

We have an opportunity—we will have—to try to do something, hopefully, about an increase in the minimum wage. If it were here before the Senate, there is a majority of the Members of the Senate who support an increase in the minimum wage. But we are not given that opportunity. We are not given that opportunity to just vote on that issue and then vote separately in terms of the increase in the estate tax. No, no; we are not given the opportunity to do that. Republicans say you have to take both or you don't get an increase in the minimum wage.

That is a contemptuous attitude—not toward those of us who are for the increase but for those workers, men and women of dignity. They work hard, work long, work in our schools, work to look after our senior citizens, work to clean the great buildings of American commerce—men and women of dignity, and you are saying they can't have what ought to be a right in the richest country of this world: If you work hard and play by the rules, you and your family should not live in poverty.

Oh, no. They say: No, you have it wrong over there for an increase in the minimum wage, unless we are going to provide another tax benefit for the most wealthy individuals in the country—then you can have an increase. That is a contemptuous attitude.

Beyond that, what this proposal contains is an ingenious proposal, suggested by the restaurant association. They say: People who work for tips in the restaurants, they often make \$5.25 an hour. They often make that in tips. So why are we required to pay them? They were able to persuade Republicans—this is strictly a Republican proposal—to say: If they are going to receive tips, you are only required to pay \$2.13 an hour. The rest can be made up in tips. That person still effectively gets the minimum wage. But the restaurant doesn't have to pay that. Do you hear me? They don't have to pay the worker the \$5.15 an hour.

A number of States said that is not fair; that is not really fair. We have, now, seven States that say to the restaurants: You have to pay the full tally. It says minimum wage of \$5.15 an hour, you have to pay the \$5.15 an hour. The States have said it. Seven States have said that. About 30 States have done somewhat in between, but seven States have said: You have to pay the whole thing.

The Congress has said an increase in the minimum wage—a tip is a tip. That goes with the territory. I wonder how many Americans, when they go into the restaurant and they are thinking about being served, try to figure out—I wonder, should I give this person \$1 or \$2 because they really are only getting \$2.13 an hour paid by the restaurant. Of course they don't. If the service is good they give them something to show their appreciation for it.

What have our Republican friends said? We don't like the fact that States

have made that judgment, that decision. We know more than the seven States that said you have to pay the full fare. We in the Senate of the United States are saying you don't know what is necessary in your State, about paying an adequate sum to those workers. So we, the Congress, are going to tell you, the State, and tell your workers, that we, the Republicans in the Senate and the House of Representatives, are going to say we are going to tell you that you only can pay \$2.13.

I hope we don't hear any more about the one big solution to all of the problems back home. How many times do we listen to a large solution, a single solution for all the problems back home? How many times do we hear: Let the States make a judgment and decision in order to protect their workers?

Here the States have made a judgment, here the States have made a decision, and the Republican Party says: We know better. We know better. We know how to save our constituency a little more money, for them, and a little less for the workers. A wonderful, Republican, ingenious concept tied on to this proposal.

At another time, and we will have more time, we will have a chance to get into this in greater detail. I will just conclude.

I note, as I gave the figures about the number of families who are living in poverty, and also the number of children in poverty, there has been a different story in one of our neighboring countries. The second strongest economy in Europe is England. No. 1 is Germany, No. 2 is England. Their minimum wage is going to nearly \$10 in October—\$9.83. They have increased it now over the last 5 years. Do you want to know something? They have taken 1.8 million children out of poverty with their increase. And they have a strong economy and a more fair economy.

But not here. Nine years, eight pay increases for Members of the Senate over 9 years, and we have not been willing to give an increase in the minimum wage. No, if you want that increase, you vote to give the wealthiest individuals another bouquet, another bouquet. How contemptuous can it be?

At another time later in this debate—I know we have limited time. There are others who want to speak on the underlying bill. I look forward to addressing the Senate in greater detail on this issue and also on the pension issue, which is going to be extremely important.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

SERVICES FOR ENDING LONG-TERM HOMELESSNESS ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions—HELP—Committee, I rise to express my support for the Services for Ending Long-Term Homelessness Act, S. 709, as introduced by Senator MIKE DEWINE.

Many low-income housing advocates in Utah have asked me to cosponsor this important legislation because it establishes a grant program, run by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, SAMHSA, for services to end chronic homelessness. In Utah alone, there are approximately 1,900 chronically homeless individuals whose lives are in a constant state of peril because they are repeatedly homeless for long periods of time. They usually have one or more disabilities, and often cycle between homeless shelters, the streets, mental health facilities, emergency rooms, hospitals, and jails. The public cost for their continued care is extremely high, and their medical outcomes are generally very poor.

I believe that ending chronic homelessness requires housing with supportive services, and policies which prevent high-risk individuals from returning to the streets. Based on several estimates, including an estimate published in the President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health Report, it will take approximately 150,000 units of supportive housing and over 10 years to end long-term homelessness. S. 709 would authorize funding for a flexible array of services in permanent supportive housing, focused on helping people move toward recovery and self sufficiency.

Although I support the bill and its intent, I am very concerned about its cost. Throughout my Senate career, I have fought hard for fiscal discipline. Although the cost of the bill has not been estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, everyone agrees that the issues and associated costs are complex.

S. 709 provides accountability, has mechanisms for controlling costs, and mechanisms for maximizing cost savings. For example, the bill prioritizes accountability and cost control through a required competitive process. In an effort to save on overall public spending, the bill gives priority to applicants who serve individuals who have proven to be more expensive to the public health system and to law enforcement. Additionally, S. 709 requires that the grantee match the Federal funds received, and the match requirement increases over time. It is important to note that the amount of funding an applicant receives cannot rise above the rate of inflation. Finally, the bill ensures accountability by requiring grantees to report on their performance. This effort is to ensure that chronic homelessness is being reduced, thus reducing costly mental health and substance abuse problems, and increasing education and employment.

Mr. President, I support strongly the goals of this bill and I believe our continued economic expansion and improving Federal budget will enable us to fully implement the objectives of this bill and end homelessness in this country forever.