

are committed daily in Cuba, and to reaffirm unconditional support for the Cuban people who seek to break free from the shackles of the Castro tyranny.

THE PRICE OF WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the American people to consider the price of the Afghan war, not only its unsustainable financial toll, but also the psychological cost to those on the front lines as well as those here at home, because this war, fought on the ground by a tiny percentage of Americans and largely ignored by the greater majority of us, nonetheless, has had powerful effects on each one of us.

In the past 3 months, there have been several high-profile incidents in Afghanistan that have forced us to reflect on the mental state of the men and women who put their lives on the line every day in Afghanistan.

In January, four soldiers in combat gear urinated on three bloodied corpses. In February, American soldiers burned copies of the Koran, which triggered 6 days of riots across Afghanistan. And this month, a soldier went on a murderous rampage in Kandahar province, killing 16 Afghans, including nine children. These events have shocked us, but they remain remote to most of us.

I want to talk today about what this war has done to our national psyche, that is, our sense of connectedness to one another and our sense of mutual obligation to this country.

The war in Afghanistan is being fought primarily by a small group from the Army and Marine Corps who serve multiple tours because we do not have adequate replacements for them. This has allowed most of us to disengage ourselves from the terror, the suffering and despair endured by those who are sent to war. Retired General Robert Scales wrote in the Washington Post last week: "We are fighting too many wars with too few soldiers." He's right.

More than 100,000 of our soldiers have been deployed three or more times since 9/11. Many of them are overused, exhausted, demoralized, and unprepared to come home to a country that has little personal investment in the war and does not fully understand its objectives. Is it fair or reasonable to send these courageous citizens to war four, five, and six times?

I was a doctor who treated combat soldiers returning from Vietnam, and I know that no one escapes multiple tours of combat duty without trauma. There have been almost 100,000 new cases of PTSD among our servicemembers since 9/11. The military suicide rate in some months has been higher than the casualty rate. We are wrong

to subject such a small group—fewer than one-half of 1 percent of all Americans—to such a disproportionate share of the consequences of war.

I felt this way in 2007 when I supported fellow veteran Charlie Rangel's bill, declaring it an obligation of every American citizen between the ages of 18 and 42 to perform a 2-year period of national service either as a member of the national forces or in civilian capacity that promotes national defense in times of war. Several weeks ago, my constituent, Sergeant William Stacey, became the 399th resident from Washington State to be killed since the war on terror began following 9/11. In his letter, which soldiers write in case they die, Sergeant Stacey wrote:

My death did not change the world, but there is a greater meaning to it. There will be a child who will live because men left the security they enjoyed in their home country to come to his.

□ 1010

If more Americans sacrificed their time and energy toward our country's ideals, perhaps Sergeant Stacey's dream of a more peaceful Afghanistan could become a reality.

As the overwhelming majority of the Nation stands by while 23-year olds die in a distant war zone, our national psyche has been frayed, and our shared identity is diminished. We have become immune, immune to the traumas of war, and we have lost our sense of common purpose.

In the Vietnam War, when everybody served, you had no immunity because everybody knew somebody, but now it's not that way. We must face the true cost of war on not only our soldiers, but ourselves and our ideals.

USING USA ENERGY TO MEET OUR NEEDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when GenOn announced it would close its coal-fired power plant in Elrama, in my district in southwestern Pennsylvania, my community didn't just lose the 50 remaining jobs; it also lost a vital component to economic growth: affordable energy.

We should be cleaning up, not shutting down these power plants, but new regulations aimed squarely at coal, oil, and natural gas are making it harder for families to get by, for manufacturers to prosper, and making it more difficult for our country to become energy independent.

The Elrama plant is one of 57 nationwide slated to close because of a multitude of costly and unworkable EPA rules set to take effect over the next 5 years. Already utilities are preparing to retire almost 10 percent of coal power in the country. That's 25 megawatts of energy that supports 18.8 million homes.

That lost capacity, which is five times greater than what the EPA predicted it would be, is why the North American Electric Reliability Corporation is warning of blackouts and service disruptions.

The EPA's new coal regulations will cost the economy \$184 billion and 1.4 million jobs in mining, transportation, manufacturing, and power generation. Of course, the expense will be passed along to consumers. Families in my State could see about \$400 more a year in their electric bills.

And it begs the question, is the President trying to make good on his promise to bankrupt utilities that use coal?

These new costs would come at a time when higher oil prices already mean families are paying \$2,400 more per year for gasoline than they were just 3 years ago. And if gasoline approaches \$5 a gallon, the average family will pay over \$3,000 more per year. That's a couple of months worth of groceries, or college loans, or payments on a new car.

Unfortunately, instead of increasing oil supplies to bring down prices, domestic oil production on Federal lands has fallen 13 percent in the last year. The President said we have only 2 percent of the world's proven reserves, conveniently overlooking the technically recoverable oil that is under lock and key in the gulf and the shale oil States. We have more oil reserves—800 billion barrels—than Saudi Arabia.

By the way, that means for a family that makes less than \$10,000 a year, they'll be spending 81 percent of their income on energy. For a family that makes between \$10,000 and \$30,000 a year, they'll be spending 24 percent of their income on energy.

And for every dollar of gasoline, 76 cents is tied up in crude oil. To bring down the price of gas, we don't need higher taxes on oil companies or penalties on speculators. What we need to do is send signals to the world that the United States is serious about using North American energy. We can start with building the Keystone pipeline.

Now, many of my colleagues argue that we can count on plentiful natural gas to replace the demand for coal and oil. But while deposits are being unlocked from the Marcellus shale and the Utica shales with new fracturing technologies, natural gas is also threatened with costly overregulation. Eight different Federal agencies are there to stop it. The EPA, the Departments of the Interior, Energy, Transportation, and Agriculture, the Centers for Disease Control, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Securities and Exchange Commission are all working on new regulatory burdens.

One national energy organization predicts an EPA natural gas regulation for well sites specifically written to combat "global warming" will cut shale gas drilling by between 31 and 52 percent. That means higher energy bills to heat our homes.

With our know-how and resources in coal, natural gas and nuclear, America