The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LANDMINE SCOURGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have spoken several times in the past few weeks—and I have spoken many times in the past 20 years—about the scourge of landmines.

They are inherently indiscriminate weapons. They are triggered by the victim, and usually the victim is an innocent civilian who is either killed or horribly maimed.

The United States has not exported, produced, or used antipersonnel mines for more than 20 years. But notwithstanding that—even though 161 nations have joined the international treaty banning them—one nation stands out for not having joined the treaty. That is the United States, and it is a shame on this country.

As the world's only superpower with by far the most powerful military, one would have thought the United States would set an example of moral leadership. Instead, we are among those who are preventing the universality of the treaty.

This is doubly disappointing, considering that it was President Clinton who, 20 years ago, called for the elimination of antipersonnel mines. Two years later, in 1996—back in the last century—he said: ''Today I am launching an international effort to ban antipersonnel landmines.'' But his administration did not sign the treaty.

Then we had the Bush administration. They did nothing on the issue.

Now we have the Obama administration. Nothing has changed. The Obama administration is following the Bush administration's policy of doing nothing. So we are still waiting.

Last week I was in Vietnam, along with Senators SHELBY and CRAPO and Representatives COOPER from Tennessee and WELCH from Vermont. We had conversations with President Sang, with the Minister of Defense, and other Vietnamese officials. But we also met with nongovernmental organizations—many of them Americans—that work to locate and clear landmines and other unexploded ordnance.

It is costly, dangerous work. They have been doing it for decades. At the current rate, when you consider that millions of landmines and bombs were dropped in Vietnam during the war, it is estimated that it will take another 100 years before it is safe to walk in that country without fear of triggering a deadly explosion.

I have met countless people in Vietnam who have been crippled and disfigured by landmines. Many of them are children the age of my grandchildren. Here is a photograph of two Vietnamese men I met last week. You can see what landmines do. My wife Marcelle and I were deeply touched when we spoke with them. After all the pain and hardship they have suffered, they were thanking us for helping to get them wheelchairs.

Their lives have been changed terribly forever, yet they are lucky because they survived. They lost their legs, their arms, but thankfully they are not among the tens of thousands who died from landmines during that war and in the decades since the war ended.

In Vietnam, we have used the Leahy War Victims Fund to provide medical care and rehabilitation to thousands of mine victims.

As a Democrat, I want to compliment a Republican President, George H.W. Bush, who worked with me and with the inspired founder of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, Bobby Muller, to start using the Leahy War Victims Fund in Vietnam.

We have spent many millions of dollars to help get rid of the mines. As I said earlier, 40 years after the war, there are still vast areas of Vietnam littered with unexploded mines and bombs.

Yet Vietnam is only one of dozens of countries whose people have been terrorized by landmines—some from our country, some from others.

When you talk to the Department of Defense about this, they say their mines are ''smart'' because they are designed to deactivate after a finite period of time. Of course, that is better than mines that remain active for years. But if a child steps on one before the time they are deactivated, that child does not know whether this is a smart mine or a dumb mine because as long as they are active, they are no better at distinguishing between a child and a soldier.

I remember the young woman I met in a hospital after the Bosnia war. She was sent away by her parents to be safe during that conflict. But when the war ended she was running down the road to greet her parents and had both legs blown off. The war was over, but it never ended for her.

I have never argued that mines have no military utility. Every weapon does. So does poison gas, so do IEDs. But we would not use them, and we consider it immoral for other people to use them. They are the antithesis of a precision weapon. They do not belong in the arsenal of civilized countries, least of all in the United States. The United States ought to have courage enough to sign the landmine treaty.

You have to wonder, if Pennsylvania or Oklahoma or Utah or Georgia or Vermont or New Jersey or any of our 50 States were littered with landmines, killing and maiming innocent Americans, would we tolerate it? Of course not. We would not make excuses about needing to use these weapons. The outcry would be deafening and the United States would join the treaty, as we should have 15 years ago.

Some might ask why this matters. The United States has not used mines for two decades, even while we fought two long land wars. That is because the political price of using them—particularly in Afghanistan where more innocent civilians have been killed or injured from landmines than perhaps anywhere else—would have been prohibitive.

It matters because, like any other issue, even when the United States is not part of the problem, we have to be part of the solution. We ought to set an example on this. We ought to be strong enough to do what 161 other countries have done and join the treaty.

I have spoken to President Obama about this. I know he shares my concern about the toll of innocent lives from landmines. As a Senator, he cosponsored my legislation. So did Secretary Hagel.

This is an unfinished job. It began with President Clinton. It is time to put the United States on a path to join the treaty. Only the Commander in Chief can do that. The world cries out to him to show that kind of moral leadership.

EGYPT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, events in Egypt continue to concern people of good will in this country and across the globe, who have shared the Egyptian people's yearning for greater freedom under the rule of law.

I am the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that funds the State Department and foreign operations.

But even if I were not chairman of that subcommittee, I would have been watching the situation in Egypt with great interest and growing dismay, where hundreds of people are sentenced to death after a sham trial lasting barely an hour. It is appalling to see this flouting of human rights and abuse of the justice system, which are fundamental to any democracy. Nobody—nobody—can justify this. It does not show a commitment to democracy. It shows a dictatorship run amok. It is an egregious violation of human rights.

So I am not prepared to sign off on the delivery of additional aid for the Egyptian military. I am not prepared to do that until we see convincing evidence the government is committed to the rule of law.

We cannot stand here and say: We are troubled by hundreds of people being sentenced to death after a few minutes in a mass trial, but since we have been friends for so long we will go ahead and send you hundreds of millions of dollars in aid. No.

I do not think the taxpayers of this country would condone that, and neither do I.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CRABTREE NOMINATION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few moments on the Senate floor. We are working our way through a number of confirmations relating to Federal district judges across the country. One of them is the potential Federal district judge for my State of Kansas. I rise to speak in support of one of those individuals who will be considered by the Senate this week, Daniel Crabtree. He was nominated by the President to be a U.S. district court judge for the District of Kansas.

I want to attest to my colleagues my view that he is a gentleman who should be confirmed by the Senate. He was reported out of the Judiciary Committee without opposition and is rated unanimously ''well qualified'' by the American Bar Association, which, in part, confirms my view that he would make an outstanding Federal judge.

I actually have known this individual for more than 30 years, dating back to our days at the University of Kansas School of Law, where he was 1 year ahead of me in law school. I have followed his personal and professional development since that time. We have remained acquainted, we have been friends, and for a short period of time we practiced law at the same firm in downtown Kansas City. He is worthy of our support today, but he is also someone who has my respect and admiration.

After graduating from the University of Kansas School of Law, Dan Crabtree became an associate and ultimately became a partner at the downtown Kansas City law firm then called Stinson, Mag & Fizzell. He became a partner in 1988. The firm merged into a firm called Stinson Morrison Hecker in 2002.

He is a litigator with extensive experience in the Federal and State courts, and he received recognition by the publication ''Best Lawyers'' in Kansas City as the Antitrust Lawyer of the Year in 2013. In 2014 he was the Kansas City Banking and Finance Litigation Lawyer of the Year. Again, this is outside confirmation of his qualifications and capabilities.

Dan is a lifelong resident of our State. He grew up in Kansas City, KS, the suburbs of Kansas City, MO, on the Kansas side of the line. He and his wife Maureen and their teenager daughter continue to live in Kansas City, KS, today.

I have often spoken on the Senate floor about the special way of life we have in our State, and Dan Crabtree, in his hometown of Kansas City, KS, exemplifies what I so often admire, respect, and speak of on the Senate floor about his humility, his devotion to others, his relationship with his community, and how important it is to him to be an active member in trying to make life better for other people, those who are his neighbors and those who surround him in Kansas City and Kansas, our State. He has those characteristics of a Kansan.

I have often known people who have been very successful in their professional lives, who have succeeded, for example, in law school, gone on to a large prestigious firm, and in many instances it seems as if they forgot where they came from. Dan continues to live in his hometown and continues to work to make certain that good things happen in that community. He does that with a great sense of humility. While he has the attributes that could cause him to be superior in his attitude toward others, Dan is humble, caring, and compassionate. His pride in where he comes from is evidenced by a devotion to many community activities—the Community Foundation of Wyandotte County and the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation. He sits on the board of directors for the Kansas City Sports Commission, and he is responsible in part for bringing 14 NCAA championships to Kansas City over the past few years.

All of this encompasses who Dan is. He is a husband, a father, a lawyer, and a community leader. He is exemplary in fulfilling each of those roles. Mostly, I want to say that his character, integrity, and professional achievements are worthy of being a member of the Federal bench. In fact, I can think of few others whom I have met in my time as a Senator but also my time as a practicing attorney in Kansas City who would fulfill the solemn duties of this position better than Dan Crabtree.

I thank the President for nominating Dan Crabtree, and I ask my colleagues to join me in swiftly confirming him as a judge for the U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

## THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. THUNE. I come to the floor to discuss the proposed minimum wage hike and the jobs it will cost Americans.

With more than 10 million Americans unemployed, the last thing this body should be doing is considering legislation that would jeopardize jobs. Yet this week we are back in session with another one of the Democrats' election-year gimmicks: a 40-percent minimum wage hike that the Congressional Budget Office estimates would result in a loss of up to 1 million jobs in this country.

Minimum wage hikes are a favorite Democratic proposal when economic times are tough and election-year prospects are dim. Hiking wages sounds good, after all, and Democrats figure it is a sure-fire way to appeal to Americans. But the truth is that when the consequences of a minimum wage hike are explained to them, Americans don't want it. Why is that? Because Americans want jobs. A minimum wage hike during such a weak economic recovery wouldn't result in job gains; it would result in job losses. It is simple: When you make something more expensive, people can afford less of it. When you drive up the cost of hiring workers, employers can't afford to hire as many of them, especially when you consider that many of those who employ minimum wage workers are small business owners.

Democrats are proposing a 40-percent hike in an economy in which unemployment is already high and job growth is already weak—in other words, a massive minimum wage hike under the worst possible conditions.

It should surprise no one that the Congressional Budget Office has estimated this hike could cost up to 1 million jobs. Who would be hurt by most by these lost jobs? Women, for one. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that 57 percent of the roughly half a million jobs that would be lost by the end of 2016 thanks to this bill would be jobs that are held by women. Young people would also be hit particularly hard. Our economy's overall unemployment rate is not good, but the unemployment rate for 16- to 24-year-olds is even worse—more than twice the national average. The unemployment rate for African Americans between 16 and 24 is still worse than that—a staggering 23.6 percent, almost four times the national average.

Duquesne University economist Antony Davies estimates that the Democrats' proposed minimum wage increase would hike unemployment for those under 25 years old without a high school diploma by 7 to 10 percent. If you are somebody who really needs a job—people under 25 years old without a diploma—the unemployment rate, which is already staggeringly high, could go up by 7 to 10 percent according to a Duquesne University economist.

Finally, the Democrats' proposed minimum wage hike would harm the lowest income and lowest skilled workers—in other words, the very people it is supposed to help. When businesses are faced with the reality of higher employment costs from a minimum wage hike, who are they going to let go? Low skilled workers, the same workers who are most likely to be making the minimum wage.

In a March 2014 survey of businesses currently employing minimum wage workers, 38 percent reported they would have to let some employees go to cover the cost of the minimum wage hike, while 54 percent reported they would reduce their hiring.

In South Dakota small business owners told me the same thing at a recent roundtable I held in my State. Multiple Main Street business owners told me they would stop hiring younger, less experienced workers and/or reduce the hours of their current employees. Others spoke of the devastating impact the