

employees who are individually engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for such commerce as these terms are defined in the Act and to employees in certain enterprises described in the amended section 3(s) which were covered under section 3(s) of the Act prior to the amendments. Through the broadening of the definition of a covered enterprise the Act's coverage was extended to additional employees because of their employment in certain enterprises beginning February 1, 1967, and in certain other enterprises beginning February 1, 1969. Such covered enterprises are described in section 3(s) as enterprises engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and further described in sections 3(s) (1) through (4) of the amended Act. A detailed discussion of the coverage of employees in those enterprises covered under the prior and amended Act of interest to the retail industry is contained in subpart C of this part. The employer must comply with the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the Act with respect to all employees who are covered either because they are individually engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or in the production of goods for such commerce, or because of their employment in an enterprise covered under the prior or amended enterprise definition of the Act, except those who may be denied one or both of these benefits by virtue of some specific exemption provision of the Act. Of special interest to the retailer in a covered enterprise is the exemption from the minimum wage and overtime provisions for certain small retail or service establishments of such enterprise. This exemption is applicable under the conditions and subject to exceptions stated in section 13(a) (2) of the Act to any retail or service establishment which has an annual dollar volume of sales of less than \$250,000 (exclusive of certain excise taxes) even if the establishment is a part of an enterprise that is covered by the Act. This exemption and other exemptions of particular interest to retailers and their employees are discussed in subparts D and E of this part. The child labor provisions as they apply to retail or service businesses are discussed in subpart F of this part.

§ 779.101 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. "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; *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.) "The details with which the exemptions in this Act have been made preclude their enlargement by implication." (*Addison v. Holly Hill*, 322 U.S. 60; *Maneja v. Waiialua*, 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 spirit; this restricted or narrow 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; *Calaf v. Gonzalez*, 127 F. 2d 934; *Bowie v. Gonzalez*, 117 F. 2d 11; *Mitchell v. Stinson*, 217 F. 2d 210; *Fleming v. Hawkeye Pearl Button Co.*, 113 F. 2d 52.)

§ 779.102 Scope of this subpart.

The Act has applied since 1938 and continues to apply to all employees, not specifically exempted, who are engaged: (a) In interstate or foreign commerce or (b) in the production of goods for such commerce, which is defined to include any closely related process or occupation directly essential to such production. (See §§ 779.12-779.16 for definitions governing the scope of this coverage.) Prior to the 1961 amendments a retailer was not generally concerned with the coverage provisions as they applied to his individual employees because retail or service establishments ordinarily were exempt. However, in some cases such coverage was applicable as where employees were employed