

Wage and Hour Division, Labor

§ 784.111

hired by an employer who is engaged in one or more of the named operations or that the employee is employed by an establishment or in an industry in which operations enumerated in section 13(a)(5) or section 13(b)(4) are performed. The relationship between what he does and the performance of the named operations must be examined to determine whether an application of the above-stated principles to all the facts and circumstances will justify the conclusion that he is "employed in" such operations within the intentment of the exemption provision.

§ 784.107 Relationship of employee's work to operations on the specified aquatic products.

It is also necessary to the application of the exemptions that the operation of which the employee's work is a part be performed on the marine products named in the Act. Thus the operations described in section 13(a)(5) must be performed with respect to "any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life." The operations enumerated in section 13(b)(4) must be performed with respect to "any kind of fish, shellfish, or other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life, or any by-product thereof". Work performed on products which do not fall within these descriptions is not within the exemptions (*Fleming v. Hawkeye Pearl Button Co.*, 113 F. 2d 52; *Mitchell v. Trade Winds, Inc.*, 289 F. 2d 278; *Walling v. Haden*, 153 F. 2d 196).

§ 784.108 Operations not included in named operations on forms of aquatic "life."

Since the subject matter of the exemptions is concerned with "aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life," the courts have held that the manufacture of buttons from clam shells or the dredging of shells to be made into lime and cement are not exempt operations because the shells are not living things (*Fleming v. Hawkeye Pearl Button Co.*, 113 F. 2d 52; *Walling v. Haden*, 153 F. 2d 196, certiorari denied 328 U.S. 866). Similarly, the production of such items as crushed shell and grit, shell lime, pearl buttons, knife handles, novelties, liquid glue, isinglass, pearl essence,

and fortified or refined fish oil is not within these exemptions.

§ 784.109 Manufacture of supplies for named operations is not exempt.

Employment in the manufacture of supplies for the named operations is not employment in the named operations on aquatic forms of life. Thus, the exemption is not applicable to the manufacture of boxes, barrels, or ice by a seafood processor for packing or shipping its seafood products or for use of the ice in its fishing vessels. These operations, when performed by an independent manufacturer, would likewise not be exempt (*Dize v. Maddix*, 144 F. 284 (C.A. 4), affirmed 324 U.S. 667, and approved on this point in *Farmers' Reservoir Co. v. McComb*, 337 U.S. 755).

§ 784.110 Performing operations both on nonaquatic products and named aquatic products.

By their terms, sections 13(a)(5) and 13(b)(4) provide no exemption with respect to operations performed on any products other than the aquatic products named in these subsections (see § 784.107). Accordingly, neither of the exemptions is applicable to the making of any commodities from ingredients only part of which consist of such aquatic products, if a substantial amount of other products is contained in the commodity so produced (compare *Walling v. Bridgeman-Russell Co.*, 6 Labor Cases 61, 422, 2 WH Cases 785 (D. Minn.) and *Miller v. Litchfield Creamery Co.*, 11 Labor Cases 63, 274, 5 WH Cases 1039 (N.D. Ind.), with *Mitchell v. Trade Winds, Inc.*, 289 F. 2d 278). Thus, the first processing, canning, or processing of codfish cakes, clam chowder, dog food, crab cakes, or livestock food containing aquatic products is often not exempt within the meaning of the relevant exemptions.

§ 784.111 Operations on named products with substantial amounts of other ingredients are not exempt.

To exempt employees employed in first processing, canning, or processing products composed of the named commodities and a substantial amount of ingredients not named in the exemptions would be contrary to the language and purposes of such exemptions

which specifically enumerate the commodities on which exempt operations were intended to be performed. Consequently, in such situations all operations performed on the mixed products at and from the time of the addition of the foreign ingredients, including those activities which are an integral part of first processing, canning, or processing are nonexempt activities. However, activities performed in connection with such operations on the named aquatic products prior to the addition of the foreign ingredients are deemed exempt operations under the applicable exemption. Where the commodity produced from named aquatic products contains an insubstantial amount of products not named in the exemption, the operations will be considered as performed on the aquatic products and handling and preparation of the foreign ingredients for use in the exempt operations will also be considered as exempt activities.

§ 784.112 Substantial amounts of non-aquatic products; enforcement policy.

As an enforcement policy in applying the principles stated in §§ 784.110 and 784.111, if more than 20 percent of a commodity consists of products other than aquatic products named in section 13(a)(5) or 13(b)(4), the commodity will be deemed to contain a substantial amount of such nonaquatic products.

§ 784.113 Work related to named operations performed in off- or dead-season.

Generally, during the dead or inactive season when operations named in section 13(a)(5) or 13(b)(4) are not being performed on the specified aquatic forms of life, employees performing work relating to the plant or equipment which is used in such operations during the active seasons are not exempt. Illustrative of such employees are those who repair, overhaul, or recondition fishing equipment or processing or canning equipment and machinery during the off-season periods when fishing, processing, or canning is not going on. An exemption provided for employees employed "in" specified operations is plainly not intended to apply to employees employed in other

activities during periods when the specified operations are not being carried on, where their work is functionally remote from the actual conduct of the operations for which exemption is provided and is unaffected by the natural factors which the Congress relied on as reason for exemption. The courts have recognized these principles. See *Maneja v. Waialua*, 349 U.S. 254; *Mitchell v. Stinson*, 217 F. 2d 210; *Maisonet v. Central Coloso*, 6 Labor Cases (CCH) par. 61,337, 2 WH Cases 753 (D. P.R.); *Abram v. San Joaquin Cotton Oil Co.*, 49 F. Supp. 393 (S.D. Calif.), and *Heaburg v. Independent Oil Mill Inc.*, 46 F. Supp. 751 (W.D. Tenn.). On the other hand, there may be situations where employees performing certain preseason or postseason activities immediately prior or subsequent to carrying on operations named in sections 13(a)(5) or section 13(b)(4) are properly to be considered as employed "in" the named operations because their work is so close in point of time and function to the conduct of the named operations that the employment is, as a practical matter, necessarily and directly a part of carrying on the operation for which exemption was intended. Depending on the facts and circumstances, this may be true, for example, of employees who perform such work as placing boats and other equipment in condition for use at the beginning of the fishing season, and taking the necessary protective measures with respect to such equipment which are required in connection with termination of the named operations at the end of the season. Where such work is integrated with and is required for the actual conduct of the named operations on the specified aquatic forms of life, and is necessarily performed immediately before or immediately after such named operations, the employees performing it may be considered as employed in the named operations, so as to come within the exemption. It should be kept in mind that the relationship between the work of an employee and the named operations which is required for exemption is not necessarily identical with the relationship between such work and the production of goods for commerce which is sufficient to establish its general coverage under the Act. Thus, repair, overhaul,