

practical guide to employers and employees as to how the office representing the public interest in its enforcement will seek to apply it” and “constitute a body of experience and informed judgment to which courts and litigants may properly resort for guidance.” Further, as stated by the Court: “Good administration of the Act and good judicial administration alike require that the standards of public enforcement and those for determining private rights shall be at variance only where justified by very good reasons.” (*Skidmore v. Swift*, 323 U.S. 134). Some of the interpretations in this part are interpretations of exemption provisions as they appeared in the original Act before amendment in 1949, 1961, and 1966, which have remained unchanged because they are consistent with the amendments. These interpretations may be said to have congressional sanction because “When Congress amended the Act in 1949 it provided that pre-1949 rulings and interpretations by the Administrator should remain in effect unless inconsistent with the statute as amended. 63 Stat. 920.” (*Mitchell v. Kentucky Finance Co.*, 359 U.S. 290; accord, *Maneja v. Waialua*, 349 U.S. 254.)

**§ 780.8 Interpretations made, continued, and superseded by this part.**

On and after publication of this part 780 in the FEDERAL REGISTER, the interpretations contained therein shall be in effect and shall remain in effect until they are modified, rescinded, or withdrawn. This part supersedes and replaces the interpretations previously published in the FEDERAL REGISTER and Code of Federal Regulations as this part 780. Prior opinions, rulings, and interpretations and prior enforcement policies which are not inconsistent with the interpretations in this part or with the Fair Labor Standards Act as amended by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 are continued in effect; all other opinions, rulings, interpretations, and enforcement policies on the subjects discussed in the interpretations in this part are rescinded and withdrawn. The interpretations in this part provide statements of general principles applicable to the subjects discussed and illustrations of the appli-

cation of these principles to situations that frequently arise. They do not and cannot refer specifically to every problem which may be met in the consideration of the exemptions discussed. The omission to discuss a particular problem in this part or in interpretations supplementing it should not be taken to indicate the adoption of any position by the Secretary of Labor or the Administrator with respect to such problem or to constitute an administrative interpretation or practice or enforcement policy. Questions on matters not fully covered by this bulletin may be addressed to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC 20210, or to any Regional Office of the Division.

**§ 780.9 Related exemptions are interpreted together.**

The interpretations contained in the several subparts of this part 780 consider separately a number of exemptions which affect employees who perform activities in or connected with agriculture and its products. These exemptions deal with related subject matter and varying degrees of relationships between them were the subject of consideration in Congress before their enactment. Together they constitute an expression in some detail of existing Federal policy on the lines to be drawn in the industries connected with agriculture and agricultural products between those employees to whom the pay provisions of the Act are to be applied and those whose exclusion in whole or in part from the Act’s requirements has been deemed justified. The courts have indicated that these exemptions, because of their relationship to one another, should be construed together insofar as possible so that they form a consistent whole. Consideration of the language and history of a related exemption or exemptions is helpful in ascertaining the intended scope and application of an exemption whose effect might otherwise not be clear (*Addison v. Holly Hill*, 322 U.S. 607; *Maneja v. Waialua*, 349 U.S. 254; *Bowie v. Gonzales* (C.A. 1), 117 F. 2d 11). In the interpretations of the several exemptions discussed in the various subparts of this part 780, effect has been given to these