

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 show-

ing 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).

§ 783.22 Pay standards for employees subject to “old” coverage of the Act.

The 1961 amendments did not change the tests described in § 783.18 by which coverage based on the employee’s individual activities is determined. Any employee whose employment satisfies these tests and would not have come within some exemption (such as section 13(a)(14)) in the Act prior to the 1961 amendments is subject to the “old” provisions of the law and entitled to a minimum wage of at least \$1.15 an hour beginning September 3,