

Wage and Hour Division, Labor

§ 783.21

provision. This would generally be true of employees employed in enterprises and by establishments engaged in a business concerned with transportation of goods or persons by vessels, where the enterprise has an annual gross sales volume of \$1,000,000 or more. Enterprise coverage is more fully discussed in part 776 of this chapter, dealing with general coverage.

§ 783.20 Exemptions from the Act's provisions.

The Act provides a number of specific exemptions from the general requirements previously described. Some are exemptions from the overtime provisions only. Others are from the child labor provisions only. Several are exemptions from both the minimum wage and the overtime requirements of the Act. Finally, there are some exemptions from all three—minimum wage, overtime pay, and child labor requirements. An examination of the terminology in which the exemptions from the general coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act are stated discloses language patterns which reflect congressional intent. Thus, Congress specified in varying degree the criteria for application of each of the exemptions and in a number of instances differentiated as to whether employees are to be exempt because they are employed by a particular kind of employer, employed in a particular type of establishment, employed in a particular industry, employed in a particular capacity or occupation, or engaged in a specified operation. (See 29 U.S.C. 203(d); 207 (b), (c), (h); 213 (a), (b), (c), (d). And see *Addison v. Holly Hill*, 322 U.S. 607; *Walling v. Haden*, 153 F. 2d 196, certiorari denied 328 U.S. 866; *Mitchell v. Stinson*, 217 F. 2d 210.) In general, there are no exemptions from the child labor requirements that apply in enterprises or establishments engaged in transportation or shipping (see part 570, subpart G of this chapter). Such enterprises or establishments will, however, be concerned with the exemption from overtime pay in section 13(b)(6) of the Act for employees employed as seamen and the exemption from the minimum wage and overtime pay requirements provided by section 13(a)(14) for employees so employed on vessels other than American

vessels. These exemptions, which are subject to the general rules stated in § 783.21, are discussed at length in this part.

§ 783.21 Guiding principles for applying coverage and exemption provisions.

It is clear that Congress intended the Fair Labor Standards Act to be broad in its scope (*Helena Glendale Ferry Co. v. Walling*, 132 F. 2d 616). “Breadth of coverage is vital to its mission” (*Powell v. U.S. Cartridge Co.*, 339 U.S. 497). An employer who claims an exemption under the Act has the burden of showing that it applies (*Walling v. General Industries Co.*, 330 U.S. 545; *Mitchell v. Kentucky Finance Co.*, 359 U.S. 290; *Tobin v. Blue Channel Corp.* 198 F. 2d 245, approved in *Mitchell v. Myrtle Grove Packing Co.*, 350 U.S. 891; *Fleming v. Hawkeye Pearl Button Co.*, 113 F. 2d 52). Conditions specified in the language of the Act are “explicit prerequisites to exemption” (*Arnold v. Kanowsky*, 361 U.S. 388; and see *Walling v. Haden*, 153 F. 2d 196). In their application, the purpose of the exemption as shown in its legislative history as well as its language should be given effect. However, “the details with which the exemptions in this Act have been made preclude their enlargement by implication” and “no matter how broad the exemption, it is meant to apply only to” the specified activities (*Addison v. Holly Hill*, 322 U.S. 607; *Maneja v. Waialua*, 349 U.S. 254). Exemptions provided in the Act “are to be narrowly construed against the employer seeking to assert them” and their application limited to those who come “plainly and unmistakably within their terms and spirits.” This construction of the exemptions is necessary to carry out the broad objectives for which the Act was passed (*Phillips v. Walling*, 324 U.S. 490; *Mitchell v. Kentucky Finance Co.*, supra; *Arnold v. Kanowsky*, supra; *Helena Glendale Ferry Co. v. Walling*, supra; *Mitchell v. Stinson*, 217 F. 2d 210; *Flemming v. Hawkeye Pearl Button Co.*, 113 F. 2d 52; *Walling v. Bay State Dredging & Contracting Co.*, 149 F. 2d 346, certiorari denied 326 U.S. 760; *Anderson v. Manhattan Lighterage Corp.*, 148 F. 2d 971, certiorari denied 326 U.S. 722; *Sternberg Dredging Co. v. Walling*, 158 F. 2d 678).