

increases are conclusive. This overrides the very salient and far more equivocal discussion which follows, leaving readers with the mistaken impression that climate change is a boon to U.S. agriculture and forestry. A summary statement which more accurately reflects the content of the technical discussions should be composed to lead each section.

EMISSIONS FROM THE COMBUSTION OF DIFFERENT FUELS VS. EMISSIONS FROM DIFFERENT MOBILE SOURCE CATEGORIES

Mobile source CO<sub>2</sub> is formed by burning fossil fuels. Virtually all of the carbon in the fuel is converted to CO<sub>2</sub>. Therefore, and considering that CO<sub>2</sub> remains in the atmosphere for a long time, national aggregate consumption of different types of fuels provides the most accurate basis for estimating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. IPCC guidelines for national reporting of GHG emissions account for this fact, and EIA and EPA both use fuel consumption—not vehicle sales and fuel economy—as a basis for estimating and reporting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. According to the IPCC (emphasis added), “Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are best calculated on the basis of the amount and type of fuel combusted (*taken to be equal to the fuel sold*, see section 3.2.1.3) and its carbon content.”<sup>2</sup>

Such reporting addresses petroleum consumption in the aggregate and for different petroleum-based fuels, such as shown below from EIA (<http://www.eia.doe.gov/oi/af/1605/ggrpt/carbon.html>): 2 [http://www.ipcc-ggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/2\\_Volume2/V2\\_3\\_Ch3\\_Mobile\\_Combustion.pdf](http://www.ipcc-ggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/2_Volume2/V2_3_Ch3_Mobile_Combustion.pdf), p. 3-10.

GENERAL EDITORIAL ISSUES

“New Motor Vehicle or Motor Engine” Reference. The draft sometimes simply refers to emissions from “motor vehicles” rather than emissions from “new motor vehicles or motor vehicle engines.” (The draft could indicate initially that the term “motor vehicle” is intended to refer to both of these.) Statements regarding consideration of current and near-term emissions [page 35], and cumulative emissions [page 17] appear to be inconsistent, and should be clarified. EPA clearly intends that the definition of the “air pollutant” emitted by new motor vehicle or motor engine sources to be the six GHGs. In several places, however, the proposal appears to describe the four GHGs emitted by new motor vehicles or motor vehicle engines as the “air pollutant.” See, e.g., pages 1 (lines 36-37), 2 (lines 24-27), and 36 (lines 34-37).

THE WRONG KIND OF  
PARTISANSHIP

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2009

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I have long believed that people who denounce partisanship in general fail to understand the role that responsible political parties can and must play in a functioning democracy. But there are cases when partisanship gets a bad name because of the kind of advocacy it receives, and those of us who believe that partisanship can be a constructive force have an obligation to dissociate ourselves from this. The most recent example of this I have seen was reported in CQ Today on Thursday, May 7, in the article on the front page headlined “Luntz Shapes GOP Messages on Health Care.”

In the article, which summarizes Mr. Luntz’s message and in some cases quotes him di-

rectly, the writer summarizes part of his message as follows: “While Republicans might not be able to get their own ideas enacted, he went on, they could at least stop Democrats from achieving the political victory created by a successful revision of the healthcare system.”

Note, Madam Speaker, that these words are not directly attributed to Mr. Luntz, but I have no reason to think that Mr. Armstrong in any way distorted the essence of Mr. Luntz’s message in his summary. And later in the article, in a direct quote, describing the words that Republicans should use in carrying on their effort to stop the Democrats from a successful health care policy, Mr. Luntz is directly quoted as saying “I could care less about matching the words to the policies . . .”

Madam Speaker, obviously Republican Members of the Congress are free to accept or reject Mr. Luntz’s partisanship of the wrong sort, but it does seem to be relevant that he was invited to address a Republican gathering and was, according to the article, warmly received by many. For example, the gentleman from California, Mr. ISSA, is quoted as saying “We look to him for how do we express the things that we believe in ways that are effective.”

Madam Speaker, the notion that a significant number of Republicans would have as their central purpose in the healthcare debate not adopting a policy or even modifying one, but rather simply preventing the Democrats from being successful in meeting the nation’s healthcare needs, is sufficiently disturbing that I believe this article should be reprinted here so that people can fully understand the dimensions of the debate in which we now find ourselves.

[From CQ Today, May 6, 2009]

LUNTZ SHAPES GOP MESSAGES ON HEALTH CARE

(By Drew Armstrong)

Republican message guru Frank Luntz is back—this time to help Republicans try to win the war of words as they battle Democrats on overhauling health care.

Speaking at a closed-door session with House Republicans on Wednesday, Luntz said the GOP needs to get away from “markets” and focus on “patients.” And while Republicans might not be able to get their own ideas enacted, he went on, they could at least stop Democrats from achieving the political victory created by a successful revision of the health care system.

For example, he said, the GOP should throw private health insurance companies under the bus.

“For 10 years we were carrying the water of the insurance companies because they were backing us on health care,” he said. “Well, they’re not anymore. They’ve sold out, so now you can go right back at them, because the American people blame the insurance companies more than almost anybody else for why health care is such a mess in this country right now. So you don’t have to be nice to them at all.”

A detailed account of the presentation was given to Congressional Quarterly by multiple people who attended the session.

Luntz, the author of the book “Words That Work,” about the political effect of specific phrases and words, offered Republicans a detailed presentation on what language to use when talking about health care and how to attack Democratic proposals, along with a long list of “don’ts.”

Republicans will get little chance to present their own vision, Luntz warned, but

they will have plenty of opportunities to stand in opposition to Democrats.

“You’re not going to get what you want, but you can kill what they’re trying to do,” he said.

Republicans need to start defining specific words on favorable terms in order to win, he said, specifically pointing out President Obama’s promises of a high-quality health care system. And they need to make sure that voters think “quality” means getting the health care they want whenever they want it.

“Don’t let them define it. If you define it this way, they can’t do well,” he said of Democrats. “They can’t provide that treatment. They can’t provide that health care.”

FROM “PRIVATE” TO “PATIENTS”

Much of Luntz’s presentation was an attempt to correct the way Republicans talk with voters about health care. He urged them to stop using economic terminology like “free market” and “private” and to talk instead about “doctors,” “nurses” and “patients.”

“If you use the phrase ‘private health insurance market competition,’ you deserve to be down to 160 seats in the House, because nobody understands that language,” Luntz said.

He also had advice for choosing the photos in mailers sent to constituents: “Get pictures of seniors that look like they make apple pie every day forever, and the children who look so angelic that it just makes you feel compassionate, which I know is sometimes tough for people in this room,” he said.

And he called on Republicans, when describing the consequences of the Democratic proposals, to use language that would scare voters.

“What’s the word that people are afraid of?” Luntz said. “Deny.”

“The idea that a doctor or a hospital would deny care that they need is what frightens them the most about a Washington takeover,” he said.

Luntz came to the presentation with polling data, all done in the last few months, to back him up.

“Each of these words has been carefully chosen. This is not random, this is not gut. I could care less about matching the words to the policies, I have no investment in the words—except that these are the words that the American people want,” he said.

Luntz, who helped craft Republican messages through the 1990s, was a fixture in Washington GOP circles until 2005, when he left for Hollywood after an alleged falling-out with House Republican leader John A. Boehner of Ohio.

He returned to Capitol Hill Wednesday, at the invitation of the House Republican Conference, to try to focus the message on health care.

Gathered in a meeting room of the Cannon House Office Building, lawmakers and aides applauded as Luntz was introduced. “Welcome home!” shouted one attendee.

“We’ve reached out to Frank,” said House Republican Conference Chairman Mike Pence, R-Ind. “I would say, enthusiastically, Frank is back.”

Republicans who attended the meeting said they were glad to have him back. “We look to him for how do we express the things that we believe in ways that are effective,” said Darrell Issa, R-Calif.

“He told us to stop talking like a bunch of wonks and politicians and start talking like people,” said Michael C. Burgess, R-Texas, who has become a prominent voice on health care issues.

## RECOMMENDING A CHANGE IN "TONE"

At times, Luntz badgered the members, castigating them for their failures of political acumen—and for the ringtones on their cell phones.

At one point, he was clearly angry over leaks to the media earlier in the day that described parts of his presentation. When an audience member asked if Luntz would e-mail the slides he was using, he fired back, "I will forward you the PowerPoint so that way I can then read it in some newspaper two days from now. What the hell?"

And as Luntz urged members to focus on healthy lifestyles and wellness, Louie Gohmert, R-Texas, piped up: "I don't want to live that kind of life."

"You don't want to live that kind of life?" Luntz asked.

"Yeah, you're eating your BBQ. Clearly you don't want to live that kind of life," he went on, to some laughter.

"Hey, ribs are a food group," an unidentified member called out, to which Luntz responded: "His ribs could actually get up and walk out of the office."

When a cell phone belonging to F. James Sensenbrenner Jr., R-Wis., started ringing, Luntz told a young aide that Sensenbrenner needed to change the ringtone. "That's gonna be your job, when Sensenbrenner comes back in here," Luntz said to the aide, though Sensenbrenner had not actually left the room—and let Luntz know it.

"You need to get him a telephone ring for the 21st century," Luntz continued, "Like 'Play that funky music, white boy.' Something much more interesting."

---

 RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK AND THE CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG POLICE DEPARTMENT

---

**HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 13, 2009*

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Speaker, in 1962, Congress passed a resolution recognizing the week of May 15 as National Police Week. Today, I want to thank and honor those brave men and women who daily protect and serve our neighborhoods, and those who have given the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

I also want to extend a special thanks to the Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department. This week, 20 officers from the CMPD and the Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office embarked on a 410-mile bike ride to Washington, DC, to honor the memory of all officers killed in the line of duty. These dedicated servants started the annual ride in 2007 after CMPD Officers Jeff Shelton and Sean Clark were killed. Not only do these officers ride to remember their fallen brothers and sisters, but they also raise money for the National Law Enforcement Memorial Fund, which commemorates the service and sacrifice of law enforcement officers.

We must never forget that we are kept safe because of those who take up the charge as law enforcement officers. This week, I join with the 9th District of North Carolina and my colleagues in honoring and remembering these brave men and women who are the truest example of American heroes.

IN HONOR OF GEORGE AND ROSEMARY ESSEFF

**HON. ELTON GALLEGLY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 13, 2009*

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor George and Rosemary Esseff: entrepreneurs, philanthropists, American patriots and world citizens.

George and Rosemary are being honored this week by Many Mansions, a nonprofit organization in my district that has been providing hope, homes, and life-enriching services to homeless and low-income citizens for 30 years. George and Rosemary are among those who have had a strong and generous hand in Many Mansions' success.

I have the privilege of calling George and Rosemary my friends.

George and Rosemary are the epitome of the American success story. George began his career in 1951 as a chemist/metallurgist for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers before striking out on his own and going on to become one of the world's most successful titanium entrepreneurs.

Along the way, George and Rosemary have used their wealth to help those in need also have the opportunity to become successful. One example is \$1 million they donated to Many Mansions for a housing project several years ago—only part of their legacy with Many Mansions.

George and Rosemary are devout Catholics and George's brother, John, is a Monsignor. The family traces their roots to Lebanon. Three years ago, George, Rosemary, John and their grandson, Andrew, traveled to Lebanon to further their humanitarian work, including donating equipment to a hospital. Monsignor Esseff planned to lead a retreat for nuns belonging to the Missionaries of Charity, the order founded by Mother Teresa,

Then war broke out. It was not the first time the Esseffs found themselves in wartime Lebanon and it only cemented their belief that their help is needed and beneficial.

One avenue for their philanthropy is The Esseff Foundation, which they founded in 1979 in memory of his grandfather, George Abdanour Esseff. The Esseff Foundation is a non-political, non-profit organization dedicated to relieving the sufferings of the poor both in America and around the world.

In pursuit of that goal, the foundation funnels its resources to those organizations whose track records demonstrate their abilities to assist and house the homeless, feed and clothe the poor and provide medical care to those in need.

George takes his politics as seriously as he takes business and philanthropy. He spelled out his beliefs and what it means to be a Republican and a patriotic American in an ad titled, "What I Am," that ran in the Washington Post on October 20, 2004.

Mr. Speaker, George and Rosemary Esseff mirror the American Dream and have been instrumental in helping others pull themselves up and realize the Dream for themselves. I know my colleagues will join me in thanking them for being role models for Americans—striving for success honorably and morally and bringing others along with you with generosity and compassion—and in congratulating them for their well deserved honors.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. B.S. TURNER

**HON. MIKE ROGERS**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 13, 2009*

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I respectfully request the attention of the House today to pay recognition to an important day in the life of a constituent of mine, Mr. B.S. Turner.

In June of 1969, Mr. Turner started a small car dealership based on years of experience in the auto industry. Today, after 40 years of business, Pee Wee Turner Motors remains an example of the entrepreneurial spirit that fulfills the American dream.

I would like to congratulate Mr. Turner for reaching this important professional milestone and recognize him for this important entrepreneurial and professional achievement.

---

 WOMEN'S HEALTH INSURANCE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2009
**HON. RICHARD E. NEAL**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 13, 2009*

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will end practices that obstruct women from attaining affordable insurance policies on the individual market. The Women's Health Insurance Act of 2009 would end discrimination against those women looking for health coverage who either do not have access to an employee-sponsored plan or those who earn too much money to qualify for Medicaid. Recent findings from the Kaiser Family Foundation have shown that 5.7 million American women in 2007 received health insurance on the individual market. During this difficult economic climate and with unemployment rising, it is becoming much more likely that more women will be looking for health coverage through individual insurance markets.

Unfortunately it is common practice in the individual market today to charge women higher premiums than men for the identical coverage. Individual market insurers also can limit coverage due to pregnancy or delivery methods. This is because individual market insurers have the ability to deny coverage based on a "pre-existing condition." For instance, a woman who has had a Cesarean section in the past can currently be charged a higher premium, imposed a waiting period, or denied coverage until she has been sterilized or can no longer bear children. The vast majority of these policies also do not provide coverage for maternity care. These conditions exist today because there is no federal protection to stop these practices on policies sold in the individual market.

Due to the aforementioned problems, the Women's Health Insurance Fairness Act of 2009 is that much more important. This legislation will prevent insurers in the individual market from charging women higher premiums than men. The current practice is gender discrimination and should not be accepted in today's system. This gender rating harms women by not only inflating premiums, but by