FOIA Number: 2016-0531-F

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Public Liaison

Series/Staff Member: Lee Satterfield

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 9434

FolderID:

Folder Title:
Minimum Wage

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	30	5	3	2

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. list	re: Minimum wage bill signing attendess [Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (4 pages)	08/00/1996	b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
Public Liaison
Lee Satterfield
OA/Box Number: 9434

FOLDER TITLE:
Minimum Wage

2016-0531-F
jm1838

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Philip Adler

Preventing Polio: Don't Tamper With Success

A new way of doing polio immunization is being considered by two important medical bodies. If the change is adopted, it could reverse the incredible progress made over the past three decades in eliminating polio and sharply increase the number of children who are not adequately protected against polio and other serious childhood diseases.

The polio immunization schedule under consideration by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) would include a greater reliance on inactivated polio vaccine and a reduced reliance on oral polio vaccine. As a practicing pediatrician with personal and professional experience with this horrible disease, I am compelled to speak out against such an ill-advised course of action.

The dispute over how best to immunize our children against polio reflects a conflict between the "killed-virus" inactivated vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas Salk and the "live-virus" oral vaccine formulated by Dr. Albert Sabin. Today the oral vaccine is the preferred agent for polio immunization in the United States, because it has proven to be highly effective. The inactivated vaccine is reserved solely for immuno-compromised patients, such as children infected with HIV. Through an immunization program using the oral vaccine, polio has been eliminated in 145 countries, including the entire Western Hemisphere. In the United States, there has not been a case of naturally acquired polio since 1979.

Despite this established record of achievement, the CDC and AAP are actively considering a shift away from the oral vaccine. The CDC's Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices voted at its meeting last October to draft a new polio immunization policy that would include a greater reliance on the inactivated vaccine. Although the committee did not reach a decision on the details of the new schedule, it is likely that it will include two doses of inactivated vaccine (at two months and four months of age) and two of oral (at six to 12 months of age and 12 to 18 months). The precise schedule and timetable for implementing it will be considered at the committee's June meeting. The Committee on Infectious Diseases of the AAP is expected to consider the issue in May.

Proponents of using the "killed-virus" vaccine maintain that eight to 10 cases of paralytic polio are caused by the "live-virus" type every year. They also frequently cite the case of a child born recently with an immune deficiency who developed paralytic polio following immunization with the oral vaccine.

Such cases, though extraordinarily rare, are undeniably tragic. Nevertheless, the CDC and the AAP must move cautiously before making a policy change that could produce profound and devastating consequences for our children. Caution is warranted for several reasons.

First, there is no scientific evidence that a mixed schedule would decrease the rare occurrences of "vaccine-associated paralytic polio." Only one country, Denmark, has any real experience using a protocol combining the killed- and live-virus vaccines, and its small, homogeneous population does not allow for a valid comparison with the United States. Moreover, Denmark does not use the same schedule now being proposed for the United States.

Second, the combined schedule would have a devastating impact on immunization compliance. As it is, the current immunization schedule requires that a child receive approximately 12 inoculations by age 2. In the absence of new combination products (which appear to be several years away from availability in the United States), using the inactive vaccine would force physicians to give as many as four shots during some visits. Because doctors and parents resist having more than two shots per pediatric visit, additional visits might be necessary. Not surprisingly, many parents have trouble complying with the visits required in the current pediatric schedule. Adding visits would likely result in reduced compliance and a decrease in the number of children fully immunized.

Another concern involves public confidence in childhood immunizations. The CDC and the AAP must consider carefully the impact that a new and untried protocol, and even discussions about the perceived need for such a protocol, can have on parental support for polio immunization generally. Sadly, public confidence in childhood immunizations is easily disrupted. I remember how unfounded reports of adverse reactions to the whole-cell pertussis vaccine for whooping cough dissuaded many parents from allowing their children to receive this important immunization during the past decade; as a result, the incidence of pertussis cases increased.

Reckless discussion about polio vaccine safety could produce the same result, especially because most of today's parents are ignorant of polio's ravages. Ironically, because the oral vaccine has proven so successful, most of this generation's parents know little or nothing about the disease, and therefore may be less committed to immunizing against it.

As a practicing pediatrician who has used this vaccine for more than 30 years, and who has seen polio disappear from the American landscape of infectious diseases, I do not believe the reintroduction of the killed-virus vaccine is justified. The oral vaccine has been the recognized vaccine worldwide for preventing polio. It has proven itself. The CDC and AAP should adopt no change to the existing polio immunization protocol unless the risks associated with such a change are properly analyzed and assessed.

The writer is a pediatrician in Tampa, Fla.

THE WASHINGTON POST
TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1996

THE WASHINGTON POST
TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1996

The Washington Post

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER

The Minimum Wage

THE PURCHASING power of the minimum wage is about to fall to its lowest level in 40 years. The last time Congress voted to increase it was in 1989. It is time—you could argue well past time—to do so again.

President Clinton has proposed to raise the minimum 45 cents in each of the next two years, to $5.15 an hour. That's a one-fifth increase, and no such step is ever cost-free. It would have a broad effect on wages, not just those at the minimum but those in the zones immediately above, and it would add to the pressures on smaller businesses particularly to cut costs in order to survive. But the president is proposing to restore the wage, not break new ground. In real terms, it would remain well below the levels that obtained from the 1960s through the early 1980s, and would be only a dime above the level to which George Bush agreed, and Bob Dole and Newt Gingrich voted for, in 1989.

Senate Democrats tried twice last week to attach the increase to unrelated legislation. The parliamentary situation was such that they needed 60 votes and failed to get them. But it became clear in the process that a majority of senators would likely support the proposal. Republican opponents said the Democratic sponsors were playing politics and seeking to embarrass Mr. Dole. No doubt that's so. The right way to depoliticize the issue is to pass the increase and be done with it.

The opponents make two traditional arguments. The first is that employers will hire fewer people if they have to pay the higher wage, so the increase will end up costing its intended beneficiaries jobs. If this were not so temperate an increase so long delayed, that might be true, and it would be a danger. But most of the evidence, including studies of the effects of the 1989 increase, which was of comparable size, suggests that any job loss would be minimal.

The second argument is that an increase in the minimum wage is an inefficient way of helping people in need, because a lot of people working at or near the minimum aren't needy. They are teenagers or other second earners in families that are fairly well off. But that argument, too, is greatly overstated. The vast majority—perhaps three-fourths—of those whose wages would be directly affected by the president's proposal are either over 25 or not in school, and in that sense "adult." There are perhaps 10 million of these workers, their average age is over 30, more than half are women, and as a group they are responsible for more than half their families' earnings. The teenagers among them produce about a fourth of their families' earnings.

Nor are these families typically well off. Most of them are found precisely where you would expect to find them—at the lower end of the income scale. It is true that an increase in the minimum won't all go to lower-income families. But most of it will, and it will help those families a lot.

This society increasingly is one in which incomes are unequal. In the lower reaches of the economy particularly, they have lagged. The decline in recent years in the value of the minimum wage is not the only reason for this, but it is surely one. A person working full-time year-round at the minimum used to be able to support a family of average size at pretty close to the poverty line. At the present wage, that's no longer possible. If the wage is increased as proposed, it will become more nearly so again.

We claim as a society to value work. We want people on welfare to quit the dole and take up jobs, and so they should if they can. But the jobs then need to pay enough to sustain them. That ought not be too much to ask of a country and economy as prosperous as this. We say again, there are costs associated with the step. The benefits outweigh them. The increase that the president has proposed is right. Both parties ought to support it; they ought to do it now.

March 27, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR MARILYN YAGER
DORIS MATSUI
LEE SATTERFIELD

FROM: LISA OSBORNE ROSS

CC: SUZANNA VALDEZ

RE: MINIMUM WAGE

In follow-up to our discussion this morning, please find a scheduling request for a March 30 minimum wage radio address. The Labor Department is sending it to Kitty.

Also attached is a briefing/talking points on the issue and a list of other minimum wage event ideas the Department of Labor proposes for consideration by the President and the First Lady.

The scheduling request attached has not yet been submitted. We are awaiting Doris' input and would you like Alexis' name added.

We'd love to start pushing some of these events.

MINIMUM WAGE EVENT IDEAS FOR THE PRESIDENT AND FIRST LADY

1. **POTUS**/Minimum wage radio address, Saturday (March 30, 1996)

2. **FLOTUS**/Minimum wage worker "profiles" story in weekly newspaper column (after April 1, 1996)

3. **FLOTUS**/Speech to minimum wage advocacy group, training center, religious organization or community college (commencement speech?) Washington or any major city (after April 1, 1996)

4. **FLOTUS**/Meeting and photo-op with minimum wage workers in day care, maintenance and elder care industries (on-site), Washington or any major city (after April 1, 1996)

5. **POTUS-FLOTUS**/Dinner with minimum wage family, any major city (after April 1, 1996)

6. **FLOTUS**/First Lady's roundtable with minimum wage workers and their children (held at community center, library or training center), any major city (after April 1, 1996)

7. **FLOTUS**/Break room visits, any shop floor or factory event, any major city (after April 1, 1996)

8. **POTUS-FLOTUS**/Continued minimum wage message points in constituent group speeches (on-going)

Scheduling Proposal March 27, 1996

____ACCEPT ______REGRET _____PENDING

TO: Stephanie Streett
Anne Walley

FROM: Kitty Higgins
Betsy Myers
Doris Matsui

REQUEST: To have the President's Radio Address on March 30 focus on the minimum wage and the need to increase it.

PURPOSE: To highlight the President's advocacy for hard-working Americans and raise the public profile for the need of an increase in the minimum wage.

BACKGROUND: An address on this Saturday, March 30, would enable the Administration to take advantage of the April 1 anniversary of the last increase as well as the developments in the Senate this week on minimum wage.

The minimum wage was last increased on April 1, 1991. Public opinion polls show that by a ratio of 4 to 1, Americans support raising the minimum wage. Even 65 percent of white Republican men support an increase in the minimum wage.

The minimum wage is worth less than it used to be: Adjusted for inflation, the minimum wage ($4.25 per hour) is now 29 percent lower than it was in 1979.

Many adults rely on the minimum wage: Almost two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults and four in ten are the sole bread winners for their families.

Raising the minimum wage is an important issue to women: Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage earners are women.

Increasing the minimum wage would lift a family out of poverty: An estimated 300,000 people would be lifted out of poverty if the minimum wage were raised to $5.15 per hour -- this includes 100,000 children who are currently living in poverty.

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION:	The President has mentioned the minimum wage in previous Radio Address, but has not focused an Address on the importance of raising the minimum wage.
DATE AND TIME:	Saturday, March 30
BRIEFING TIME:	5 minutes.
REMARKS REQUIRED:	Radio Address.
CONTACT:	Bibb Hubbard, 219-8271

Making Work Pay

The Case for Raising the Minimum Wage

U.S. Department of Labor
Robert B. Reich, Secretary
March 1996

Making Work Pay
The Case for Raising the Minimum Wage

Fact Sheet

Americans know a raise in the minimum wage is one way to help make work pay. For many working Americans an increase in the minimum wage will make the difference between living in poverty and not. Furthermore, a higher minimum wage -- a floor to ensure workers that they're getting a fair deal for their efforts -- provides a foothold into the middle class for many other families.

The Problem: The Minimum Wage is Worth Less Than It Used to Be

The Federal minimum wage is currently $4.25 per hour. Adjusted for inflation, the value of the minimum wage has fallen by nearly 50 cents since it was last increased in 1991, and is now 29% lower than it was in 1979. If left unchanged, its real value will be at a forty-year low by January 1997.

Raising the minimum wage is one way to make work pay. A recent study concluded that the decline in the real value of the minimum wage since 1979 accounts for 20% of the rise in wage inequality for men, and 30% for women (see DiNardo, Lemieux & Fortin). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 3.66 million workers paid by the hour earn at or below the minimum wage. An increase in this living wage is a strong response to the stagnant incomes that many of these workers face.

Many Adults Rely on the Minimum Wage as a Living Wage

Contrary to popular opinion, the average worker affected by an increase in the minimum wage is not just a teenager flipping hamburgers. Only one in fourteen is a teenage student from a family with above average earnings.

The fact is, almost two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults, and four in ten are the sole bread winner of their family.

Increasing the Minimum Wage Lifts Families out of Poverty

Twenty percent of those living on the minimum wage the last time it was raised in 1991 were in poverty, and an additional 13% were near poverty. In 1993, the President expanded the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), which raised income for 15 million families, helping many working families move above the poverty line. Yet to complete the goal of insuring that full-time working families are out of poverty, we need to raise the minimum wage. Recent analysis by the Economic Policy Institute and preliminary work by the Department of Health and Human

Services suggests that 300,000 people would be lifted out of poverty if the minimum wage was raised to $5.15 per hour. This figure includes 100,000 children who are currently living in poverty.

The current poverty line for a family of 4 is $15,600. A family of 4 with one worker earning $4.25 an hour and working full-time year round ($8,500) would receive a tax credit of $3,400 under the 1996 provisions of the EITC, will collect food stamps worth $3,516, and will pay $650 in payroll taxes. This family would end up $834 below the poverty line. On the other hand, for a family of 4 with one worker earning $10,300 (a full-time year round worker at $5.15 per hour), the EITC would provide the maximum tax credit ($3,560), food stamps would provide $2,876, and they would pay $788 in payroll taxes. The increase in the minimum wage -- along with EITC and food stamps -- would lift this family out of poverty.

What a Moderate Increase in the Minimum Wage Would Mean for Workers

The President's proposal to raise the minimum wage by $.90 would generate $1800 in potential income for minimum wage workers.

Based on expenditure patterns of an average family, $1800 would buy:

- Seven months of groceries
- One year of health care costs, including insurance premiums, prescription drugs, and out-of-pocket costs
- Nine months' worth of utility bills
- More than a full-year's tuition at a 2-year college
- Basic housing costs for almost 4 months

Many Working Women Depend upon the Minimum Wage

Fifty nine percent of workers earning from $4.25 to $5.14 per hour are women; of those, 72 percent are adults 20 years old or over. The President's proposal to increase the minimum wage would raise wages of more than 5.7 million working women. This includes more than 950,000 African-American women and 760,000 women of Hispanic origin. Single heads of households, who are often women, represent over one-fifth of all families who currently rely on the earnings of a worker making $4.25 to $5.14 per hour.

A Moderate Increase in the Minimum Wage Does Not Cost Jobs

The standard criticism of the minimum wage is that it raises employers' costs and reduces employment opportunities for teenagers and disadvantaged workers. However, several studies have found that the last two increases in the minimum wage had an insignificant effect on employment. Furthermore, an extension of the time-series studies that had previously been used to claim that raising the minimum wage decreases employment, no longer finds a significant impact.

In a recent review of the literature, Professor Richard Freeman of Harvard, a widely respected labor economist, wrote: "At the level of the minimum wage in the late 1980s, moderate legislated increases did not reduce employment and were, if anything, associated with higher employment in some locales."

In discussing the minimum wage, Robert M. Solow, a Nobel laureate in economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, recently told the New York Times, "The main thing about (minimum wage) research is that the evidence of job loss is weak. And the fact that the evidence is weak suggests that the impact on jobs is small."

Americans Want an Increase in the Minimum Wage

The American public supports increasing the minimum wage by a solid margin. Nearly every survey finds overwhelming support for raising the minimum wage. For example, a national poll conducted in January 1995 for the Los Angeles Times found that 72% of Americans backed an increase in the wage, confirming a December 1994 Wall Street Journal/NBC News survey that found raising the minimum wage is favored by 75%.

Despite expected criticism in some corners, the minimum wage has traditionally had bipartisan support. In 1989, the minimum wage increase passed the House by a vote of 382 to 37 (with 135 Republicans voting for the bill), and 89 to 8 in the Senate (with the support of 36 Republicans).

Currently, ten states and the District of Columbia have minimum wages that exceed the Federal minimum wage (Alaska, Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington). Delaware is expected to pass legislation that will raise its minimum wage on April 15, 1996. Hawaii's minimum wage is $5.25 an hour and Massachusetts will match this in January 1997; New Jersey's is $5.05.

The Minimum Wage
Myth and Reality

The federal minimum wage now stands at $4.25 per hour. A person who works full-time all year long at that wage earns only $8500 in a year. The buying power of the minimum wage is already 29 percent lower than in 1979 -- and if left unchanged, will be at its lowest point in 40 years by January 1997. To restore that buying power and to make work pay, the President has challenged Congress to raise the minimum wage.

But the debate has been muddied by several myths that anti-minimum wage forces repeat at every opportunity.

Myth: The only Americans working for the minimum wage are teenagers.

Reality: 63 percent of minimum-wage workers are adults age 20 or over. (Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics)

Myth: Minimum wage workers don't support families.

Reality: The last time the federal minimum wage was increased, the average minimum wage worker brought home 51 percent of his or her family's weekly earnings. (Source: Analysis of Census Bureau's Current Population Survey by Professors David Card and Alan Krueger)

Myth: Raising the minimum wage hurts the poor by causing job loss.

Reality: Nearly 10 million working Americans would get a pay raise if the minimum wage is increased to $5.15 per hour. As Nobel Prize-winning economist Robert Solow said, "[T]he evidence of job loss is weak. And the fact that the evidence is weak suggests that the impact on jobs is small." (Source: *New York Times,* January 12, 1995)

Myth: The only study showing that raising the minimum wage does not cost jobs was a study funded by the U.S. Labor Department.

Reality: One major study -- conducted in 1992 and financed by Princeton University and the University of Wisconsin -- was published by two Princeton University economists. One of those economists later joined the Labor Department. (Source: *Washington Post*, January 11, 1995) Furthermore, a similar conclusion has been reached by at least ten other independent studies.

Myth: Raising the minimum wage will have a negligible impact on people's lives.

Reality: A 90-cent per hour increase in the minimum wage means an additional $1,800 for a minimum wage earner who works full-time, year round -- as much as the average family spends on groceries in more than 7 months. (Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics)

Myth: Increasing the minimum wage has always been a bitter, partisan issue that only Democrats have supported.

Reality: In 1989, the last time the minimum wage was increased, the House of Representatives vote in favor of the proposal was 382 to 37, and the Senate vote was 89 to 8. Indeed, Senator Dole said at the time, "[T]his is not an issue where we ought to be standing and holding up anybody's getting a 30 to 40 cents an hour pay increase, at the same time that we're talking about capital gains. I never thought the Republican Party should stand for squeezing every last nickel from the minimum wage." (Source: *Congressional Quarterly Almanac 1989)*

Making Work Pay

Questions and Answers on Raising the Minimum Wage

With unemployment at its lowest level in years, should we be tinkering with the minimum wage? Won't an increase in the minimum wage hinder the creation of new jobs?

The minimum wage is currently valued at 29% lower in real terms than it was in 1979.

A number of recent studies have found that a moderate rise in the minimum wage has little, if any, affect on job creation starting at such a low level. In fact, "The impact of a minimum wage rise on jobs is small," the New York Times quoted Nobel Laureate Robert Solow as saying. The Times also reported that economists agree that a minimum wage rise will lift the incomes of low wage workers.

Isn't the minimum wage poorly targeted to people in poverty? The Democratic Leadership Council reports that a number of minimum wage workers are in households with earnings higher than the median worker. Wouldn't a rise in the minimum wage just help middle class teenagers?

Although some people who earn the minimum wage are teenagers, almost two-thirds are adults age 20 and older. The average minimum wage worker brings home about half of his or her family's earnings. Increasing the minimum wage will help these workers to make up for lost ground due to inflation -- it will help make work pay.

The minimum wage provides a foothold into the middle class. A family with two full-time year round workers would earn $20,600 a year with a $5.15 minimum wage.

Wouldn't a rise in the minimum wage hurt minorities and the disadvantaged due to job loss?

As the New York Times reported, most economists agree that raising the minimum wage increases the incomes of low wage workers, which more than offsets any effect on jobs. Further, studies of minimum wage increases fail to show disproportionate impacts for minority youth.

Additionally, public support for a minimum wage increase is strong. A January 1995 Los Angeles Times poll found that 72% of Americans back an increase, confirming a December 1994 Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll that found that 75% of adults favored a rise in the minimum wage.

How many workers are affected by a rise in the minimum wage?

An estimated 10 million hourly paid workers earn between $4.25 and $5.14, and would directly benefit from the President's proposal to increase the minimum wage.

How can you contemplate a rise in the minimum wage with a new Congress intent on getting government off the backs of business?

The minimum wage has historically enjoyed bipartisan support. Sens. Dole and Kassenbaum, Speaker Gingrich and Rep. Goodling voted for the last minimum wage increase to $4.25 an hour in 1989.

Governors across the country are fighting against unfunded mandates. Isn't the minimum wage an unfunded mandate on businesses and states?

The minimum wage is not a new unfunded mandate. In fact, given the erosion of the value of the minimum wage over the last 15 years it is now much less of a mandate on businesses and the public sector than it used to be.

What do you say to all the businesses that say they will lose profit and possibly go bankrupt if the minimum wage is raised? Aren't you just antagonizing the business community by proposing a minimum wage increase?

Inflation has eroded the minimum wage so much that it is currently at its second lowest level since the 1950s. The economy has been very strong, but wages have not grown as much as they need to for the middle class to keep up.

The Clinton Administration has pursued economic policies to put our fiscal house in order, laying the foundation for the current economic expansion. But the problem is that low-wage and middle class workers have not shared fully in this recovery.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. list	re: Minimum wage bill signing attendess [Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (4 pages)	08/00/1996	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Public Liaison
Lee Satterfield
OA/Box Number: 9434

FOLDER TITLE:

Minimum Wage

2016-0531-F
jm1838

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Minimum Wage Bill Signing Attendees

The following people will be attending the Minimum Wage Bill Signing on Wednesday, August 7, 1996 at the Department of Labor:

[001]

1. Angela Jones Arnett
   American Council of Life Insurance
   (b)(6)

2. Deborah Briceland-Betts
   Older Women's League
   (b)(6)

3. Lynn Dudley
   Ass'n of Private Pension and Welfare
   (b)(6)

4. Matthew Fink
   Investment Company Institute
   (b)(6)

5. Cindy Fithian
   National Council of Senior Citizens
   (b)(6)

6. Janice Gregory
   ERISA Industry Committee
   (b)(6)

7. Randolf Hardock
   Davis and Harmon
   (b)(6)

8. Catherine L. Herron
Investment Company Institute
(b)(6)

9. Joanne House
National Breast Cancer Coalition
(b)(6)

10. Jim Kaitz
Financial Executives Institute
(b)(6)

11. Lana M. Keelty
National Rural Electric Coop Assn
(b)(6)

12. James A. Klein
Association of Private Pension and Welfare Plans
(b)(6)

13. Paula Calimafde Mark
Small Business Council of America
(b)(6)

14. Joel Marx
Samll Business Campaign
(b)(6)

15. Cynthia L. Moore
National Council on Teacher Retirement
(b)(6)

16. Alan Patricof
Patricof & Co., Inc.
(b)(6)

17. Steve Protulis
National Council of Senior Citizens
(b)(6)

18. Daniel Schulder
National Council of Senior Citizens
(b)(6)

19. Eric Sklar
Burrito Brothers
(b)(6)

20. Lee Snell
David Vienna & Associates
(b)(6)

21. Mike Stern
Investment Company Institute
(b)(6)

22. Mark Ugoretz
ERISA Industry Committee
(b)(6)

23. Yasmina Vinci
National Association of Child Care Resource and Referal Agencies
(b)(6)

24. David Hildebrandt
Profit Sharing Council of America
(b)(6)

25. Stephen Regenstreif
AFSCME Retirees
(b)(6)

26. Colleen Laura Barry
American Association of Classified School Employees
(b)(6)

27. Frank Stella
American Federation of Teachers Retirees

28. Barbara Malinowski
Senator Edward Kennedy's Office
(b)(6)

29. William Malinowski
Senator Edward Kenndy's Office
(b)(6)