

the record straight about this legislation. It is simple. It is easy to understand. It impacts everybody in America. It does pick winners and losers. It says: America is going to win, and the people who are not our friends are going to lose.

I am not sure you can say it any clearer than that. It does not cost the taxpayers a dime. The beneficiaries are the ones who pay the tab. If it does not work, there is no downside. If it does work, it is a game changer from the standpoint of our energy policy and, more importantly, our future.

The bill sunsets after 5 years. We have a 100-year supply of natural gas today if we did not drill another well. We import 70 percent of our petroleum, and that costs \$25 billion a month that we send there. Imagine what that \$25 billion could create in jobs here if, in fact, we made this simple policy change.

I thank you, Mr. President, for your attention and your patience and the patience of my colleagues since I ran over a little bit. But I will conclude with this. A bill that roughly costs \$3.4 to \$3.8 billion and is funded by user fees is not a big bill in Washington. But the potential impact of this legislation will not only be big in America, it will change the landscape of the world. It will put us back in control of our national security, of our economic security, and, more importantly, of our energy security. This will be a day that Congress will either be proud or disgusted at the outcome of a policy such as this.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator JOHNSON from Wisconsin and I be able to conduct a colloquy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, it has not been that long since the President's health care proposal has been passed. If we recall, it was passed on Christmas Eve, after a long battle. We were told: Don't worry what is in it; we will have to pass it first to find out what is in it. I remember Senator BROWN was running in the State of Massachusetts, a liberal State. He said, If you elect me—and he was running in the special election—I will vote against

it and provide the vote that kills it. But the matter was delayed—his appointment and confirmation, after he won his election. It was put off and the interim Senator cast a vote for the bill and it passed by a single vote and the result was 60 to 40. I think it was a dangerous step for America.

I am the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee and the Senator from Wisconsin is a member of that committee. We have serious concerns about what is in this bill now that we are beginning to read it and beginning to apply it and see what might happen. Senator JOHNSON is a successful businessman who ran for the Senate and joined us just a little over 1 year ago. He came here to do something. I have been exceedingly impressed with his approach to business. He had looked at these numbers and challenged the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary Sebelius, on some numbers last week. The situation was quite troubling.

Maybe Senator JOHNSON can tell us about his concern and what he raised last week—the economic impact of what happened with jobs, the American economy, and the debt of our country. Maybe we can begin our discussion with where he is coming from and what he observed from his exchange last week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. First of all, I thank the Senator for his kind comments. He mentioned that Speaker PELOSI famously stated we needed to pass this bill in order to figure out what is in it. I know the Senator from Alabama and I are dedicated to making sure the Obama administration doesn't make sure this law is fully implemented before we understand the true cost of the bill. We simply cannot afford to have the American people and Members of Congress not understand the true cost of the health care law.

I remind everybody that, back in 1965, when they passed the Medicare bill, first of all, the entire bill was less than 300 pages. That is interesting. The provision that applied to Medicare alone was about 124 pages. That compares, of course, with the 2,600- or 2,700-page bill that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was. There are 10,000 pages of regulations just to try to implement this bill.

When they passed Medicare, they estimated it out 25 years and said that in 1990, Medicare would cost \$12 billion. In fact, in 1990, Medicare cost \$110 billion, which is more than nine times the original cost estimate.

I am new here, but I have been watching this town pretty carefully over the last few decades. I don't believe Washington has gotten any better at projecting and estimating figures—particularly on new entitlements that people want around here. They always tend to underestimate spending in order to pass legislation, particularly a bill such as the health care bill, which was done in partisan fashion, without any kind of support and input from our side.

The point of my question to Secretary Sebelius last week was to try to lay out the broken promises that are occurring, when we have only begun to implement the law. The first broken promise I asked her about was the very famous guarantee of President Obama, who said: If you pass this health care law, every single family in America will see their annual insurance premium go down by \$2,500 by the end of his first term. The Kaiser Family Foundation has already conducted a study and has said that, on average, premiums have gone up about \$2,200 per year. That is a \$4,700 difference in the first 3 years of his administration or only 2 years after it was originally passed.

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator has been in the real world, having to make a payroll and manage a company. If he, as a CEO, made a representation that this was going to reduce the cost of insurance for your employees by \$2,500, and it increases by 2,200, that would be a stunning event, would it not? Does it bother the Senator, as a person from the real world—and this is the first time he has been in elected office—to have people walking around with numbers that are so divergent, promising to reduce health care costs, and they actually are driving costs up?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Had I made that guarantee to my shareholders and management—and that is basically what the President did; he made that guarantee to the shareholders of America—I would not want to face the appropriations committee meeting, where I would have to explain that away. Secretary Sebelius was in a very unenviable position to have to explain how the President promised a \$2,500 reduction and there was an increase.

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator is right. I was here. There was a promise made to achieve passage of the bill. A lot of Americans didn't believe these promises and thought they were inflated to begin with, and this promise—a fundamental promise—has already been proven to be wildly inaccurate. And thank you for raising that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Of course, that is only the first promise. I have a couple more.

The administration also famously said this health care law would not add one dime to the deficit. In fact, the original projections were that it would save \$143 billion in the first 10 years. Well, thankfully, the administration has recognized that the CLASS Act was, as Budget Committee chairman KENT CONRAD said, a Ponzi scheme. It was simply not financially workable. So they are not implementing it. Because they are not implementing it, they are not going to get \$86 billion worth of revenue, so that will eat away at that \$143 billion of deficit reduction.

Of course, a couple of weeks ago when President Obama presented his fiscal year 2013 budget, included in that budget was a \$111 billion request—or I