White Paper:

The Illusion of Reform — Why Rand Paul's Health Care Bill Fails to Deliver Anything Substantial

And Why Voluntary, Consumer-Owned Options Are the Only Path Forward

---

Executive Summary

Senator Rand Paul's newest health care proposal claims to lower costs, expand freedom, and create a more competitive market. But beneath the rhetoric, the bill fails to confront the structural drivers of American health-care inflation — chief among them the employer-sponsored insurance (ESI) system and insurer-controlled risk pools that reward higher spending.

Worse, the bill offers no transformative alternative for consumers. It recycles ideas that have already failed, such as association plans and unfunded HSAs, while leaving untouched the financial mechanisms that suppress wages, inflate premiums, and restrict consumer choice.

By contrast, true reform comes from creating **voluntary**, consumer-centered alternatives — such as age-based tax credits — that empower individuals to own their insurance, build lifetime health savings, and gradually unwind the broken system **by choice**, not force.

Rand Paul's bill does none of this.

I. Paul's Bill Leaves Employer-Sponsored Insurance Completely Intact

And as long as ESI dominates, premiums will continue to climb.

Every major economic analysis agrees:
Employer-sponsored insurance is the core structural cause of America's health-care inflation.

research demonstrates that:

- Workers pay **100% of premiums** through reduced wages
- ESI hides true costs, allowing insurers and employers to spend freely
- Insurers profit through the ACA's 80/20 rule — the more expensive the claims, the more dollars they earn
- Premiums now exceed **$38,000 per family per year** in many states
- Workers lose their coverage when they get sick and can't work, shifting costs to ACA and Medicaid

Yet Rand Paul's bill **preserves the employer tax exclusion**, the financial engine that props up ESI and drives wage suppression.

If a reform bill refuses to give workers a voluntary off-ramp from ESI, it cannot lower costs.
Paul's bill offers no off-ramp.

By contrast, a *voluntary* age-based credit system gives workers the option to leave ESI — and only when they choose to do so. No replacement. No mandates. Just choice.

II. Association Plans Do Not Lower Costs — They Hide Them

A central pillar of Paul's bill is the expansion of **association health plans** — the same failed strategy from the 1990s.

Association plans:

- Do **not** reduce the true cost of insurance
- Provide **no portability**
- Reinforce the insurer-centered model of purchasing
- Hide risk and encourage inflated pricing
- Do nothing to change incentives for insurers or employers

The assumption that "bigger groups = lower premiums" has been disproven repeatedly. Larger pools simply give insurers more room to disguise claims experience.

Premium inflation in ESI proves this:
Large group plans are the most expensive plans in America.

Association pooling is not reform — it is a cosmetic rearrangement of the same structures that already exist.

III. HSAs Without Funding Are Meaningless

Paul's bill expands eligibility for HSAs, but does not provide:

- Any predictable funding
- Any portable contribution mechanism
- Any savings opportunity for low- or moderate-income families

An HSA with no dollars in it is not empowerment — it is symbolism.

Real savings come from a *voluntary* system where individuals receive:

- A fixed annual credit
- The ability to choose any legal insurance plan
- The right to deposit **unused credit dollars** into their personal HSA

This enables households to accumulate **hundreds of thousands of dollars** over a lifetime — something Rand Paul's bill does not even attempt.

IV. No Ownership. No Portability. No Transition Path.

Any health reform worthy of the name must create:

1. **Individually owned insurance**
2. **Portable coverage**
3. **A voluntary alternative to ESI**

Paul's bill delivers none of these.

Workers remain tied to employer-defined coverage.
They still lose insurance when they lose employment.
They still have no portable savings mechanism.
They still cannot choose a stable, individually-owned plan for the long term.

By contrast, a voluntary age-based credit system allows individuals to leave employer plans **only if they want to**, own their insurance permanently, and take their coverage with them regardless of job status.

Nothing in that model forces ESI, ACA plans, or Medicaid out of existence — but individuals will *choose* better options when they are finally given access to them.

V. The Bill Fails to Change the Incentives That Drive Costs Up

True cost reform requires realigning incentives so insurers earn more **when costs fall**, not when they rise.

Under Paul's bill:

- Insurers still profit from higher claims
- Employers still shift all costs to workers
- ESI still distorts the market
- Federal spending remains unlimited and uncapped
- No incentive exists for consumers to choose lower-cost plans

The system stays exactly as it is today — bloated, expensive, and unaccountable.

A voluntary age-based credit system — with defined contributions and retained savings — flips the incentives. Insurers must compete on price. Consumers keep the difference. Programs become obsolete **because people walk away**, not because government eliminates them.

VI. Paul's Bill Does Not Reduce Federal Spending

Despite libertarian branding, Paul's proposal:

- Does not reduce federal subsidies
- Does not reform Medicaid
- Does not cap the employer tax exclusion
- Does not create a defined contribution system
- Does not offer a voluntary alternative to ACA subsidies

In short:
Paul deregulates, but does not de-spend.

The bill leaves the highest-cost programs in place, untouched and unreformed.

A voluntary age-based credit model, on the other hand, naturally lowers federal spending as individuals migrate toward more efficient private coverage — entirely by choice.

Other programs fade only because they become unnecessary, not because they are repealed.

VII. Paul Protects the Status Quo Instead of Challenging It

Rand Paul's bill protects the three pillars of health-care cost inflation:

1. Employer-sponsored insurance

Which suppresses wages and inflates premiums.

2. Insurer-controlled risk pools

Where higher spending = higher profits.

3. Government subsidies that reward spending, not efficiency

Preserved completely in his bill.

This is not reform.
It is a superficial repackaging of the same broken system.

VIII. The Path Forward: Voluntary Alternatives, Not Forced Replacement

Real reform cannot be coercive.
It cannot eliminate the ACA.
It cannot ban ESI.
It cannot take Medicaid away from anyone.

It must offer Americans a **voluntary** pathway that is so simple, transparent, and economically superior that millions naturally choose it.

That voluntary option must:

- Provide portable, predictable credits
- Allow individuals to keep unused funds (HSA deposits)
- Encourage competition on price
- Reduce subsidies automatically as people move to lower-cost coverage
- Allow every existing program to remain available

As individuals migrate voluntarily, the old system simply becomes obsolete.

Rand Paul's bill offers no such path.

Conclusion: Reform Requires More Than Deregulation — It Requires a Voluntary Alternative Worth Choosing

Senator Rand Paul's health care bill is well-intentioned but ultimately hollow. It deregulates around the edges without addressing the structural defects at the center of the U.S. health-care crisis. It provides no ownership, no portability, no savings buildup, and no voluntary off-ramp from ESI.

Because of that, it cannot lower premiums, cannot expand freedom, and cannot reverse the decades of inflation that have crushed American workers.

Real reform will come only from **voluntary, consumer-owned, portable insurance models** that give people the ability to choose something better — not from recycled association plan ideas that keep the status quo firmly in place.

Rand Paul's bill doesn't fail because it tries too much.
It fails because it attempts nothing substantial.