the same quantity of goods could be made in less time. But he disputed common assertions that automation inevitably would lead either to shorter hours for workers, or else to layoffs and a greatly re-



duced workforce. Instead, he pointed to a third possibility: that workers would maintain their work hours and take higher wages in order to increase their spending power.<sup>63</sup> And this, it seems, is what eventually happened. Contrary to expectations, Canadians had an unlimited appetite for consumer goods. Rather than continuing to fight for a shorter work week, most workers instead chose an option that brought them no more free time, but a higher standard of living.<sup>64</sup> This, ultimately, is why the anticipated age of leisure never arrived.

The postwar panic over a supposed coming age of leisure might seem absurd or quaintly amusing today, but it raised many issues that remain relevant in the early twenty-first century. Though expectations of abundant free time have proven to be wildly misplaced, Canadians continue to debate the merits of time, technology, and consumer culture, now within the context of neo-liberal economics and global environmental destruction.<sup>65</sup> At a time when computers, robots, and self-driving vehicles are posing new threats to Canadian jobs, the postwar anxiety over automation and the “dawning age of leisure” is well worth remembering.<sup>66</sup>

---

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Dimitry Anastakis, ed., *The Sixties: Passion, Politics, and Style* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008); Bryan D. Palmer, *Canada's 1960s: The Ironies of Identity in a Rebellious Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009); M. Athena Palaeologu, ed., *The Sixties in Canada: A Turbulent and Creative Decade* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2009); Lara Campbell, Dominique Clément, and Gregory S. Kealey, eds., *Debating Dissent: Canada and the Sixties* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).

<sup>2</sup> Harry Bruce, “Will More Free Time Kill Freedom?,” *Saturday Night* (March 1965): 19.

<sup>3</sup> Anson Rabinbach, *The Human Motor: Energy, Fatigue, and the Origins of Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 218–224.

<sup>4</sup> Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870–1920* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt, *Work Without End: Abandoning Shorter Hours for the Right to Work* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988); Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt, *Free Time: The Forgotten American Dream* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2013); David R. Roediger and Philip S. Foner, *Our Own Time: A History of American Labor and the Working Day* (London and New York:



Verso, 1989); Bryan D. Palmer, *Working Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800–1991*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc., 1991), 106–108.

<sup>5</sup> Shirley Tillotson, "Time, Swimming Pools, and Citizenship: The Emergence of Leisure Rights in Mid-Twentieth-Century Canada," in *Contesting Canadian Citizenship: Historical Readings*, eds. Robert Adamoski, Dorothy E. Chunn, and Robert Menzies (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2000), 199–221; Mark Thomas, "Setting the Minimum: Ontario's Employment Standards in the Postwar Years, 1944–1968," *Labour/Le Travail* 54 (Fall 2004): 49–82; William Graebner, *A History of Retirement: The Meaning and Function of an American Institution, 1885–1978* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980). The specific limits on the workweek varied from province to province.

<sup>6</sup> Joffre Dumazedier, "Free Time and Leisure," *Continuous Learning* 6, no. 3 (May–June 1967): 127–128; Anthony W. Preston, "Will You Use Your Leisure Or Not?," *Canadian Banker* 74, no. 4 (Winter 1967): 99; L.B. Kuffert, *A Great Duty: Canadian Responses to Modern Life and Mass Culture, 1939–1967* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003), 203–216.

<sup>7</sup> Quoted in Bruce, "Will More Free Time Kill Freedom?," 21; Harold Brain, "The Changing Concept of Leisure," *Continuous Learning* 10, no. 2 (March–April 1971): 85.

<sup>8</sup> Peter C. Newman, "The Dilemma of Greater Leisure: Threat or Opportunity?," *Queen's Quarterly* 66, no. 1 (Spring 1959): 106.

<sup>9</sup> Craig Heron, "Arguing about Idleness," in *Working Lives: Essays on Canadian Working-Class History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, forthcoming). Also see Bruce Kidd, *The Struggle for Canadian Sport* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996); Lynne Marks, *Revivals and Roller Rinks: Religion, Leisure, and Identity in Late-Nineteenth-Century Small-Town Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996).

<sup>10</sup> Harvey Botting, "How Are We Handling Our Ever-Increasing Leisure Time?," *Canada and the World* 37, no. 3 (November 1971): 16.

<sup>11</sup> Newman, "The Dilemma of Greater Leisure," 107.

<sup>12</sup> "Leisure Is Where the Future Lies," *Monetary Times*, 136, no. 6 (June 1968): 32. Also see *Canadian Leisure* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1970): 2.

<sup>13</sup> Botting, "How Are We Handling Our Ever-Increasing Leisure Time?," 16.

Scholars have since shown that such claims were hopelessly optimistic. See Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave* (New York: Basic Books, 1983); Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982); Juliet B. Schor, *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure* (New York:

---

Basic Books, 1992), chapter 4; Joy Parr, *Domestic Goods: The Material, the Moral, and the Economic in the Postwar Years* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999); Pat Armstrong and Hugh Armstrong, *The Double Ghetto: Canadian Women and their Segregated Work*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2010).

<sup>14</sup> Brain, "The Changing Concept of Leisure," 79.

<sup>15</sup> Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London and New York: Routledge Classics, 2001). For recent discussions of Weber's theory and its continued influence, see William H. Swatos, Jr. and Lutz Kalber, eds., *The Protestant Ethic Turns 100: Essays on the Centenary of the Weber Thesis* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2005).

<sup>16</sup> Bruce, "Will More Free Time Kill Freedom?," 19–21; Peter A. Angeles, "Leisure: Opportunity or Opiate?" *The Business Quarterly* 30, no. 4 (Winter 1965): 10–20; W.C. Yeomans, "The Pressures of Urbanization," *Community Planning Review* 20, no. 4 (Winter 1970–1971): 5; quoted in Brain, "The Changing Concept of Leisure," 79, 82.

<sup>17</sup> Quoted in Bruce, "Will More Free Time Kill Freedom?," 19.

<sup>18</sup> Newman, "The Dilemma of Greater Leisure," 114–15.

<sup>19</sup> Botting, "How Are We Handling Our Ever-Increasing Leisure Time?" 16.

<sup>20</sup> J.R. Brent Ritchie, "Leisure—An Economic or Social Phenomenon?" *Optimum* 5, no. 2 (1974): 44.

<sup>21</sup> Newman, "The Dilemma of Greater Leisure," 106, 112.

<sup>22</sup> Botting, "How Are We Handling Our Ever-Increasing Leisure Time?," 16–17; John Kettle, "Leisure—Part 1: Travel, Sports—and We'll Still Be Plugged In To the Tube," *Monetary Times* 137, no. 5 (May 1969): 32.

<sup>23</sup> John Kettle, "The Age of Leisure," *Monetary Times* 135, no. 6 (June 1967): 19–26.

<sup>24</sup> John Kettle, "Leisure—Part 2: Neat Costly Gadgets Are Assured of Sales in the Affluent Age," *Monetary Times* 137, no. 6 (June 1969): 22.

<sup>25</sup> "Leisure is Where the Future Lies," *Monetary Times* 136, no. 6 (June 1968): 32–33.

<sup>26</sup> Michael Hicks, "What's Ahead for the Outdoor Leisure Market?," *Canadian Business* 45, no. 3 (March 1972): 32–38.

<sup>27</sup> Gerald R. Ottenheimer, "Leisure: An Essay on the Responsible Use of Free Time," *Continuous Learning* 5, no. 5 (September–October 1966): 229.

<sup>28</sup> Quoted in Kettle, "The Age of Leisure," 19–20.

<sup>29</sup> Frances Oxley, Arthur Guttman, and Asa Knowles, "What Are His Hobbies?: A Study of Leisure-Time Activities," *The Business Quarterly* 20, no. 2 (Summer

---

1955): 105–114; Botting, “How Are We Handling Our Ever-Increasing Leisure Time?,” 16–17.

<sup>30</sup> Brain, “The Changing Concept of Leisure,” 84.

<sup>31</sup> Harold Wilensky, “Technology, Work and Leisure: Reflections on the Gains and Costs of Abundance,” *Industrial Relations* 22, no. 4 (October 1967): 520. Also see Paul Rutherford, *When Television Was Young: Prime Time Canada, 1952-1967* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), chapter 12; Kuffert, *A Great Duty*.

<sup>32</sup> Wilensky, “Technology, Work and Leisure,” 518, 525.

<sup>33</sup> Angeles, “Leisure: Opportunity or Opiate?,” 17–18.

<sup>34</sup> Bruce, “Can We Stand Life Without Work?” 22. Also see “Editorial,” *Continuous Learning* 4, no. 1 (January–February 1965), 1–2; Kettle, “The Age of Leisure,” 20; and Newman, “The Dilemma of Greater Leisure,” 106.

<sup>35</sup> Ottenheimer, “Leisure,” 228.

<sup>36</sup> “Editorial,” 2.

<sup>37</sup> Ottenheimer, “Leisure,” 230.

<sup>38</sup> Preston, “Will You Use Your Leisure or Not?,” 101–102; Bruce, “Can We Stand Life Without Work?” 24. Also see Angeles, “Leisure,” 18–20; Wilensky, “Technology, Work and Leisure,” 520–524; Kettle, “The Age of Leisure,” 24–25.

<sup>39</sup> Angeles, “Leisure: Opportunity or Opiate?,” 20; Bruce, “Will More Free Time Kill Freedom?,” 21.

<sup>40</sup> Yeomans, “The Pressures of Urbanization,” 6; quoted in Botting, “How Are We Handling Our Ever-Increasing Leisure Time?,” 17.

<sup>41</sup> Kuffert, *A Great Duty*; Paul Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992); Ryan Edwardson, *Canadian Content: Culture and the Quest for Nationhood* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008).

<sup>42</sup> Notably, the anti-Americanism that flavoured most postwar Canadian critiques of mass culture was absent from the discussion of growing leisure time, mainly because Canadian commentators took inspiration from like-minded American experts, whose books they often cited. Among the seminal works in leisure studies dating from this period are Charles Brightbill, *Man and Leisure: A Philosophy of Recreation* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961); Max Kaplan, *Leisure in America: A Social Inquiry* (New York: Wiley, 1960); and Sebastian de Grazia, *Of Time, Work and Leisure* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1962). The latter was made into a film of the same name that was distributed in Canada by the National Film Board.

<sup>43</sup> Bruce, “Will More Free Time Kill Freedom?,” 20.

<sup>44</sup> For example, see Angeles, “Leisure: Opportunity or Opiate?,” 16–17.

<sup>45</sup> Bruce, "Will More Free Time Kill Freedom?," 20; W.H. Auden, "Culture and Leisure," *Continuous Learning* 5 no. 5 (September–October 1966): 232.

<sup>46</sup> Schor, 39.

<sup>47</sup> A.L. Hepworth, "Meeting Workers' Leisure-Time Needs," *Canadian Labour* 3, no. 4 (April 1958): 57–58; Newman, "The Dilemma of Greater Leisure," 108.

<sup>48</sup> Craig Heron, *Booze: A Distilled History* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2003); Craig Heron and Steve Penfold, *The Workers' Festival: A History of Labour Day in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005); Craig Heron, "The Boys and Their Booze: Masculinities and Public Drinking in Working-Class Hamilton, 1890–1946," *Canadian Historical Review* 86, no. 3 (September 2005): 411–452; Craig Heron, "Boys Will Be Boys: Working-Class Masculinities in the Age of Mass Production," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 69 (Spring 2006): 6–34; Craig Heron, *Lunch-Bucket Lives: Remaking the Workers' City* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2015), chapter 14.

<sup>49</sup> Quoted in Newman, "The Dilemma of Greater Leisure," 111.

<sup>50</sup> Walter Herbert, "The Place of Leisure in Canadian Society," *Canadian Labour* 3, no. 4 (April 1958): 67. Also see Dumazedier, "Free Time and Leisure," 128.

<sup>51</sup> Even at the time, the earnest hyperbole of the free-time fearmongers was ripe for satire. For example, see Bruce Hutchison, "The Coming Revolt Against Leisure," *Maclean's Magazine* 15 (March 1958): 18–19, 49–53.

<sup>52</sup> Here I follow Juliet Schor, who makes the same argument for the American context. See Schor, *The Overworked American*, 24–32.

<sup>53</sup> Jamie Swift, *Wheel of Fortune: Work and Life in the Age of Falling Expectations* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1995); Leah F. Vosko, *Temporary Work: The Gendered Rise of a Precarious Employment Relationship* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000); Vivian Shalla, ed., *Working in a Global Era: Canadian Perspectives* (Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2006); Schor, *The Overworked American*.

<sup>54</sup> Preston, "Will You Use Your Leisure or Not?," 99.

<sup>55</sup> Hunnicutt, *Free Time*, chapters 8–10.

<sup>56</sup> Peter S. McInnis, *Harnessing Labour Confrontation: Shaping the Postwar Settlement in Canada, 1943–1950* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002); Laura J. Owen, "The Choice of Part-time Employment in the United States and Canada, 1955–2000," *Labor History* 56, no. 5 (2015): 643–69.

<sup>57</sup> Hepworth, "Meeting Workers' Leisure-Time Needs," 57.

<sup>58</sup> "Union Vacation Gains," *Canadian Labour* 10, no. 6 (June 1965): 4.

<sup>59</sup> Newman, "The Dilemma of Greater Leisure," 107–12.

<sup>60</sup> Quoted in Bruce, "Can We Stand Life Without Work?," 20–23; Wilensky,

---

"Technology, Work and Leisure," 520.

<sup>61</sup> "Editorial," 1–2.

<sup>62</sup> Preston, "Will You Use Your Leisure Or Not?," 99.

<sup>63</sup> Joffre Kettle, "Leisure—Part 1," 30–31. Also see Dumazedier, "Free Time and Leisure," 125–126; Wilensky, "Technology, Work and Leisure," 513; Hunnicutt, *Free Time*; Gary Cross, *Time and Money: The Making of Consumer Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

<sup>64</sup> Indeed, such was the allure of consumer culture that unions found it necessary to advise their members against moonlighting during their leisure time. Newman, "The Dilemma of Greater Leisure," 111; Hepworth, "Meeting Workers' Leisure-Time Needs," 56.

<sup>65</sup> For example, see Carl Honore, *In Praise of Slow: How a Worldwide Movement is Challenging the Cult of Speed* (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2004); Naomi Klein, *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate* (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2014).

<sup>66</sup> For example, "42% of Canadian Jobs At High Risk of Being Affected By Automation, New Study Suggests," CBC.ca, June 15, 2016, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/business/automation-job-brookfield-1.3636253>.