

## Tab J

### Labor and Labor Management Relations

#### IP Event Lesson Plan

1. **Topic:**

Labor and labor management relations

2. **Suggested activities:**

A. Business and industries to show the independent roles of labor and management in negotiating pay, working hours and conditions, and other benefits associated with employment

B. American civil liberties union (ACLU) (call ahead so that speaker can be made available. They probably can offer suggestions on other places to visit in your area and can provide copies of Bill of Rights)

C. Unions

D. National association for the advancement of colored people (NAACP)

3. **Student requirements:**

A. Attire (civilian clothes/uniform)

B. Event information sheet

C. Camera and film

D. Money for emergency phone call or souvenirs

4. **Escort requirements:**

A. Advance ticket purchases if necessary

B. Event information sheets for each international student

C. Ensure necessary briefing information is available

D. Brief (pre & post) international students about event(s)

E. Ensure escort(s) are familiar with event objectives to guarantee all points are adequately covered

F. Confirm/arrange transportation requirements

G. Event evaluation sheets are completed by each student

H. Discuss event with point of contact at event location and ensure escort carries point of contact's name and phone number

I. Ensure point of contact at event location is provided with the objectives to be covered prior to arrival of students

**5. Introduce student to following objective(s) (under the universal declaration of human rights):**

A. **Article 20:** everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

No one May be compelled to belong to an association.

B. **Article 23:** everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions or work and to protection against unemployment.

Everyone, with any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection if his interests.

C. **Article 24:** everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

**6. IP area(s) of emphasis:**

A. Internationally recognized human rights as outlined in the universal declaration of human rights.

B. U.S. free enterprise system and its role in a democratic society.

**7. Other learning objective(s) or teaching point(s):**

A. Cannot restrain right of people to assemble peaceably and in law-abiding manner for almost any purpose.

B. Associations have right to conceal names of members if revealing names will subject them to harassment.

C. Can organize collectively to get meaningful access to courts (class actions) or secure working rights (unions).

D. Rights are applicable to any activity (in this case, business, economic, etc.)

E. Organizations cannot be sued for nonviolent activities that cause business losses (boycotts), but violent members can be prosecuted individually.

F. Can stop others that bar others from access to courts/government agencies/workplace (if illegal strike).

G. Government can limit access to special areas (May not be able to hand out leaflets in courthouse, but can hand them out on sidewalk outside of the building).

H. Government employees can join unions; however, government employees cannot walkout or strike against their employer -- the government.

### **IP Event Information Sheet**

#### **Labor and Labor Management Relations**

In tracing the changes in the U.S. agricultural system we can show that growing productivity has reduced the number of farmers. Greater agricultural efficiency has freed a larger and larger proportion of our population from working on the land. In the continuing process of industrialization in America, we have been transformed from a nation of farmers to a nation of workers-white collar, blue collar, specialists. Most of us are wage earners, dependent on the paycheck as the main source of support for ourselves and our families. A large proportion of the labor force belongs to trade unions of various kinds, and these organizations have come to play an important role, and a controversial one, in our politics, our economy, and our society as a whole. It is therefore necessary for anyone seeking a balanced picture of American life and institutions to understand the status of our workers and the nature of their organizations.

Many people have many incorrect notions about both the position of workers in America and the functions of their unions. Most foreigners come from countries with rigid, often insurmountable, class distinctions, with the ordinary workingman on the bottom rung of the ladder both socially and financially. Even in industrial, democratic England, for example, a man's "class" is "branded on his tongue," a theme recently revived in "my fair lady," and it can seem very difficult for people of talent to find "room at the top." In the less developed countries the differences between classes are often much sharper. It is difficult for people with this background to grasp the remarkably fluid nature of our society; the fact that "classes," if they exist at all, have very vague boundaries and that people can move in and out of them with relative ease. On the other hand, many of the trainees are also likely to have ideas about workingmen's lives in an industrial society based on the dismal picture of the early 19th century shown by writers like Charles Dickens or Karl Marx. Some might be inclined to think of labor unions in such a society as basically political organizations, dedicated to the radical overthrow of the existing regime, as indeed they are in some countries.

These difficulties are compounded by the fact that the great gains of American labor unions since 1933 and the powerful role of labor organizations in our national life remain emotional issues for many Americans. The idea of organizing the workingman for collective action jars against the image of "rugged individualism," which has had such appeal in our history. Some Americans are alarmed by labor's power, which they feel could be used irresponsibly under certain circumstances. Such fears have proved wide of the mark. But, right or wrong, they reflect an old theme in our society: a distrust of any great concentration of power.

To understand American unions and to avoid being ensnared in the controversy which still surrounds them, the topic must be placed in a sound perspective. Bigness is an unavoidable feature of modern industrialism. We have seen the same trend in the evolution of American business and on our farms. Big labor has grown up for many of the same reasons. Its growth came only after a long struggle, marked by the kinds of compromises which are typically

American. One such compromise involved our strongly held conviction about the sanctity of private property. Industrial growth often brought this into conflict with our equally strong ideals about the sanctity of individual rights. We have tried to preserve both of these ideals and bring them into harmony in our new "mixed economy." labor unions have been accepted as a permanent and established feature of our democracy, sharing fully in the benefits of the free enterprise system. They are as dedicated as any group to its preservation, so much so that some students of union affairs criticize them for being too "conservative." and businessmen, while subject to greater governmental control than previously and confronted with a very different relationship with their workers, have lost little on the whole in power, prestige or profits. Indeed, some experts have argued that by giving labor a bigger role, we have strengthened our free enterprise economy and made it more different than ever from the kind of "capitalism" that Marx wrote against.

There are very rich and very poor people in the United States as there are in almost all societies; and, as we might expect, more of the latter than the former. But the great majority fall somewhere between the extremes. Sociologists and other experts have shown that our people are divided to some degree by "status" or "class;" there can be no blinking at the fact that almost every community has both a country club and a shantytown. But the great majority of Americans, including most of those who work at tough jobs for a living, regard themselves as "middle class," and rightly so.

Over the course of the last four generations there has been a more equitable distribution of the national income, a change that is taking place slowly and gradually. More important, perhaps, than the shares of income each occupational group may achieve is the fact that individuals can move from one group to another in the quest for greater opportunity. This was a land settled and populated by those who sought the opportunity to improve their lot in life, and that of their children, by escaping from rigid class distinctions and restrictions. A democratic government and labor-short economy provided ideal conditions for realizing those aspirations. The result, as one scholar has pointed out, is that "America has had a greater measure of social equality and social mobility than any highly developed society in human history." work has always enjoyed respect in America, and we have constantly sought to make sure that no permanent barriers were ever placed before individual effort. Many of the social reforms of the progressive era and the new deal period were passed with this objective in mind. Consequently, ordinary working people -- if any among our highly individualistic labor force can be called ordinary -- have shared to a striking degree in the benefits of economic growth.

The gains of the American wage earner have been particularly notable in the economic prosperity that has generally prevailed since World War II. Take-home pay in manufacturing industries rose from an average of \$70 per week in 1950 to about \$82 in 1959 (all in 1960 prices), an impressive record for a decade of only moderate growth. The increase in take home pay has continued during the 60's and 70's; however, the effective buying power in terms of real dollars has been diminished because of inflationary increases in the cost of goods and services. There has also been a reduction in the proportion of the population in low income groups (family income of less than \$2,500 per year). This kind of improvement means that a large proportion of our working families can afford many of the goods and services which in other societies are restricted to the very well-to-do. About 70 percent of American spending units (families and single persons) own a car and about 60 percent own a house. It was by no means a perfect record, and there are still many glaring inequities and social problems; but the improvement is very real and something that all Americans not only expect, but take for granted.

The United States has a highly mobile labor force. Here is one of the unique elements in our society, a working class in which the overwhelming majority are certain that they will share in the proceeds of continuing industrialization and equally convinced that those among them with special talent and ambition will not find the road to advancement barred. We have no hereditary working class -- proletariat, in the marxist jargon-bound together as they are in many lands by old

ties, social immobility, and festering grievances. Our workers are more likely to be divided from each other -- racially, religiously, ethnically, and regionally. They move around a good deal, both geographically and socially. Above all, they are independent in spirit, on the job, in the union hall, and in broader affairs. Like most Americans they will follow good leaders (and sometimes bad ones if the produce results), but are skeptical of authority.

Relatively few workers belonged to labor organizations before the 1930's, although such institutions have existed since the beginning of our republic. Skilled craftsmen in particular formed local and regional associations early in our history. But much of the working class was recruited from the constant stream of immigrants who came here during the 19th century; the ethnic and language divisions among them and their general expectation of rapid personal gains made them difficult to organize. Some national unions were formed after the civil war, like the railroad brotherhoods and the knights of labor. There were also some attempts to form radical unions with basically political purposes, but they had very little appeal and, by the 1920's, were virtually defunct.

Only the American federation of labor (AFL), begun in 1886, succeeded in forming a permanent widespread organization. A loose confederation of existing national craft unions, the AFL turned away from political and social objectives and concentrated on immediate economic benefits for its members. Under Samuel Gompers its membership reached three million by the 1920's, about 10 percent of the labor force. Even these gains required great effort and were made in the face of a rather suspicious public and hostile courts. Although fairly successful, the AFL provided little or no protection for unorganized workers in the great mass industries. These unskilled workers were most vulnerable to technological change and the swings of the business cycle. The great depression of the 1930's underlined that vulnerability. This was the background of the drive to organize unskilled labor during the 1930's, led by the Congress of industrial organizations (CIO).

With mass unemployment and real distress among the workingmen, public opinion, which had long looked upon unions as "radical" outfits, came to sympathize with their purposes for the first time. Reflecting that public opinion, the new deal Congresses passed laws which favored organization and recognition of labor unions. Meanwhile, the courts, which had taken a restrictive view of the rights of labor when they seemed to conflict with those of private property, rendered more favorable decisions and upheld the new laws.

Against this background of a favorable political and public climate, the CIO led a great drive to organize the industrial workers, and found a favorable reception under depression conditions. The result was a rapid growth in labor union membership, which jumped from three million in 1925 to about 11 million by the outbreak of World War II.

So rapid was the growth of the CIO and so powerful its political and economic influence that since World War II many Americans feel that, having so successfully encouraged labor's gains, the time has come that it should be placed under tighter control. In the 1930's unions were left almost completely free from government interference and were given certain great advantages in their bargaining position with management. Since 1947 several laws, notably the Taft-Hartley act of 1947 -- have been passed, subjecting unions to the same kind of government regulations that business bears. There has also been a drive -- both inside and outside the labor movement -- to eliminate any communist influence from unions and to bring corrupt union officials to book. All these efforts have sought to strike a new and fairer balance between labor and management -- not to destroy labor's position. It remains as much as ever an established force in our society. It is no longer an underdog. It is legal, respectable for the most part, often powerful, and increasingly businesslike.

The American workingman and his leaders have never sought organization purely for the sake of organization. Their aim was to use organization to deal effectively with problems. As we look back at them today some of these problems were temporary, arising out of conditions which have

passed away. Others were permanent, arising out of human nature and society itself; they are still with us and always will be.

Wages for American workers during the 19th century, while low by modern standards, were good compared with those of Europe. However, they were rarely high enough to permit much saving, particularly in an increasingly urban society. Better wages therefore have been a principal aim of labor organization from the beginning.

Working conditions in many ways are -- and always have been -- equally important as wages to the workingman. Under 19th century conditions he worked a 12- to 14-hour day, 6 days a week. He had little, if any, security in the event of injury or death on the job. He could be fired or laid off without recourse at almost any time.

In the first stages of our industrialization, many of the workers were immigrants -- confused, ignorant of our language, very liable to being exploited. Even natural-born Americans found the new, impersonal discipline of the factory hard to take.

To deal with these conditions labor leaders have sought to establish two clear rights. First, they seek the right to represent the workers--either locally or nationally -- in bargaining with employers over wages and conditions. Second, to enforce their bargaining position, they claim the right to withdraw the labor force (that is, to strike) and to prevent, forcibly if necessary, the hiring of other laborers to take their place in the meantime. It is on the last count that labor met most criticism -- from public opinion and the courts as well as management.

Through combined action by unions and government, the wages and working conditions of American labor today have become the best in the world.

Despite these gains, unions have not become less important than before in workingmen's eyes -- for a reason often overlooked by people who have never had direct experience with a mass production line. Work in a modern factory is likely to be a mechanical and impersonal affair. Often the individual worker feels like just a cog in the great machine, powerless to affect it much. In such circumstances there is a powerful motive for unionism -- personal identification of worker with union as a social grouping. Unions have responded to this fact by sponsoring social, educational, and political activities for their members. Many students of labor affairs feel that union efforts in these directions present their greatest opportunities in the years ahead. It is the strength and diversity of these motives for union membership -- not purely economic in nature-- which have won and assured them a permanent role in our society.

The American government, as we have seen, exists primarily to protect and advance individual rights. In many areas it serves that purpose best by standing completely aside, as it does in matters of religion. In others intervention is necessary. From the beginning, the American government has been concerned with the position of labor in this country. As the United States has become more industrial, more urban, and more complex, both state and federal governments increasingly have intervened in social and economic affairs with an eye to improving the positions of the common man.

Until the "new deal," most government responsibility in this area was left to the states. Their actions varied widely, depending on local conditions and local politics. In the industrial areas of the nation, state governments from about 1880 enacted laws governing child work (in many states it was prohibited for children under 14), working hours for women, and working conditions in dangerous occupations. Many states provided workmen's compensation and various forms of health and old age insurance.

The federal government established the department of labor in 1913 to facilitate these and other efforts. But generally it contented itself with providing a good example through treatment of its own employees. In the 1930's, it intervened more directly in broad social welfare problems and it has since extended that interest. The federal government brought low-cost housing, vocational training, employment services, and many other kinds of aid to economically deprived persons. It also passed the fair labor standards act -- still a basic law which sets minimum conditions of employment.

Perhaps the most important of these laws was the social security act of 1935. Continuously amended and expanded, it provides a broad system of federally sponsored programs.

In 1946 Congress passed the full employment act, which pledged the federal government to pursue policies designed to achieve the highest possible level of employment for our workers. In the years since then, there has also been continuous broadening and extending of the social security act, of public housing programs, and of manpower retraining activities.

The present character of the American labor movement has been shaped by many factors. The principal ones are:

Our open society whose social climate blurs ideas of class, diminishes personal identification with class distinctions, and emphasizes and provides a good measure of individual opportunity.

The labor movement which is devoted to practical goals and hostile to ideology (foreign or otherwise).

A political climate which is accustomed to dealing with "pressure groups" devoted to special interests and able therefore to deal with labor precisely as with other pressure groups, balancing off its interests and purposes against those of other similar groups.

Government is increasingly inclined to intervene in social and economic affairs to better the living standards of the people, and is supported by the greater part of the electorate in making such interventions.

It is well to remember that Americans look upon noisy encounters and polemics as sources of strength, not of weakness, as we attempt to adjust our institutions to deal with the problems of the present and the future. The whole history of labor disputes and arbitration has been filled with many "noisy" encounters.

Union membership grew vigorously during the 1930's and World War II. After the war it has increased very slowly, and now remains practically stationary. Some people feel the unions have lost their organizing zeal and were too slow in opening membership more widely to blacks.

Many of the unorganized workers are rural, southern, or white-collar workers who are usually less interested in joining a union than were the northern city workers. Furthermore, in recent years the laws have been less favorable for the extension of unionizing activity to these groups than in the 1930's.

Unions have had their greatest successes in mining and manufacturing. About two-thirds of the workers in these trades are union members. Unfortunately for the unions, it is precisely this sector of the economy which is most affected by automation and other technological advances. And the new groups advanced by these changes -- technicians, professionals, and white-collar workers-- are of all groups the most difficult to organize. As a result, labor unions may be fated, as some

experts feel, to become the representatives of a "permanent minority." This was the case in Europe where labor organized earlier and more completely than it ever has here.

The growth of unskilled unionism in the 1930's was achieved only at the cost of a split within the ranks of labor, resulting in jurisdictional disputes and other antagonism between the AFL and CIO.

The basic ideological split between the organizations had been over the question of whether and how to organize mass-production industries, a matter of little concern now that most of them have been unionized.

In December 1955, the two major groups merged into a loose federation and were joined by several other smaller, independent unions. This has eliminated much of the jurisdictional rivalry so harmful to both labor and the public. However, several national unions have remained outside of the AFL-CIO; therefore, the AFL-CIO can "speak for labor" -- but sometimes it cannot say too much.

Americans are instinctively mistrustful of power. This mistrust, reflected in changing tides of public opinion, has been very influential in the history of the labor movement. For the last few years it has been veering in the direction of greater limitations on the power of union leadership.

The "magna carta" of labor unions, the Wagner act of 1935, was passed during the great depression for which big business received much of the blame. Public opinion therefore shifted in favor of labor organizations as a means of self-protection for the worker. It gave the unions great power, backed by government, and great freedom in the disposal of their own affairs, finances in particular.

In 1947 the tide turned, with the passage of the Taft-Hartley act. This act aimed at protecting the rights of union and nonunion workers, the employers, and the general public. It did not repeal the Wagner act, but changed and modified its character; in particular, it outlawed the closed shop and other union practices which were felt to be unfair. There is pressure from unions to have the most undesirable features of this law repealed.

The Taft-Hartley act was augmented in 1959 by the Landrum-griffin act, designed to curb certain abuses of union power and the misuse of union funds. This regulation of the internal affairs of unions was made on the grounds that unions are quasi-public institutions.

These acts have been hotly opposed by some union spokesmen as "slave-labor laws." They seem, however, to be supported by the electorate and by many, if not most, union members. Their aim is to protect the individual worker, union member or not, from aggressive acts by unions and to ensure that union leadership is more responsible and more responsive to the needs and desires of members. There is much controversy about whether these laws really do the job, but little about their aims.

Although the AFL-CIO carried on an aggressive campaign to purge unions of leaders who abuse their powers, and laws have been passed regulating union affairs more closely. In addition, unions are threatened in some states by campaigns to pass "right-to-work" laws forbidding the "union shop." In their struggle against such laws, unions are gravely handicapped by charges of corruption and intimidation which, while applying to only a few unions, can be used to castigate all of them. But because of the looseness of its "federal" organization, labor

itself has not been able to act effectively to clear up such abuses. This failure has cost labor much public sympathy which it can regain only by a major effort.

This has changed very little since the late 19th century. The worker belongs to a local to which he pays dues, whose meetings he attends (sometimes), and whose officers he elects. A local union is a chapter of a national union, which is the real seat of power. Some national unions are formed on the basis of a craft or particular skill (like the carpenters union) others on the basis of work in a particular industry (like the united automobile workers).

On the city and state level there are bodies which serve to coordinate locals. One important function is to unite the political efforts of local unions; to voice opinions on school problems, public transportation, and other civic issues. The state federation maintains a constant watch on legislatures and applies pressure to get favorable treatment of bills affecting labor.

A federation like the AFL-CIO is made up of national unions, but it is not comparable to the federal level of government. It more closely resembles the United States in that it is not a governing unit but a league which cannot dictate to the member national Unions. This is why it is so often difficult for the federation to impose its policy on a recalcitrant member.

There seems to be a trend toward increasing the power of the national unions and reducing that of locals -- the growing emphasis on bargaining for standard contracts with all the employers in an industry is one example of this. But the great remaining autonomy of the local unions and almost complete sovereignty of the national unions makes it very difficult to introduce reforms into the labor organizations. There is also the tendency for unions to be afflicted with the same problems of internal bureaucracy which plague other large institutions in modern life.

The local chapter is fairly autonomous in the AFL and is important, if not so powerful, even in the CIO. Chapters are grouped together in national industry organizations -- the united mine workers, for example -- but the policies and decisions of such organizations often reflect the mood and temper of the "locals." occasionally the "locals" ignore the national organization and follow their own noses. The power of the big confederations -- the AFL and the CIO -- is even more amorphous. If most of their member unions are agreed, the confederations can push this way or that. But such agreement is hard to come by, and in most respects the confederations are like our national political parties -- loose coalitions of divergent local groups.

All levels of the labor movement are run by union democracy; officials are subject to periodic reelection. American union democracy, like our political democracy, contains among its other rights the right to apathy. Thus many unions are effectively controlled by small groups within their membership. However, when those groups offend the union members they can be promptly voted out and often are. But on most issues union members tend to follow their leaders. In this fact lie both the great strength and many of the weaknesses of the American labor movement.

A union's chief objective is to gain maximum benefits for its members by making an advantageous bargain with the employer. Its right to represent employees at the bargaining table, resisted for many years by most employers, was established in law by the Wagner act in 1935. The union's ultimate weapon is the strike; management's is the shutdown and/or lockout. Both sides-and the public -- are hurt when these weapons are used.

In recent years there have been greater efforts to avoid strikes. When negotiations break down, the national labor relations board (NLRB) is available to act as an impartial arbiter. In some industries, there have been experiments with year-round committees of labor and management which negotiate issues well in advance of contract expiration. Negotiations have become more complicated, including extensive "fringe benefits" for workers, profit-sharing plans, wage scales tied to the cost-of-living index or to increases in productivity, and a host of other complicated provisions. Such matters are difficult to negotiate successfully under a strike deadline.

The Taft-Hartley act gave the president authority to intervene in work stoppages which threaten "national health and safety" and impose an 80-day "cooling-off" period.

Collective bargaining hitherto has been reasonably successful. It has provided a method for resolving the conflicting economic interests of management and labor; has enhanced the rights, dignity, and self-respect of the workingman; and has served as a bulwark for the preservation of the private enterprise system. Some experts feel that the strike is an increasingly undesirable solution for industrial problems. A strike in a key industry can hamper production all across the country and can sometimes drastically affect national defense efforts. Consequently, government has been forced recently to intervene even more directly than before in such disputes and exert pressure for the settlement. The kind of direct intervention seen in the railroad dispute is still rare, but some observers look for an increase of this governmental role and for other changes in the bargaining process.

Technological advance presents a tremendous and growing challenge. The increased productivity such changes bring is of great benefit, but it has sharply reduced the number of workers in industries where such changes are introduced, particularly the less skilled workers for whom new employment is difficult to find. This problem has presented a great challenge to labor. Some unions have responded by "featherbedding" tactics. Others have attempted to deal with it more honestly. In some cases they got management to agree to cushion the effect of layoffs by various arrangements. They set up schemes to retrain skilled workers made redundant by automation and to train unskilled ones to higher standards. With government cooperation they relocated workers to areas of greater employment opportunities. But solutions are not easy, and they are likely to get more difficult. All this is bound to bring great changes in American unionism. The "unskilled worker" was never very unskilled, but now he seems to be passing from the scene. In the future we seem likely to have only skilled and very skilled workers.

In some areas, like eastern Kentucky and west Virginia, economic change has brought serious hardship to an entire region. Aid to these depressed areas, vocational training centers, and special programs to attract new industry are some of the means being tried to remedy this problem, but it remains a serious one.

The foregoing factors have intensified the unions' traditional stress on job security and on keeping high the barriers to membership, and thus to employment, as long as there are too few jobs for existing members. But the demands of the great wave of young people coming into the labor market and of such groups as the blacks, so long denied membership in certain unions and access to the jobs they control, have generated a certain amount of hostility toward unions as they grapple with the difficult problems they face.

American labor unions, like our corporations, are an integral part of our economic and social life and of the private enterprise system we have created. They have made the American wage earner a full partner in our social democracy and the recipient of its material blessings. There is still much to be done to aid the bottom 20 to 30 percent of our income groups—mostly composed of the badly educated, the blacks, the older citizens, and the displaced rural population. Despite the shortcomings and the serious new problems arising alongside our increasing wealth, we have achieved a considerable measure of economic justice while retaining an open, fluid society with few restrictions on liberty and opportunity for the individual worker.

This information should give you an understanding of how our labor and labor management systems operate. You should also be able to recognize how labor and labor management relate to the following Articles in the universal declaration of human rights:

*Article 20*

*Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.*

*No one May be compelled to belong to an association.*

*Article 23*

*Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions or work and to protection against unemployment.*

*Everyone, with any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.*

*Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.*

*Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection if his interests.*

*Article 24*

*Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.*