trucks, carrying the Nation's commerce, our children, schoolbuses, and parents trying to get home for dinner. Thousands of communities across the country are simply keeping their fingers crossed, hoping their current bridge will last another year.

Let me provide one more example in terms of what is happening with regard to the overregulation of our economy. This involves one of the most important sectors of the U.S. economy—small community banks. Over 1,300 small community banks have disappeared since 2010, and only 2 new banks in the United States have been chartered in the last 5 years. If you ask any small community banker what is driving this, they will point to this chart. Regulations from Washington, DC, are driving our small community banks out of existence. Even during the Great Depression, we had on average 19 new banks a year. In the last 5 years, the United States has seen two new banks open. This is not talking about one-out, one-in. It is not saying one-in, one-out. This has freed up hundreds of thousands of hours of paperwork for small businesses in particular. Even the Canadian
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Socialists have backed this idea. I certainly hope Senator SANDERS is listening, and I hope I can get him and other Members of this body to support this amendment.

To be clear, I am certainly not against all regulations or permitting requirements. When I served as the commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources in Alaska, we worked with our bipartisan legislature to overhaul our permitting and regulatory system and to bring what we have on the Government side—a huge backlog of permits—to get projects moving. We brought that backlog down by over 50 percent through regulatory and permitting reform, and we did so with the absolute understanding that protecting our environment and keeping our citizens safe was a fundamental precondition to any of our actions. But we can do both. We can bring down this huge burden and still make sure we have a clean environment and a strong, healthy economy.

There are simply too many Federal regulations out there, and the American people know it. It is time this body stops increasing this number of regulations and puts a cap on it. Finally, if we do this, we will make sure that all of the comparative advantages we have in this country—so many that we have over so many other countries—will enable us to unleash the might of the U.S. economy, create better jobs, and create a brighter future for our children and their children.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE DEBATE

Mr. Sasse. Mr. President, one of the fundamental purposes of this body is to debate some of the biggest issues facing this Nation and to do so in an honorable way. We do it by working on an amendment that tries to find a regulatory fix to regulations that was one-in, one-out. In Great Britain they have done this to the point where it is viewed as so successful that they are not talking about one-in, one-out anymore. They are talking about maybe one-in, two-out. I think this is an idea that both parties of the Senate, Members from both sides of the aisle, can get behind.

Even National Public Radio did a recent story about how well this one-in, one-out rule is working in Canada. It has freed up hundreds of thousands of hours of paperwork for small businesses in particular. Even the Canadian
hold—and values rather than resents those who help them on that journey.

The purpose of debating, then, isn't so much just to win an argument as it is to deepen our understanding of how things really and truly are. It isn't to out-about an opponent but, at least now and then, to listen to them, to weight their arguments with care, to learn from them. It's worth noting that Lewis warned about simply surrounding ourselves with like-minded people who reinforce our own biases and how debates conducted properly “helped to civilize one another.”

What a quintessential argument.

In saying all this, I'm not insisting that everyone you disagree with is someone you can learn from, nor that everyone's views contain an equal measure of wisdom. Some people really don't know what they're talking about. Some people really do hold malicious and false views, and some people really do deserve harsh criticisms.

My point is simply that because the pull is so strong the other way—most of us use debates as a way to amplify pre-existing views rather than refine them; try to crush opponents rather than engage and understand them; and we do so weakly rather than the strongest arguments found in opposing views—the Moynihan-Lewis model is a good one to strive for.

Wehner concludes:

I understand that talking about such things can sound hopelessly high-minded and, for some, signal a mushy lack of conviction. When you're in a political death match with the other side, after all, the idea of learning from it seems either ridiculously naive or slightly treasonous. But of course, this reaction highlights just how much things have gone off track.

To be sure, American politics has always been a raucous affair. As Madison put it in Federalist #55, “Had every Athenian citizen been as wise, as virtuous, and as truly sound in all that respect as Mr. Justice Story, the American revolution nevertheless would still have been a mob.” The question is whether one stokes the passions of the mob or appeals to reason.

As someone who doesn't do nearly well enough in this regard, I rather admire the Lewis model. He was a better man, and Miracles was a better book, for having recognized the debate with Ms. Anscombe. For Lewis to then promote her despite having been bested by her was doubly impressive. For Lewis he lost his debate with Ms. Anscombe. For Lewis to then promote her despite having been bested by her was doubly impressive. For Lewis he lost his debate with Ms. Anscombe. I understand that talking about such arguments than winning them.

After all, Lewis was a man who cared more about learning and even to learn from them. It's worth noting that Lewis warned about simply surrounding ourselves with like-minded people who reinforce our own biases and how debates conducted properly “helped to civilize one another.”

I think we pretty much agree—most of us, anyway would still have been a mob. The question is whether one stokes the passions of the mob or appeals to reason.

Wehner continues:

Again, this was Pete Wehner, Commentary Magazine, with some instructive words for all of us laboring here in this body.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have introduced legislation on this subject. It is a bill that I have titled the “American Mineral Security Act.” What we have done within the energy bill is take much of that legislation and include it as part of a subtitle on critical minerals. Maybe it is because I enjoyed it, but I feel pretty strongly that this is a pretty good version. This is a pretty good title that is contained in the EPMA, and I think that passage of not only the critical minerals piece as part of the EPMA but also our economic security, energy security, and our national security. It is just the right thing for us to be doing.

We take for granted that our minerals and metals that we have available to us are going to continue to be available. Unfortunately, most of us do not really pay attention to the fact that so many of the things that we rely on for so much of what we need in our every day lives and come from just do not think about it. We assume that stuff just gets here. We do not think about where it comes from. We should not ever take for granted our mineral security. We should not ever take for granted that it is that we need.

People talk about rare earth elements, rare earth minerals. When we think “rare,” what is “rare”? What exactly does that mean? Why do we need them? What do we use them in? Rare earth elements make many aspects of our modern life possible.

We talk a lot about how we are going to move to more renewable energy sources. You are going to need rare earth elements for wind turbines. You are going to need it for your solar panels. You are going to need it for your rechargeable batteries. You are going to need it for your hard drives, your smartphones, and the screens on your computer. You are going to need it for your digital cameras, for your defense applications, for audio amplification.

That is just what we put on this particular chart.

It is important to recognize that so much of what allows us to do the good things that we do—to communicate, to help defend, to help power our country—comes to us because we have access to certain minerals.

According to the National Research Council, more than 25,000 pounds of new minerals are needed per person per year in the United States to make the items that we use for basic human needs, infrastructure, energy, transportation, communication, and defense. You might say: Whoa, 25,000 pounds per person per year—I cannot possibly need all that stuff.

But, Mr. President, you and I fly back and forth to Alaska. Those airplanes we fly on need these minerals. Every one of these young people, as well as us sitting in here, all have a smartphone or some way we are communicating, and we all need this. All of the staff who are working on their computers need that screen to look at, and we all need this.

When you think about it, it is like OK, maybe that number is right. Bill Gates put it quite memorably last year. He wrote a blog post entitled: “Have You Hugged a Concrete Pillar Today?” It is really a very interesting read, and it reminds us that you take for granted the things that we need, the things that we use on a daily basis, the things that are under our feet as we are walking here to work.

Minerals are really the foundation of our modern society. Our access to them enables a range of products and technologies that greatly add to our quality of life. Yet many of the