

permitted. Where a part of an employee's covered work in a workweek is exempt under section 13(a)(5) and the remainder is exempt under another section which grants an exemption from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Act, the wage and hours requirements are not applicable. If the scope of the exemption is not the same, however, the exemption applicable to the employee is that provided by whichever exemption provision is more limited in scope unless, of course, the time spent in performing work which is nonexempt under the broader exemption is not substantial. For example, an employee may devote part of his workweek to work within section 13(b)(4) and the remainder to work exempt from both the minimum wage and overtime requirements under another section of the Act. In such a case he must receive the minimum wage but is not required to receive time and one-half for his overtime work during that week (*C.F. Mitchell v. Myrtle Grove Packing Co.*, 350 U.S. 891; *Tobin v. Blue Channel Corp.*, 198 F. 2d 245). Each activity is tested separately under the applicable exemption as though it were the sole activity of the employee for the whole workweek in question. Unless the employee meets all the requirements of each exemption a combination exemption would not be available.

GENERAL CHARACTER AND SCOPE OF THE
SECTION 13(a)(5) EXEMPTION

§ 784.118 The exemption is intended for work affected by natural factors.

As indicated by the legislative history, the purpose of the section 13(a)(5) exemption is to exempt from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Act employment in those activities in the fishing industry that are controlled or materially affected by natural factors or elements, such as the vicissitudes of the weather, the changeable conditions of the water, the run of the catch, and the perishability of the products obtained (83 Cong. Rec. 7408, 7443; S. Rep. No. 145, p. 33 on H.R. 3935, 87th Cong., first session; *Fleming v. Hawkeye Pearl Button Co.*, 113 F. 2d 52; *Walling v. Haden*, 153 F. 2d 196, certiorari denied 328 U.S. 866).

§ 784.119 Effect of natural factors on named operations.

The various activities enumerated in section 13(a)(5)—the catching, taking, propagating, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life as well as “the going to and returning from work” are materially controlled and affected by the natural elements. Similarly, the activities of “first processing, canning, or packing of such marine products at sea as an incident to, or in conjunction with, such fishing operations” are subject to the natural factors mentioned above. The “loading and unloading” of such aquatic products when performed at sea are also subject to the natural forces.

§ 784.120 Application of exemption to “offshore” activities in general.

The expression “offshore activities” is used to describe the category of named operations pertaining to the acquisition from nature of aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life. As originally enacted in 1938, section 13(a)(5) exempted not only employees employed in such “offshore” or “trip” activities but also employees employed in related activities on shore which were similarly affected by the natural factors previously discussed (see § 784.103, and *Fleming v. Hawkeye Pearl Button Co.*, 113 F. 2d 52). However, the intent of the 1961 amendments to the Act was to remove from the exemption the so-called onshore activities and “leave the exemption applicable to ‘offshore’ activities connected with the procurement of the aquatic products” (S. Rep. 145, 87th Cong., first session, p. 33). Despite its comprehensive reach (see §§ 784.105 and 784.106), the exemption, like the similar exemption in the Act for agriculture, is “meant to apply only” to the activities named in the statute (see *Maneja v. Waialua*, 349 U.S. 254; *Farmers Reservoir Co. v. McComb*, 337 U.S. 755).

§ 784.121 Exempt fisheries operations.

Employees engaged in the named operations, such as “catching” or “taking,” are clearly exempt. As indicated in § 784.106, employees engaged in activities that are “directly and necessarily a part of” an enumerated operation are also exempt (*Mitchell v. Trade*