

total, according to Josef Pacyna of the Norwegian Institute of Air Research, as well as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. An enormous amount originates in Asia. More than half of mercury emissions are nationally occurring. Given that statistic, mercury will be present in the human bloodstream regardless of whether powerplants are regulated by a cap and trade emissions reduction program or the more costly but less effective MACT standard—or, for that matter, even if all powerplants and manufacturing facilities in the country were to be shut down altogether.

EPA data shows that eliminating U.S. powerplants from the mercury deposition equation would have virtually no effect on reducing actual deposition. Throughout New England, for example, the range of deposition levels would be unchanged. With or without powerplants, deposition levels are between 10 and 15 micrograms per square meter in the overwhelming majority of the area. Where there is a reduction, the amount is negligible.

These four charts created by the EPA using state-of-the-art computer modeling tell the story. As you can see in chart No. 5, throughout the country mercury deposition from all sources ranges from as low as 5 to 10 micrograms, up to more than 20 micrograms per square meter. The next chart, in contrast, shows that powerplants contribute less than 1 microgram per square meter for most of the country, including virtually the entire United States. Nonetheless, it is true that in most of the East, powerplants are responsible for 1 to 10 micrograms per square meter of the deposition. In a small region of the country, they cause as much as 10 to 20 micrograms. That is why the EPA has issued its regulation.

The next chart, however, is revealing. With the EPA's rule, powerplants will contribute less than 1 microgram in the vast majority of the country and less than 5 micrograms anywhere else. Clearly, the EPA rule is effective. Yet despite the effectiveness of the EPA rule, some are advocating overturning a 70-percent emission reduction in the hopes of eking out a slightly greater reduction of 90 percent.

This last chart, No. 8, completes the story. Even if all powerplants in the country were shut down, mercury deposition would be at least 5 to 10 micrograms; that is, if we shut down all powerplants. All we are addressing now is powerplants, and a lot of people are deceived into thinking that powerplants is where you get your problem with mercury. That is not it. One percent of the total is in powerplants. Even if all powerplants in the country were shut down, mercury deposition would be at least 5 to 10 micrograms. In half the country, it is 10 to 15 micrograms. In a significant portion of the country, it ranges from 15 to more than 20 micrograms.

Look at this chart. Now go back to chart 3. It is incredible that some Sen-

ators are willing to roll back EPA's current rule when deposition from powerplants will be negligible compared to other sources. EPA believes we should act now to reduce emissions of mercury from the powerplants so we can achieve the progress you see in chart No. 7. Repealing the section 111 rule would be a step backward in our efforts to regulate mercury emissions from powerplants. It would create enormous uncertainty for the States. Keep in mind that prior to 6 months ago, when the President came out with a cap and trade restriction on mercury, we had no restriction on mercury in powerplants. It was nonexistent. In the absence of the mercury rule, there will be no Federal regulation of mercury from existing powerplants, at least in the foreseeable future. Repealing EPA's rule would roll back the 70-percent reductions required by the agency and eliminate incentives for the development of new mercury-specific control technologies.

It is not appropriate for Congress to address this issue. The very people who claim that EPA acted improperly have asked the DC Circuit Court of Appeals to review the EPA's action to determine if their actions were proper or improper. The court would thoroughly review the legal and factual basis for the EPA's determination. There is no reason for Congress to interfere with this process. Congress can take affirmative action on mercury emissions by passing the Clear Skies legislation.

We went through this. We have been working for 2 years to get the President's Clear Skies legislation passed. Clear Skies legislation mandates a 70-percent reduction in SO_x, NO_x, and in mercury. And for some reason those individuals who claim to be concerned about the environment would rather have no mandated reduction at all. We have the opportunity now to do that. Clear Skies cuts mercury emissions from the power section by 70 percent. The President's Clear Skies legislation is a more effective, long-term mechanism to achieve large scale national reductions of not only mercury but sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Clear Skies legislation applies nationwide and is modeled on the highly successful acid rain program, a program many people have said was not going to work, was not going to be effective. Yet we all now realize it was effective.

We are not talking about just mercury. We are talking about sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide. I believe it would be totally irresponsible to somehow roll back the first attempt that we have to regulate mercury in powerplants. Keep in mind, prior to 6 months ago, it was not regulated at all. That is what this is all about.

Tonight is a vote on the motion to proceed. I don't care about the motion to proceed. Let's go ahead and vote in favor of that. Tomorrow is the main vote. That is a significant vote. I think we need to proceed to that vote tomorrow.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, morning business is closed.

DISAPPROVING A RULE PROMULGATED BY THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a vote on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 20 which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 20) disapproving a rule promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to delist coal and oil-direct utility units from the source category list under the Clean Air Act.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALENT). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Akaka	Bunning	Cornyn
Alexander	Burr	Corzine
Allard	Byrd	Craig
Allen	Cantwell	Crapo
Baucus	Carper	Dayton
Bayh	Chafee	DeWine
Bennett	Clinton	Dodd
Biden	Coburn	Dole
Bingaman	Cochran	Domenici
Bond	Coleman	Dorgan
Boxer	Collins	Durbin
Brownback	Conrad	Ensign

Enzi	Lautenberg	Santorum
Feingold	Leahy	Sarbanes
Feinstein	Levin	Schumer
Frist	Lieberman	Sessions
Graham	Lincoln	Shelby
Grassley	Lott	Smith
Gregg	Lugar	Snowe
Hagel	McCain	Specter
Harkin	McConnell	Stabenow
Hatch	Mikulski	Stevens
Hutchison	Murkowski	Sununu
Inhofe	Murray	Talent
Isakson	Nelson (FL)	Thomas
Jeffords	Nelson (NE)	Thune
Johnson	Obama	Vitter
Kennedy	Pryor	Voivovich
Kohl	Reed	Warner
Kyl	Reid	Wyden
Landrieu	Salazar	

NOT VOTING—8

Burns	Inouye	Roberts
Chambliss	Kerry	Rockefeller
DeMint	Martinez	

The motion was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business.

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

CLEAN AIR MERCURY RULE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise this evening to express opposition to the resolution that we are going to be voting on tomorrow morning. First, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to explain that to be effective the resolution must be passed by the Senate and the House and signed by the President. While the act provides for expedited and privileged procedures in the Senate, there are not such rules in the House. I have every reason to believe this resolution will not be considered by the House, and even if it is considered by the House and passed, the President has announced today that he would veto this legislation. So it is clear where this is going.

What are we talking about? On March 15 of this year, EPA finalized the clean air mercury rule and made the United States the first nation in the world to regulate mercury emissions from existing coal-fired powerplants. That is the first in the world. We know we have coal-fired powerplants all over the world—China, India, all over. Through two phases in a program called cap and trade, mercury emissions will be reduced by 70 percent. The program is modeled after the Nation's most successful clean air program, the Acid Rain Program. There were not any lawsuits filed, and it went through and made a big difference in terms of reducing acid rain.

Modeling by the Electric Power Research Institute, an independent non-profit research organization, shows that the rule is going to reduce mercury in every State. This is quite amazing given the nature of mercury.

Let us talk about mercury and where it comes from because the debate ear-

lier this evening gave the impression that all of the mercury that people are experiencing today in the United States comes from the United States. Not so. Mercury travels hundreds and thousands of miles. About 55 percent of worldwide mercury emissions come from natural sources such as oceans and volcanoes. So it is already in the environment. Only 1 percent of worldwide emissions come from U.S. powerplants, which is what we are talking about today.

From 1990 to 1999, the Environmental Protection Agency estimates that U.S. emissions of mercury were reduced by nearly half. So we have been doing some real good, and that has been completely offset by increases in emissions from Asia.

As many of my colleagues know, throughout my career I have focused a lot of my time and energy on the Great Lakes. In a report published after a workshop sponsored by the International Air Quality Advisory Board of the International Joint Commission—the International Joint Commission is made up of U.S. and Canadian representatives and the Commission for Environmental Cooperation—I learned that as much as 45 percent of the mercury disposition in the Great Lakes is believed to come from Asia.

We have had some discussion today about mercury control technology. I would like to share with my colleagues that the testing performed by the Department of Energy, EPA, and the electric utility industry has demonstrated that existing control equipment for sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, and particulate matter can reduce mercury emissions by approximately 40 percent. In other words, if we do a better job of reducing NO_x and SO_x, we will have a real impact on the reduction of mercury in the United States.

According to the DOE's national environmental technology laboratory, the ability of these existing pollution controls to reduce mercury can vary from zero levels approaching 90 percent. In fact, some combinations of control technologies for reasons unexplained show an increase in mercury emissions.

So the status of the technology is really fuzzy. If mercury technology is so settled, as my colleagues would lead many to believe, then why is the Department of Energy supporting 36 mercury control projects located in 12 States—California, Washington, Alabama, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, West Virginia, Colorado, North Dakota, North Carolina, and Iowa.

Additionally, Green Wire published an article, by the way, that was referenced by the Senator from Delaware, where the first sentence reads: A leading technology for removing mercury from the coal combustion process will be fully applied for the first time to a commercial scale powerplant. So this is proven technology of one or two out of more than a thousand coal-fired units are going to install it.

In other words, we have a couple of plants that they are talking about doing something in terms of this mercury technology. The vendor that is going to install this technology on two plants in the Midwest has said their target is 80 percent.

Those who are promoting the resolution want a 90-percent reduction within 3 years. Now, here is somebody who is out there in front on technology, and they are talking about their target being 80 percent. The President's regulation, EPA regulation, is a reduction of 70 percent.

So let us look at this. Two plants out of more than 1,000 coal-fired plants. I am not sure that one could argue with a straight face that the technology is out there to do what the sponsors of this resolution would say that they could do.

According to the DOE, currently no single technology exists that can uniformly control mercury from all powerplant gas emissions. For that reason, the EPA concluded that mercury-specific control technologies are not yet commercially available and does not believe widely applicable technologies can be developed and broadly applied over the next 5 years.

The sponsors of this resolution, as I mentioned, are for something called the Maximum Available Control Technology. They want a 90-percent reduction in 3 to 4 years. First of all, the technology is not there, but let's say what would happen if it were there. EPA's cap-and-trade program, the one that is reflected in the regulation that EPA promoted on mercury, is going to cost \$2 billion, while the regulation of the sponsors of this regulation would cost \$358 billion. That is not million; we are talking about \$2 billion versus \$358 billion.

Utilities will be forced to increase their use of natural gas by almost 30 percent because natural gas is the only means available at the present time to achieve significant mercury reductions within such a short timeframe. Natural gas prices will increase by over 20 percent. National average electricity prices will increase by 20 percent. Some regions of the United States, especially those that rely on coal, are projected to experience electricity price increases as much as 45 percent.

I have to say that I come from the State of Ohio. I live in Cleveland, OH. We have seen our natural gas prices increase almost 100 percent since 2001. In fact, I believe that is when the recession started in my State. This is impacting dramatically on those people who are the least able to pay. It is impacting dramatically on the businesses in my State and, frankly, throughout the United States of America. I suspect it is also impacting on those people in the Northeastern part of the United States, the home of many of those who are sponsoring this resolution to overturn the EPA rule on mercury.

Let's talk about natural gas prices. According to the independent Energy