Official - Subject to Final Review

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 1 2 - - - - - - - x _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND 3 : 4 HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL., : Petitioners : No. 11-398 5 6 v. : 7 FLORIDA, ET AL. : 8 - - - - - - - - - - - - - x 9 Washington, D.C. 10 Tuesday, March 27, 2012 11 The above-entitled matter came on for oral 12 argument before the Supreme Court of the United States 13 at 10:00 a.m. 14 15 APPEARANCES: DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR., ESQ., Solicitor General, 16 17 Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf of 18 Petitioners. PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of 19 20 Respondents Florida, et al. MICHAEL A. CARVIN, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of 21 22 Respondents NFIB, et al. 23 24 25

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR., ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondents Florida, et al.	53
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	MICHAEL A. CARVIN, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Respondents NFIB, et al.	79
11	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
12	DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR., ESQ.	
13	On behalf of the Petitioners	107
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 (10:00 a.m.) CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will continue 3 argument this morning in Case 11-398, the Department of 4 5 Health and Human Services v. Florida. 6 General Verrilli. 7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR., 8 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS 9 GENERAL VERRILLI: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the Court: 10 11 The Affordable Care Act addresses a 12 fundamental and enduring problem in our health care system and our economy. Insurance has become the 13 predominant means of paying for health care in this 14 15 country. Insurance has become the predominant means of 16 paying for health care in this country. 17 For most Americans, for more than 80 percent of Americans, the insurance system does provide 18 19 effective access. Excuse me. But for more than 40 20 million Americans who do not have access to health insurance either through their employer or through 21 2.2 government programs such as Medicare or Medicaid, the 23 system does not work. Those individuals must resort to 24 the individual market, and that market does not provide affordable health insurance. 25

3

1	It does not do so because, because the
2	multibillion dollar subsidies that are available for
3	the, the employer market are not available in the
4	individual market. It does not do so because ERISA and
5	HIPAA regulations that preclude, that preclude
6	discrimination against people based on their medical
7	history do not apply in the individual market. That is
8	an economic problem. And it begets another economic
9	problem.
10	JUSTICE SCALIA: Why aren't those problems
11	that the Federal Government can address directly?
12	GENERAL VERRILLI: They can address it
13	directly, Justice Scalia, and they are addressing it
14	directly through this, through this Act by regulating
15	the means by which health care, by which health care is
16	purchased. That is the way this Act works.
17	Under the Commerce Clause, what, what
18	Congress has done is to enact reforms of the insurance
19	market, directed at the individual insurance market,
20	that preclude, that preclude discrimination based on
21	pre-existing conditions, that require guaranteed issue
22	and community rating, and it uses and the minimum
23	coverage provision is necessary to carry into execution
24	those insurance reforms.
25	JUSTICE KENNEDY: Can you create commerce in

4

1 order to regulate it? 2 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's not what's going 3 on here, Justice Kennedy, and we are not seeking to defend the law on that basis. 4 5 In this case, the -- what is being regulated 6 is the method of financing health, the purchase of 7 health care. That itself is economic activity with substantial effects on interstate commerce. And --8 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: Any self purchasing? Anything I -- you know if I'm in any market at all, my 10 failure to purchase something in that market subjects me 11 12 to regulation. GENERAL VERRILLI: No. That's not our 13 position at all, Justice Scalia. In the health care 14 15 market, the health care market is characterized by the 16 fact that aside from the few groups that Congress chose to exempt from the minimum coverage requirement -- those 17 who for religious reasons don't participate, those who 18 19 are incarcerated, Indian tribes -- virtually everybody 20 else is either in that market or will be in that market, and the distinguishing feature of that is that they 21 2.2 cannot, people cannot generally control when they enter 23 that market or what they need when they enter that 24 market. 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, the same, it

5

1 seems to me, would be true say for the market in emergency services: police, fire, ambulance, roadside 2 assistance, whatever. You don't know when you're going 3 to need it; you're not sure that you will. But the same 4 5 is true for health care. You don't know if you're going 6 to need a heart transplant or if you ever will. So 7 there is a market there. To -- in some extent, we all 8 participate in it.

9 So can the government require you to buy a 10 cell phone because that would facilitate responding when 11 you need emergency services? You can just dial 911 no 12 matter where you are?

GENERAL VERRILLI: No, Mr. Chief Justice. I 13 think that's different. It's -- We -- I don't think we 14 15 think of that as a market. This is a market. This is market regulation. And in addition, you have a 16 situation in this market not only where people enter 17 involuntarily as to when they enter and won't be able to 18 19 control what they need when they enter but when they --20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It seems to me that's the same as in my hypothetical. You don't know 21 22 when you're going to need police assistance. You can't 23 predict the extent to emergency response that you'll 24 need. But when you do, and the government provides it. 25 I thought that was an important part of your argument,

6

1 that when you need health care, the government will make 2 sure you get it. Well, when you need police assistance or fire assistance or ambulance assistance, the 3 government is going to make sure to the best extent it 4 can that you get it -- get it. 5 6 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think the fundamental 7 difference, Mr. Chief Justice, is that that's not an 8 issue of market regulation. This is an issue of market regulation, and that's how Congress, that's how Congress 9 looked at this problem. There is a market. Insurance 10 is provided through the market system --11 12 JUSTICE ALITO: Do you think there is a, a market for burial services? 13 14 GENERAL VERRILLI: For burial services? 15 JUSTICE ALITO: Yes. 16 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes, Justice Alito, I think there is. 17 18 JUSTICE ALITO: All right, suppose that you 19 and I walked around downtown Washington at lunch hour 20 and we found a couple of healthy young people and we stopped them and we said, "You know what you're doing? 21 22 You are financing your burial services right now because 23 eventually you're going to die, and somebody is going to 24 have to pay for it, and if you don't have burial 25 insurance and you haven't saved money for it, you're

7

1	going to shift the cost to somebody else."
2	Isn't that a very artificial way of talking
3	about what somebody is doing?
4	GENERAL VERRILLI: No, that
5	JUSTICE ALITO: And if that's true, why
6	isn't it equally artificial to say that somebody who is
7	doing absolutely nothing about health care is financing
8	health care services?
9	GENERAL VERRILLI: It's, I think it's
10	completely different. The and the reason is that
11	the, the burial example is not the difference is here
12	we are regulating the method by which you are paying for
13	something else health care and the insurance
14	requirement I think the key thing here is my friends
15	on the other side acknowledge that it is within the
16	authority of Congress under Article I under the commerce
17	power to impose guaranteed-issue and community rating
18	forms, to end to impose a minimum coverage provision.
19	Their argument is just that it has to occur at the point
20	of sale, and
21	JUSTICE ALITO: I don't see the difference.
22	You can get burial insurance. You can get health
23	insurance. Most people are going to need health care.
24	Almost everybody. Everybody is going to be buried or

25 cremated at some point. What's the difference?

8

Official - Subj	ct to Final Review
-----------------	--------------------

1 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, one big difference, one big difference, Justice Alito, is the -- you don't 2 have the cost shifting to other market participants. 3 4 Here --5 JUSTICE ALITO: Sure you do, because if you 6 don't have money then the State is going to pay for it. 7 Or some --8 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's different. 9 JUSTICE ALITO: Or a family member is going 10 to pay. GENERAL VERRILLI: That's a difference and 11 12 it's a significant difference. In this situation one of the economic effects Congress is addressing is that 13 the -- there -- the many billions of dollars of 14 15 uncompensated costs are transferred directly to other market participants. It's transferred directly to other 16 17 market participants because health care providers charge 18 higher rates in order to cover the cost of uncompensated 19 care, and insurance companies reflect those higher rates 20 in higher premiums, which Congress found translates to a thousand dollars per family in additional health 21 2.2 insurance costs. 23 JUSTICE ALITO: But isn't that a very small 24 part of what the mandate is doing? You can correct me 25 if these figures are wrong, but it appears to me that

9

1 the CBO has estimated that the average premium for a 2 single insurance policy in the non-group market would be 3 roughly \$5,800 in -- in 2016.

Respondents -- the economists have 4 5 supported -- the Respondents estimate that a young, 6 healthy individual targeted by the mandate on average 7 consumes about \$854 in health services each year. So 8 the mandate is forcing these people to provide a huge subsidy to the insurance companies for other purposes 9 10 that the act wishes to serve, but isn't -- if those 11 figures are right, isn't it the case that what this 12 mandate is really doing is not requiring the people who are subject to it to pay for the services that they are 13 14 going to consume? It is requiring them to subsidize 15 services that will be received by somebody else. GENERAL VERRILLI: No, I think that -- I do 16 think that's what the Respondents argue. It's just not 17 I think it -- it really gets to a fundamental 18 right. 19 problem with their argument. 20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: If you're going to have

21 insurance, that's how insurance works.

GENERAL VERRILLI: A, it is how insurance works, but, B, the problem that they -- that they are identifying is not that problem. The -- the guaranteed issue and community rating reforms do not have the

10

1 effect of forcing insurance companies to take on lots of additional people who they then can't afford to cover 2 because they're -- they tend to be the sick, and that 3 is -- in fact, the exact opposite is what happens here. 4 5 The -- when -- when you enact Guaranteed 6 Issue and Community Rating Reforms and you do so in the 7 absence of a minimum coverage provision, it's not that insurance companies take on more and more people and 8 then need a subsidy to cover it, it's that fewer and 9 fewer people end up with insurance because their rates 10 11 are not regulated. Insurance companies, when -- when 12 they have to offer Guaranteed Issue and Community Rating, they are entitled to make a profit. They charge 13 rates sufficient to cover only the sick population 14 15 because health --JUSTICE KENNEDY: Could you help -- help me 16 with this. Assume for the moment -- you may disagree. 17 18 Assume for the moment that this is unprecedented, this 19 is a step beyond what our cases have allowed, the 20 affirmative duty to act to go into commerce. If that is so, do you not have a heavy burden of justification? 21 22 I understand that we must presume laws are 23 constitutional, but, even so, when you are changing the 24 relation of the individual to the government in this, what we can stipulate is, I think, a unique way, do you 25

11

1 not have a heavy burden of justification to show
2 authorization under the Constitution?

GENERAL VERRILLI: So two things about that, 3 Justice Kennedy. First, we think this is regulation of 4 people's participation in the health care market, and 5 6 all -- all this minimum coverage provision does is say 7 that, instead of requiring insurance at the point of 8 sale, that Congress has the authority under the commerce power and the necessary proper power to ensure that 9 people have insurance in advance of the point of sale 10 11 because of the unique nature of this market, because this is a market in which -- in which you -- although 12 most of the population is in the market most of the 13 time -- 83 percent visit a physician every year; 96 14 15 percent over a five-year period -- so virtually 16 everybody in society is in this market, and you've got to pay for the health care you get, the predominant way 17 18 in which it's -- in which it's paid for is insurance, 19 and -- and the Respondents agree that Congress could 20 require that you have insurance in order to get health care or forbid health care from being provided --21 22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why do you -- why do you 23 define the market that broadly? Health care. It may 24 well be that everybody needs health care sooner or

25 later, but not everybody needs a heart transplant, not

12

1 everybody needs a liver transplant. Why -2 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's correct, Justice
3 Scalia, but you never know whether you're going to be
4 that person.

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Could you define the 6 market -- everybody has to buy food sooner or later, so 7 you define the market as food, therefore, everybody is 8 in the market; therefore, you can make people buy 9 broccoli.

GENERAL VERRILLI: No, that's guite 10 That's quite different. The food market, 11 different. 12 while it shares that trait that everybody's in it, it is not a market in which your participation is often 13 unpredictable and often involuntary. It is not a market 14 15 in which you often don't know before you go in what you 16 need, and it is not a market in which, if you go in and -- and seek to obtain a product or service, you will 17 get it even if you can't pay for it. It doesn't --18

JUSTICE SCALIA: Is that a principal basis for distinguishing this from other situations? I mean, you know, you can also say, well, the person subject to this has blue eyes. That would indeed distinguish it from other situations. Is it a principle basis? I mean, it's -- it's a basis that explains why the government is doing this, but is it -- is it a basis

13

1 which shows that this is not going beyond what -- what 2 the -- the system of enumerated powers allows the 3 government to do.

GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes, for two reasons.
First, this -- the test, as this Court has articulated
it, is: Is Congress regulating economic activity with a
substantial effect on interstate commerce?

8 The way in which this statute satisfies the 9 test is on the basis of the factors that I have 10 identified. If --

JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Verrilli, I thought 11 12 that your main point is that, unlike food or any other market, when you made the choice not to buy insurance, 13 14 even though you have every intent in the world to 15 self-insure, to save for it, when disaster strikes, you may not have the money. And the tangible result of it 16 is -- we were told there was one brief that Maryland 17 Hospital Care bills 7 percent more because of these 18 19 uncompensated costs, that families pay a thousand 20 dollars more than they would if there were no 21 uncompensated costs.

I thought what was unique about this is it's not my choice whether I want to buy a product to keep me healthy, but the cost that I am forcing on other people if I don't buy the product sooner rather than later.

14

1	GENERAL VERRILLI: That is and that is
2	definitely a difference that distinguishes this market
3	and justifies this as a regulation.

JUSTICE BREYER: All right. So if that is your difference -- if that is your difference, I'm somewhat uncertain about your answers to -- for example, Justice Kennedy asked, can you, under the Commerce Clause, Congress create commerce where previously none existed.

Well, yeah, I thought the answer to that 10 was, since McCulloch versus Maryland, when the Court 11 12 said Congress could create the Bank of the United States which did not previously exist, which job was to create 13 commerce that did not previously exist, since that time 14 15 the answer has been, yes. I would have thought that 16 your answer -- can the government, in fact, require you to buy cell phones or buy burials that, if we propose 17 comparable situations, if we have, for example, a 18 19 uniform United States system of paying for every burial 20 such as Medicare Burial, Medicaid Burial, CHIP Burial, ERISA Burial and Emergency Burial beside the side of the 21 road, and Congress wanted to rationalize that system, 22 23 wouldn't the answer be, yes, of course, they could. So --24 GENERAL VERRILLI:

25 JUSTICE BREYER: And the same with the

15

1 computers or the same with the -- the cell phones, if 2 you're driving by the side of the highway and there is a federal emergency service just as you say you have to 3 buy certain mufflers for your car that don't hurt the 4 5 environment, you could -- I mean, see, doesn't it depend 6 on the situation? 7 GENERAL VERRILLI: It does, Justice Breyer, 8 and if Congress were to enact laws like that, we --JUSTICE BREYER: We would be -- or --9 GENERAL VERRILLI: My responsibility -- and 10 I would defend them on a rationale like that, but I do 11 12 think that we are advancing a narrower rationale. JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, then your question 13 is whether or not there are any limits on the Commerce 14 15 Clause. Can you identify for us some limits on the 16 Commerce Clause? GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes. 17 The -- the rationale purely under the Commerce Clause that we're 18 19 advocating here would not justify forced purchases of 20 commodities for the purpose of stimulating demand. We -- the -- it would not justify purchases of insurance 21 2.2 for the purposes -- in situations in which insurance 23 doesn't serve as the method of payment for service --24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But why not? If 25 Congress -- if Congress says that the interstate

16

commerce is affected, isn't, according to your view,
 that the end of the analysis.

GENERAL VERRILLI: No. The, the -- we think 3 that in a -- when -- the difference between those 4 5 situations and this situation is that in those 6 situations, Your Honor, Congress would be moving to 7 create commerce. Here Congress is regulating existing 8 commerce, economic activity that is already going on, people's participation in the health care market, and is 9 regulating to deal with existing effects of existing 10 11 commerce.

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: That -- that it seems to me, it's a -- it's a passage in your reply 13 14 brief that I didn't quite grasp. It's the same point. 15 You say health insurance is not purchased for its own sake, like a car or broccoli; it is a means of financing 16 health care consumption and covering universal risks. 17 18 Well, a car or broccoli aren't purchased for their own 19 sake, either. They are purchased for the sake of 20 transportation or in broccoli, covering the need for food. I -- I don't understand that distinction. 21 2.2 GENERAL VERRILLI: The difference, Mr. Chief 23 Justice, is that health insurance is the means of 24 payment for health care and broccoli is --CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, now that's a 25

17

1 significant -- I'm sorry.

2 GENERAL VERRILLI: And -- and broccoli is
3 not the means of payment for anything else. And an
4 automobile is not --

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It's the means of 6 satisfying a basic human need, just as your insurance is 7 a means of satisfying --

8 GENERAL VERRILLI: But I do think that's the difference between existing commerce activity in the 9 market already occurring -- the people in the health 10 care market purchasing, obtaining health care 11 services -- and the creation of commerce. And the 12 principle that we are advocating here under the Commerce 13 Clause does not take the step of justifying the creation 14 15 of commerce. It's a regulation of the existing 16 commerce.

JUSTICE GINSBURG: General Verrilli, can we 17 - can we go back to, Justice Breyer asked a question, 18 19 and it kind of interrupted your answer to my question. 20 And tell me if I'm wrong about this, but I thought a major, major point of your argument was that the people 21 22 who don't participate in this market are making it much 23 more expensive for the people who do; that is, they --24 they will get, a good number of them will get services that they can't afford at the point where they need 25

18

1 them, and the result is that everybody else's premiums get raised. So you're not -- it's not your -- your free 2 choice just to do something for yourself. What you do 3 is going to affect others, affect them in -- in a major 4 5 way. 6 GENERAL VERRILLI: That -- that absolutely 7 is a justification for Congress's action here. That is 8 existing economic activity that Congress is regulating by means of this rule. 9 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: General Verrilli, you -you could say that about buying a car. If -- if people 11 12 don't buy cars, the price that those who do buy cars pay will have to be higher. So you could say in order to 13 bring the price down, you are hurting these other people 14 15 by not buying a car. 16 GENERAL VERRILLI: That is not what we are saying, Justice Scalia. 17 18 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's not -- that's not 19 what you're saying. 20 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's not -- not --JUSTICE SCALIA: I thought it was. I 21 thought you were saying other people are going to have 22 23 to pay more for insurance because you're not buying it. 24 GENERAL VERRILLI: No. It's because you're 25 going -- in the health care market, you're going into

19

Official - Subject to Final Review

1 the market without the ability to pay for what you get, 2 getting the health care service anyway as a result of the social norms that allow -- that -- to which we've 3 obligated ourselves so that people get health care. 4 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, don't obligate 6 yourself to that. Why -- you know? 7 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I can't imagine 8 that that -- that the Commerce Clause would --would forbid Congress from taking into account this deeply 9 embedded social norm. 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: You -- you could do it. 11 12 But -- but does that expand your ability to, to issue 13 mandates to -- to the people? 14 GENERAL VERRILLI: I -- I -- this is not a 15 purchase mandate. This is a -- this is a law that regulates the method of paying for a service that the 16 class of people to whom it applies are either 17 18 consuming --19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General --20 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- or -- or inevitably will consume. 21 2.2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, I see or have 23 seen three strands of arguments in your briefs, and one 24 of them is echoed today. The first strand that I have 25 seen is that Congress can pass any necessary laws to

20

effect those powers within its rights, i.e., because it made a decision that to effect, to effect mandatory issuance of insurance, that it could also obligate the mandatory purchase of it.

5 The second strand I see is self-insurance 6 affects the market, and so the government can regulate 7 those who self-insure.

And the third argument -- and I see all of 8 them as different -- is that what the government is 9 10 doing, and I think it's the argument you're making today -- that what the -- what the government is saying 11 12 is if you pay for -- if you use health services, you have to pay with insurance. Because only insurance will 13 14 guarantee that whatever need for health care that you 15 have will be covered. Because virtually no one, perhaps 16 with the exception of 1 percent of the population, can afford the massive cost if the unexpected happens. 17

This third argument seems to be saying what we are regulating is health care, and when you go for health services, you have to pay for insurance, and since insurance won't issue at the moment that you consume the product, we can reasonably, necessarily tell you to buy it ahead of time, because you can't buy it at the moment that you need it.

Is that -- which of these three is your

25

21

1 argument? Are all of them your argument? I'm just not 2 sure what the --

GENERAL VERRILLI: So, let me try to state 3 it this way. The Congress enacted reforms of the 4 5 insurance market, the guaranteed-issue and 6 community-rating reforms. It did so to deal with a very 7 serious problem that results in 40 million people not 8 being able to get insurance and therefore not access to the health care environment. Everybody agrees in this 9 case that those are within Congress's Article I powers. 10 11 The minimum coverage provision is necessary 12 to carry those provisions into -- into execution; because without them, without those provisions, without 13 minimum coverage, guaranteed issue and community rating 14 15 will, as the experience in the States showed, make 16 matters worse, not better. There will be fewer people covered; it will cost more. Now the -- so --17 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So on that ground, 19 you're answering affirmatively to my colleagues that 20 have asked you the question, can the government force you into commerce. 21 2.2 GENERAL VERRILLI: So -- no. 23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And there is no limit to 24 that power. 25 GENERAL VERRILLI: No. No. Because that's

22

1 -- that's the first part of our argument.

The second part of our argument is that the 2 means here that the Congress has chosen, the minimum 3 coverage provision, is a means that regulates the --4 5 that regulates economic activity, namely your 6 transaction in the health care market, with substantial 7 effects on interstate commerce; and it is the 8 conjunction of those two that we think provides the particularly secure foundation for this statute under 9 10 the commerce power.

JUSTICE KAGAN: General, you've talked on -a couple of times about other alternatives that Congress might have had, other alternatives that the Respondents suggest to deal with this problem, in particular, the alternative of mandating insurance at the point at which somebody goes to a hospital or an emergency room and asks for care.

Did Congress consider those alternatives? Why did it reject them? How should we think about the question of alternative ways of dealing with these problems?

GENERAL VERRILLI: I do think, Justice Kagan, that the point of difference between my friends on the other side and the United States is about one of timing. They have agreed that Congress has Article I

23

1 authority to impose an insurance requirement or other --2 or other penalty at the point of sale, and they have agreed that Congress has the authority to do that to 3 achieve the same objectives that the minimum coverage 4 provision of the Affordable Care Act is designed to 5 6 This is a situation if which we are talking achieve. 7 about means. Congress gets a substantial deference in 8 the choice of means, and if one thinks about the difference between the means they say Congress should 9 have chosen and the means Congress did choose, I think 10 you can see why it was eminently more sensible for 11 12 Congress to choose the means that it chose.

13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I'm not sure which way it If the Congress has alternate means, let's assume 14 cuts. 15 it can use the tax power to raise revenue and to just have a national health service, single payer. How does 16 that factor into our analysis? In the one sense, it can 17 18 be argued that this is what the government is doing; it 19 ought to be honest about the power that it's using and 20 use the correct power. On the other hand, it means that since the Court can do it anyway -- Congress can do it 21 22 anyway, we give a certain amount of latitude. I'm not 23 sure which the way the argument goes.

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: Let me try to answer that 25 question, Justice Kennedy, and get back to the question

24

you asked me earlier. The, the -- I do think one striking feature of the argument here that this is a novel exercise of power is that what Congress chose to do was to rely on market mechanisms and efficiency and a method that has more choice than would the traditional Medicare/Medicaid type model; and so it seems a little ironic to suggest that that counts against it.

8 But beyond that, in the sense that it's novel, this provision is novel in the same way, or 9 10 unprecedented in the same way, that the Sherman Act was 11 unprecedented when the Court upheld it in the Northern 12 Securities case; or the Packers and Stockyards Act was unprecedented when the Court upheld it, or the National 13 Labor Relations Act was unprecedented when the Court 14 15 upheld it in Jones and Laughlin; or the -- the dairy price supports in Wrightwood Dairy and Rock Royal --16

JUSTICE SCALIA: Oh, no, it's not. They all involved commerce. There was no doubt that was what regulated was commerce. And here you're regulating somebody who isn't covered.

By the way, I don't agree with you that the relevant market here is health care. You're not regulating health care. You're regulating insurance. It's the insurance market that you're addressing and you're saying that some people who are not in it must be

25

1 in it and that's -- that's difference from regulating in 2 any manner commerce that already exists out there. GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, to the extent that 3 we are looking at the comprehensive scheme, Justice 4 5 Scalia, it is regulating commerce that already exists 6 out there. And the means in which that regulation is 7 made effective here, the minimum coverage provision, is 8 a regulation of the way in which people participate, the method of their payment in the health care market. That 9 is what it is. 10

And I do think, Justice Kennedy, getting 11 12 back to the question you asked before, what -- what matters here is whether Congress is choosing a tool 13 that's reasonably adapted to the problem that Congress 14 15 is confronting. And that may mean that the tool is 16 different from a tool that Congress has chosen to use in the past. That's not something that counts against the 17 provision in a Commerce Clause analysis. 18

JUSTICE SCALIA: Wait. That's -- that's -it's both "Necessary and Proper." What you just said addresses what's necessary. Yes, has to be reasonably adapted. Necessary does not mean essential, just reasonably adapted. But in addition to being necessary, it has to be proper. And we've held in two cases that something that was reasonably adapted was not proper

26

because it violated the sovereignty of the States, which
 was implicit in the constitutional structure.

The argument here is that this also is -- may be 3 necessary, but it's not proper because it violates an 4 5 equally evident principle in the Constitution, which is 6 that the Federal Government is not supposed to be a 7 government that has all powers; that it's supposed to be 8 a government of limited powers. And that's what all this questioning has been about. What -- what is left? 9 If the government can do this, what, what else can it 10 11 not do? 12 GENERAL VERRILLI: This does not violate the norm of proper as this Court articulated it in Printz or 13 in New York because it does not interfere with the 14

15 States as sovereigns. This is a regulation that -- this 16 is a regulation --

JUSTICE SCALIA: No, that wasn't my point. That is not the only constitutional principle that exists.

20 GENERAL VERRILLI: But it --

JUSTICE SCALIA: An equally evident constitutional principle is the principle that the Federal Government is a government of enumerated powers and that the vast majority of powers remain in the States and do not belong to the Federal Government. Do

27

Official - Subject to Final Review

you acknowledge that that's a principle?
 GENERAL VERRILLI: Of course we do, Your
 Honor.

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay. That's what we are 5 talking about here.

6 GENERAL VERRILLI: And the way in which this 7 Court in its cases has policed the boundary that -- of what's in the national sphere and what's in the local 8 sphere is to ask whether Congress is regulating economic 9 activity with a substantial effect on interstate 10 11 commerce. And here I think it's really impossible, in 12 view of our history, to say that Congress is invading the State sphere. This is a -- this is a market in 13 14 which 50 percent of the people in this country get their 15 health care through their employer. There is a massive Federal tax subsidy of \$250 billion a year that makes 16 that much more affordable. ERISA and HIPAA regulate 17 that to ensure that the kinds of bans on pre-existing 18 19 condition discrimination and pricing practices that 20 occur in the individual market don't occur. 21 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't understand your --2.2 GENERAL VERRILLI: This is in --23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Whatever the States have 24 chosen not to do, the Federal Government can do? 25 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, not at all.

28

JUSTICE SCALIA: I mean, the Tenth Amendment says the powers not given to the Federal Government are reserved, not just to the States, but to the States and the people. And the argument here is that the people were left to decide whether they want to buy insurance or not.

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: But this -- but, Your 8 Honor, this is -- what the Court has said, and I think it would be a very substantial departure from what the 9 Court has said, is that when Congress is regulating 10 11 economic activity with a substantial effect on 12 interstate commerce that will be upheld. And that is what is going on here, and to embark on -- I would 13 14 submit with all due respect, to embark on the kind of 15 analysis that my friends on the other side suggest the Court ought to embark on is to import Lochner-style 16 substantive due process --17

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The key in Lochner 19 is that we were talking about regulation of the States, 20 right, and the States are not limited to enumerated The Federal Government is. And it seems to me 21 powers. 22 it's an entirely different question when you ask 23 yourself whether or not there are going to be limits in 24 the Federal power, as opposed to limits on the States, which was the issue in Lochner. 25

29

1 GENERAL VERRILLI: I agree, except, 2 Mr. Chief Justice, that what the Court has said as I read the Court's cases is that the way in which you 3 ensure that the Federal Government stays in its sphere 4 5 and the sphere reserved for the States is protected is 6 by policing the boundary: Is the national government 7 regulating economic activity with a substantial effect on interstate commerce? 8

9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But the reason, the reason this is concerning, is because it requires the 10 11 individual to do an affirmative act. In the law of torts our tradition, our law, has been that you don't 12 have the duty to rescue someone if that person is in 13 14 The blind man is walking in front of a car and danger. 15 you do not have a duty to stop him absent some relation between you. And there is some severe moral criticisms 16 of that rule, but that's generally the rule. 17

And here the government is saying that the Federal Government has a duty to tell the individual citizen that it must act, and that is different from what we have in previous cases and that changes the relationship of the Federal Government to the individual in the very fundamental way.

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: I don't think so, Justice 25 Kennedy, because it is predicated on the participation

30

Official - Subject to Final Review

1 of these individuals in the market for health care 2 services. Now, it happens to be that this is a market in which, aside from the groups that the statute 3 excludes, virtually everybody participates. But it is a 4 5 regulation of their participation in that market. 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but it's 7 critical how you define the market. If I understand the 8 law, the policies that you're requiring people to purchase involve -- must contain provision for maternity 9 10 and newborn care, pediatric services, and substance use It seems to me that you cannot say that 11 treatment. 12 everybody is going to need substance use treatment, substance use treatment or pediatric services, and yet 13 that is part of what you require them to purchase. 14 15 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, it's part of what 16 the statute requires the insurers to offer. And I think the reason is because it's trying to define minimum 17 essential coverage because the problem --18 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But your theory is 20 that there is a market in which everyone participates because everybody might need a certain range of health 21 22 care services, and yet you're requiring people who are 23 not -- never going to need pediatric or maternity 24 services to participate in that market. 25 GENERAL VERRILLI: The -- with respect to

31

1 what insurance has to cover, Your Honor, I think Congress is entitled the latitude of making the 2 judgments of what the appropriate scope of coverage is. 3 And the problem here in this market is that for -- you 4 5 may think you're perfectly healthy and you may think 6 that you're not -- that you're being forced to subsidize 7 somebody else, but this is not a market in which you can say that there is a immutable class of healthy people 8 who are being forced to subsidize the unhealthy. 9 This is a market in which you may be healthy one day and you 10 may be a very unhealthy participant in that market the 11 12 next day and that is a fundamental difference, and you're not going to know in which --13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: 14 I think you're 15 posing the question I was posing, which is that doesn't 16 apply to a lot of what you're requiring people to purchase: Pediatric services, maternity services. You 17

18 cannot say that everybody is going to participate in the 19 substance use market and yet you require people to 20 purchase insurance coverage for that.

GENERAL VERRILLI: Congress has got --Congress is enacting economic regulation here. It has latitude to define essential, the attributes of essential coverage. That doesn't -- that doesn't seem to me to implicate the question of whether Congress is

32

1 engaging in economic regulation and solving an economic problem here, and that is what Congress is doing. 2 JUSTICE ALITO: Are you denying this? 3 If you took the group of people who are subject to the 4 5 mandate and you calculated the amount of health care 6 services this whole group would consume and figured out 7 the cost of an insurance policy to cover the services that group would consume, the cost of that policy would 8 be much, much less than the kind of policy that these 9 people are now going to be required to purchase under 10 11 the Affordable Care Act?

12 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, while they are 13 young and healthy that would be true. But they are not 14 going to be young and healthy forever. They are going 15 to be on the other side of that actuarial equation at 16 some point. And of course you don't know which among 17 that group is the person who's going to be hit by the 18 bus or get the definitive diagnosis. And that --

JUSTICE ALITO: The point is -- no, you take into account that some people in that group are going to be hit by a bus, some people in that group are going to unexpectedly contract or be diagnosed with a disease that -- that is very expensive to treat. But if you take their costs and you calculate that, that's a lot less than the amount that they are going to be required

33

1 to pay.

2 So that you can't just justify this on the 3 basis of their trying to shift their costs off to other 4 people, can you?

5 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, the -- the people 6 in that class get benefits, too, Justice Alito. They 7 get the guaranteed-issue benefit that they would not otherwise have, which is an enormously valuable benefit. 8 9 And in terms of the -- the subsidy rationale, I -- I don't think -- I think it's -- it 10 11 would be unusual to say that it's an illegitimate exercise of the commerce power for some people to 12 subsidize others. Telephone rates in this country for a 13 century were set via the exercise of the commerce power 14 15 in a way in which some people paid rates that were much higher than their costs in order to subsidize --16 17 JUSTICE SCALIA: Only if you make phone 18 calls. GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, right. But -- but 19 20 everybody -- to live in the modern world, everybody needs a telephone. And the -- the same thing with 21 22 respect to the -- you know, the dairy price supports 23 that -- that the Court upheld in Wrightwood Dairy and 24 Rock Royal. You can look at those as disadvantageous

25 contracts, as forced transfers, that -- you know, I

34

Official - Subject to Final Review

1	suppose it's theoretically true that you could raise
2	your kids without milk, but the reality is you've got to
3	go to the store and buy milk. And the commerce power
4	as a result of the exercise of the commerce power,
5	you're subsidizing somebody else
6	JUSTICE KAGAN: And this is especially true,
7	isn't it, General
8	GENERAL VERRILLI: because that's the
9	judgment Congress has made.
10	JUSTICE KAGAN: Verrilli, because in this
11	context, the subsidizers eventually become the
12	subsidized?
13	GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, that was the point
14	I was trying to make, Justice Kagan, that you're young
15	and healthy one day, but you don't stay that way. And
16	the the system works over time. And so I just don't
17	think it's a fair characterization of it. And it does
18	get back to, I think a problem I think is important
19	to understand
20	JUSTICE SCALIA: We're not stupid. They're
21	going to buy insurance later. They're young and and
22	need the money now.
23	GENERAL VERRILLI: But that's
24	JUSTICE SCALIA: When when they think
25	they have a substantial risk of incurring high medical

35

1 bills, they'll buy insurance, like the rest of us.
2 But --

GENERAL VERRILLI: That's -- that's --3 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- I don't know why you 4 5 think that they're never going to buy it. 6 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's the problem, 7 Justice Scalia. That's -- and that's exactly the experience that the States had that made the imposition 8 of guaranteed-issue and community rating not only be 9 10 ineffectual but be highly counterproductive. Rates, for 11 example, in New Jersey doubled or tripled, went from 180,000 people covered in this market down to 80,000 12 people covered in this market. 13

14 In Kentucky, virtually every insurer left the market. And the reason for that is because when 15 16 people have that guarantee of -- that they can get insurance, they're going to make that calculation that 17 18 they won't get it until they're sick and they need it, 19 and so the pool of people in the insurance market gets 20 smaller and smaller. The rates you have to charge to cover them get higher and higher. It helps fewer and 21 22 fewer -- insurance covers fewer and fewer people until 23 the system ends.

This is not a situation in which you're conscripting -- you're forcing insurance companies to

36

1 cover very large numbers of unhealthy people --JUSTICE SCALIA: You could solve that 2 3 problem by simply not requiring the insurance company to sell it to somebody who has a -- a condition that is 4 going to require medical treatment, or at least not --5 6 not require them to sell it to him at -- at a rate that 7 he sells it to healthy people. 8 But you don't want to do that. GENERAL VERRILLI: But that seems to me to 9 say, Justice Scalia, that Congress -- that's the problem 10 here. And that seems to be --11 12 JUSTICE SCALIA: That seems to me a 13 self-created problem. 14 GENERAL VERRILLI: Congress cannot solve the 15 problem through standard economic regulation, and that -- and -- and I do not think that can be the 16 premise of our understanding of the Commerce Clause --17 18 JUSTICE SCALIA: Whatever --19 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- this is an economic 20 problem --JUSTICE SCALIA: -- whatever problems 21 2.2 Congress's economic regulation produces, whatever they 23 are, I think Congress can do something to counteract 24 them. Here, requiring somebody to enter -- to enter the 25 insurance market.

37

1	GENERAL VERRILLI: This is not a it's not
2	a problem of Congress's creation. The problem is that
3	you have 40 million people who cannot get affordable
4	insurance through the means that the rest of us get
5	affordable insurance. Congress, after a long study and
6	careful deliberation, and viewing the experiences of the
7	States and the way they tried to handle this problem,
8	adopted a package of reforms. Guaranteed-issue and
9	community rating, and and subsidies and the minimum
10	coverage provision are a package of reforms that solve
11	that problem.
12	I don't I think it's highly artificial to
13	view this as a problem of Congress's own creation.
14	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Is your argument
15	limited to insurance or means of paying for health care?
16	GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes. It's limited to
17	insurance.
18	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, now why is
19	that? Congress could once you once you establish
20	that you have a market for health care, I would suppose
21	Congress's power under the Commerce Clause meant they
22	had a broad scope in terms of how they regulate that
23	market. And it would be it would be going back to
24	Lochner if we were put in the position of saying no, you
25	can use your commerce power to regulate insurance but

25 can use your commerce power to regulate insurance, but

38

you can't use your commerce power to regulate this market in other ways. I think that would be a very significant intrusion by the Court into Congress's power.

5 So I don't see how we can accept your --6 it's good for you in this case to say oh, it's just 7 insurance. But once we say that there is a market and 8 Congress can require people to participate in it, as some would say -- or as you would say, that people are 9 already participating in it -- it seems to me that we 10 11 can't say there are limitations on what Congress can do under its commerce power, just like in any other area, 12 all -- given significant deference that we accord to 13 14 Congress in this area, all bets are off, and you could 15 regulate that market in any rational way. GENERAL VERRILLI: But this is insurance as 16 a method of payment for health care services --17 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Exactly. 19 GENERAL VERRILLI: And that -- and that 20 is --CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And you're 21 22 worried -- that's the area that Congress has chosen to 23 There's this health care market. Everybody's regulate. 24 in it. So we can regulate it, and we're going to look

25 at a particular serious problem, which is how people pay

39

for it. But next year, they can decide everybody's in this market, we're going to look at a different problem now, and this is how we're going to regulate it. And we can compel people to do things -- purchase insurance, in this case. Something else in the next case, because you've -- we've accepted the argument that this is a market in which everybody participates.

8 GENERAL VERRILLI: Mr. Chief Justice, let me 9 answer that, and then if I may, I'd like to move to the 10 tax power argument.

11JUSTICE SCALIA: Can -- can I tell you what12the something else is so -- while you're answering it?13The something else is everybody has to exercise, because14there's no doubt that lack of exercise cause -- causes15illness, and that causes health care costs to go up.16So the Federal government says everybody has17to -- to join a -- an exercise club. That's -- that's

18 the something else.

19 GENERAL VERRILLI: No. The -- the position 20 we're taking here would not justify that rule, Justice 21 Scalia, because health club membership is not a means of 22 payment for -- for consumption of anything in -- in a 23 market.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right. Right.
25 That's -- that's exactly right, but it doesn't seem

40

responsive to my concern that there's no reason -- once we say this is within Congress's commerce power, there's no reason other than our own arbitrary judgment to say all they can regulate is the method of payment. They can regulate other things that affect this now-conceded interstate market in health care in which everybody participates.

8 GENERAL VERRILLI: But I think it's common ground between us and the Respondents that this is an 9 interstate market in which everybody participates. And 10 they agree that -- that Congress could impose the 11 12 insurance requirement at the point of sale. And this is just a question of timing, and whether Congress's --13 whether the necessary and proper authority gives 14 15 Congress, because of the particular features of this 16 market, the ability to impose the -- the insurance, the need for insurance, the maintenance of insurance before 17 you show up to get health care rather than at the moment 18 19 you get up to show --

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right. No, I
21 think -22 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- show up to get health

23 care. And that --

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- unless I'm
 missing something, I think you're just repeating the

41

idea that this is the regulation of the method of payment. And I understand that argument. And it may be -- it may be a good one. But what I'm concerned about is, once we accept the principle that everybody is in this market, I don't see why Congress's power is limited to regulating the method of payment and doesn't include as it does in any other area.

8 What other area have we said Congress can 9 regulate this market but only with respect to prices, 10 but only with respect to means of travel? No. Once 11 you're -- once you're in the interstate commerce and can 12 regulate it, pretty much all bets are off.

13 GENERAL VERRILLI: But we agree Congress can regulate this market. ERISA regulates this market. 14 15 HIPAA regulates this market. The -- the market is 16 regulated at the Federal level in very significant ways already. So I don't think that's the question, 17 18 Mr. Chief Justice. The question is, is there a limit to 19 the authority that we're advocating here under the 20 commerce power, and the answer is yes, because we are not advocating for a power that would allow Congress to 21 22 compel purchases --

JUSTICE ALITO: Could you just -- before you move on, could you express your limiting principle as succinctly as you possibly can? Congress can force

42

people to purchase a product where the failure to purchase the product has a substantial effect on interstate commerce -- if what? If this is part of a larger regulatory scheme? Was that it? Was there anything more?

6 GENERAL VERRILLI: We got two and they 7 are -- they are different. Let me state them. First 8 with respect to the comprehensive scheme. When Congress is regulating -- is enacting a comprehensive scheme that 9 10 it has the authority to enact that the Necessary and 11 Proper Clause gives it the authority to include regulation, including a regulation of this kind, if it 12 is necessary to counteract risks attributable to the 13 14 scheme itself that people engage in economic activity 15 that would undercut the scheme. It's like -- it's very 16 much like Wickard in that respect, very much like Raich in that respect. 17

18 With respect to the -- with respect to 19 the -- considering the Commerce Clause alone and not 20 embedded in the comprehensive scheme, our position is that Congress can regulate the method of payment by 21 2.2 imposing an insurance requirement in advance of the time 23 in which the -- the service is consumed when the class 24 to which that requirement applies either is or virtually 25 is most certain to be in that market when the timing of

43

1 one's entry into that market and what you will need when 2 you enter that market is uncertain and when -- when you will get the care in that market, whether you can afford 3 to pay for it or not and shift costs to other market 4 participants. 5 6 So those -- those are our views as to --7 those are the principles we are advocating for and it's, 8 in fact, the conjunction of the two of them here that makes this, we think, a strong case under the Commerce 9 Clause. 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, could you turn 11 12 to the tax clause? 13 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I have to look for a 14 15 case that involves the issue of whether something 16 denominated by Congress as a penalty was nevertheless treated as a tax, except in those situations where the 17 code itself or the statute itself said treat the penalty 18 19 as a tax. 20 Do you know of any case where we've done 21 that? 2.2 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I think I would 23 point the Court to the License Tax Case, where it was --24 was denominated a fee and nontax, and the Court upheld it as an exercise of the taxing power, in a situation in 25

44

which the structure of the law was very much the
 structure of this law, in that there was a separate
 stand-alone provision that set the predicate and then a
 separate provision in closing --

JUSTICE SCALIA: But fees, you know, license fees, fees for a hunting license, everybody knows those are taxes. I mean, I don't think there is as much of a difference between a fee and a tax as there is between a penalty and a tax.

10 GENERAL VERRILLI: And that, and -- and I 11 think in terms of the tax part, I think it's useful to 12 separate this into two questions. One is a question of 13 characterization. Can this be characterized as a tax; 14 and second, is it a constitutional exercise of the 15 power?

With respect to the question of characterization, the -- this is -- in the Internal Revenue Code, it is administered by the IRS, it is paid on your Form 1040 on April 15th, I think --

JUSTICE GINSBURG: But yesterday you told me -- you listed a number of penalties that are enforced through the tax code that are not taxes and they are not penalties related to taxes.

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: They may still be
25 exercise of the tax -- exercises of the taxing power,

45

1	Justice Ginsburg, as as this is, and I think there
2	isn't a case in which the Court has, to my mind,
3	suggested anything that bears this many indicia of a tax
4	can't be considered as an exercise of the taxing power.
5	In fact, it seems to me the License Tax Cases point you
6	in the opposite direction. And beyond that your
7	the it seems to me the right way to think about this
8	question is whether it is capable of being understood as
9	an exercise of the tax.
10	JUSTICE SCALIA: The President said it
11	wasn't a tax, didn't he?
12	GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, Justice Scalia,
13	what the two things about that, first, as it seems to
14	me, what matters is what power Congress was exercising.
15	And they were and I think it's clear that that
16	the the they were exercising the tax power as well
17	as
18	JUSTICE SCALIA: You're making two
19	arguments. Number one, it's a tax; and number two, even
20	if it isn't a tax, it's within the taxing power. I'm
21	just addressing the first.
22	GENERAL VERRILLI: If the President said
23	JUSTICE SCALIA: Is it a tax or not a tax?
24	The President didn't think it was.
25	GENERAL VERRILLI: The President said it

46

Official - Subject to Final Review

1 wasn't a tax increase because it ought to be understood 2 as an incentive to get people to have insurance. I don't think it's fair to infer from that anything about 3 whether that is an exercise of the tax power or not. 4 5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: A tax is to raise 6 revenue, tax is a revenue-raising device, and the 7 purpose of this exaction is to get people into the health care risk -- risk pool before they need medical 8 care, and so it will be successful. If it doesn't raise 9 any revenue, if it gets people to buy the insurance, 10 that's -- that's what this penalty is -- this penalty is 11 12 designed to affect conduct.

The conduct is buy health protection, buy health insurance before you have a need for medical care. That's what the penalty is designed to do, not to raise revenue.

GENERAL VERRILLI: That -- that is true, Justice Ginsburg. This is also true of the marijuana tax that was withheld in Sanchez. That's commonly true of penalties under the Code. They do -- if they raise revenue, they are exercises of the taxing power, but their purpose is not to raise revenue. Their purpose is to discourage behavior.

I mean, the -- the mortgage deduction works
that way. When the mortgage deduction is -- it's

47

clearly an exercise of the taxing power. When it's
 successful it raises less revenue for the Federal
 Government. It's still an exercise of the taxing power.
 So, I don't --

5 JUSTICE KAGAN: I suppose, though, General, 6 one question is whether the determined efforts of 7 Congress not to refer to this as a tax make a 8 difference. I mean, you're suggesting we should just look to the practical operation. We shouldn't look at 9 10 labels. And that seems right, except that here we have a case in which Congress determinedly said this is not a 11 tax, and the question is why should that be irrelevant? 12 I don't think that that's 13 GENERAL VERRILLI: 14 a fair characterization of the actions of Congress here, 15 Justice Kagan. On the -- December 23rd, a point of constitutional order was called to, in fact, with 16 respect to this law. The floor sponsor, Senator Baucus, 17 18 defended it as an exercise of the taxing power. In his 19 response to the point of order, the Senate voted 60 to39 20 on that proposition.

The legislative history is replete with members of Congress explaining that this law is constitutional as an exercise of the taxing power. It was attacked as a tax by its opponents. So I don't think this is a situation where you can say that

48

1 Congress was avoiding any mention of the tax power. It would be one thing if Congress explicitly 2 disavowed an exercise of the tax power. But given that 3 it hasn't done so, it seems to me that it's -- not only 4 5 is it fair to read this as an exercise of the tax power, 6 but this Court has got an obligation to construe it as 7 an exercise of the tax power, if it can be upheld on 8 that basis. 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Why didn't Congress call it a tax, then? 10 11 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well --12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You're telling me they thought of it as a tax, they defended it on the tax 13 power. Why didn't they say it was a tax? 14 15 GENERAL VERRILLI: They might have thought, 16 Your Honor, that calling it a penalty as they did would 17 make it more effective in accomplishing its objective. 18 But it is -- in the Internal Revenue Code it is 19 collected by the IRS on April 15th. I don't think this 20 is a situation in which you can say --CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, that's the 21 22 They thought it might be more effective if they reason. 23 called it a penalty. 24 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I -- you know, I don't -- there is nothing that I know of that -- that 25

49

1 illuminates that, but certainly --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, the problem 2 goes back to the limiting principle. Is this simply 3 anything that raises revenue that Congress can do? 4 5 GENERAL VERRILLI: No. There are certain 6 limiting principles under the --7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So there has to be a limiting principle --8 9 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- taxing power, and they -- and I think, of course, the Constitution imposes 10 some, got to be uniform, can't be taxed on exports, if 11 12 it's a direct tax, it's got to be apportioned. Beyond that, the limiting principle, as the Court has 13 14 identified from Drexel Furniture to Kurth Ranch, is that 15 it can't be punishment, punitive in the quise of a tax. And there are three factors of Court has identified to 16 look at that. 17 18 The first is the sanction and how 19 disproportionate it is to the conduct; the second is 20 whether there is scienter; and the third is whether there is an -- an -- an administrative apparatus out 21 2.2 there to enforce the tax. 23 Now in -- in Bailey v. Drexel Furniture, for 24 example, the tax was 10 percent of the company's profits, even if they had only one child laborer for one 25

50

1	day. There was a scienter requirement, and it was
2	enforced by the Department of Labor. It wasn't just
3	collected by the Internal Revenue Service.
4	Here you don't have any of those things.
5	This the the penalty is calculated to be no more
6	than, at most, the equivalent of what one would have
7	paid for insurance if you forgone. There is no scienter
8	requirement, there is no enforcement apparatus out
9	there. So, certain
10	JUSTICE ALITO: Can the can the mandate
11	be viewed as tax if it does impose a requirement on
12	people who are not subject to the penalty or the tax?
13	GENERAL VERRILLI: I think it could, for the
14	reasons I I discussed yesterday. I don't think it
15	can or should be read that way. But if there is any
16	doubt about that, Your Honor, if there is if if it
17	is the view of the Court that it can't be, then I think
18	the the right way to handle this case is by analogy
19	to New York v. United States, in which the the Court
20	read the shall provision, shall handle the level of
21	radioactive waste as setting the predicate, and then the
22	other provisions were merely incentives to get the
23	predicate met, and so
24	JUSTICE SCALIA: You're saying that all the

25 discussion we had earlier about how this is one big

51

Official - Subject to Final Review

1 uniform scheme and the Commerce Clause blah, blah, blah, it really doesn't matter. This is a tax and the Federal 2 Government could simply have said, without all of the 3 rest of this legislation, could simply have said 4 5 everybody who doesn't buy health insurance at a certain 6 age will be taxed so much money, right? 7 GENERAL VERRILLI: It -- it used its powers 8 together to solve the problem of the market not --9 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes, but you didn't need that. 10 11 GENERAL VERRILLI -- providing for the --JUSTICE SCALIA: You didn't need that. If 12 it's a tax, it's only -- raising money is enough. 13 GENERAL VERRILLI: It's justifiable under 14 15 its tax power. 16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Extraordinary. 17 GENERAL VERRILLI: If I may reserve the balance of my time. 18 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 20 gentlemen. We'll take a pause for a minute or so, Mr. Clement. 21 2.2 (Pause.) 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Why don't we get 24 started again. Mr. Clement. 25

52

1	ORAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL D. CLEMENT
2	ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS FLORIDA, ET AL.
3	MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chief Justice and may it
4	please the Court. The mandate represents an
5	unprecedented effort by Congress to compel individuals
6	to enter commerce in order to better regulate commerce.
7	The Commerce Clause gives Congress the power
8	to regulate existing commerce. It does not give
9	Congress the far greater power to compel people to enter
10	commerce to create commerce essentially in the first
11	place.
12	Now, Congress when it passed the statute did
13	make findings about why it thought it could regulate the
14	commerce here, and it justified the mandate as a
15	regulation of the economic decision to forego the
16	purchase of health insurance. That is a theory without
17	any limiting principle.
18	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Do you accept your
19	the General's position that you have conceded that
20	Congress could say, if you're going to consume health
21	services, you have to pay by way of insurance?
22	MR. CLEMENT: That's right,
23	Justice Sotomayor. We say, consistent with 220 years of
24	this Court's jurisprudence, that if you regulate the
25	point of sale, you regulate commerce, that's within

53

1 Congress' commerce power.

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So what do you do with the impossibility of buying insurance at the point of consumption. Virtually, you force insurance companies to sell it to you?

MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice, I think there 6 7 is two points to make on that. One is, a lot of the 8 discussion this morning so far has proceeded on the assumption that the only thing that is at issue here is 9 10 emergency room visits, and the only thing that's being 11 imposed is catastrophic care coverage; but, as the Chief Justice indicated earlier, a lot of the insurance that's 12 being covered is for ordinary preventive care, ordinary 13 14 office visits, and those are the kinds of things that 15 one can predict.

So there is a big part of the market that's 16 regulated here that wouldn't pose the problem that 17 you're suggesting; but, even as to emergency room 18 19 visits, it certainly would be possible to regulate at 20 that point. You could simply say, through some sort of mandate on the insurance companies, you have to provide 21 22 people that come in -- this will be a high-risk pool, 23 and maybe you will have to share it amongst yourself or 24 something, but people simply have to sign up at that point, and that would be regulating at the point of 25

54

1 sale.

JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, Mr. Clement, now it seems as though you're just talking about a matter of timing; that Congress can regulate the transaction, and the question is when does it make best sense to regulate that transaction?

7 And Congress surely has within its authority 8 to decide, rather than at the point of sale, given an 9 insurance-based mechanism, it makes sense to regulate it 10 earlier. It's just a matter of timing.

11 MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Kagan, we don't think it's a matter of timing alone, and we think it has 12 very substantive effects. Because if Congress tried to 13 regulate at the point of sale, the one group that it 14 wouldn't capture at all are the people who don't want to 15 purchase health insurance and also have no plans of 16 using health care services in the near term. 17 And 18 Congress very much wanted to capture those people. I 19 mean, those people are essentially the golden geese that 20 pay for the entire lowering of the premium. 21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Was the government's 22 argument this -- and maybe I won't state it 23 accurately -- it is true that the noninsured young adult 24 is, in fact, an actuarial reality insofar as our

25 allocation of health services, insofar as the way health

55

1 insurance companies figure risks? That person who is sitting at home in his or 2 her living room doing nothing is an actuarial reality 3 that can and must be measured for health service 4 purposes; is that their argument? 5 6 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I don't know, 7 Justice Kennedy, but, if it is, I think there is at least two problems with it. 8 9 One is, as Justice Alito's question suggested earlier, I mean, somebody who is not in the 10 11 insurance market is sort of irrelevant as an actuarial I mean, we could look at the people not in the 12 risk. insurance market, and what we'd find is that they're 13 relatively young, relatively healthy, and they would 14 15 have a certain pool of actuarial risks that would 16 actually lead to lower premiums. 17 The people that would be captured by guaranteed rating and community issue -- guaranteed 18 19 issue and community rating would presumably have a 20 higher risk profile, and there would be higher premiums. 21 And one of the things, one of the things 22 Congress sought to accomplish here, was to force 23 individuals into the insurance market to subsidize those 24 that are already in it to lower the rates. And that's just not my speculation, that's Finding I at 43A of the 25

56

1 government's brief that -- it has the statute. And 2 that's one of the clear findings.

JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Clement, doesn't that 3 work -- that work the way Social Security does? 4 5 Let me put it this way. Congress, in the 6 '30s, saw a real problem of people needing to have old 7 age and survivor's insurance. And yes, they did it through a tax, but they said everybody has got to be in 8 it because if we don't have the healthy in it, there's 9 not going to be the money to pay for the ones who become 10 11 old or disabled or widowed. So they required everyone 12 to contribute. It was a big fuss about that in the 13 beginning because a lot of people said -- maybe some 14 15 people still do today -- I could do much better if the 16 government left me alone. I'd go into the private market, I'd buy an annuity, I'd make a great investment, 17 18 and they're forcing me to paying for this Social 19 Security that I don't want; but, that's constitutional. 20 So if Congress could see this as a problem when we need to have a group that will subsidize the 21 22 ones who are going to get the benefits, it seems to me

24 government does it itself; it can't involve the private 25 market, it can't involve the private insurers. If it

you are saying the only way that could be done is if the

23

57

1 wants to do this, Social Security is its model. The 2 government has to do -- has to be government takeover. 3 We can't have the insurance industry in it. Is that 4 your position?

5 MR. CLEMENT: No. I don't think it is, 6 Justice Ginsburg. I think there are other options that 7 are available.

8 The most straightforward one would be to figure out what amount of subsidy to the insurance 9 industry is necessary to pay for guaranteed issue and 10 community rating. And once we calculate the amount of 11 12 that subsidy, we could have a tax that's spread generally through everybody to raise the revenue to pay 13 for that subsidy. That's the way we pay for most 14 15 subsidies.

16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Could we have an exemption? Could the government say, everybody pays a 17 shared health care responsibility payment to offset all 18 19 the money that we are forced to spend on health care, we 20 the government; but, anybody who has an insurance policy is exempt from that tax? Could the government do that? 21 22 MR. CLEMENT: The government might be able 23 to do that. I think it might raise some issues about 24 whether or not that would be a valid exercise of the 25 taxing power.

58

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Under what theory 2 wouldn't it be? MR. CLEMENT: Well, I do think that --3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: We get tax credits for 4 5 having solar-powered homes. We get tax credits for using fuel efficient cars. Why couldn't we get a tax 6 7 credit for having health insurance and saving the government from caring for us. 8 9 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I think it would depend a little bit on how it was formulated; but, my concern 10 11 would be -- the constitutional concern would be that it would just be a disguised impermissible direct tax. And 12 I do think -- I mean, I don't want to suggest we get to 13 the taxing power to soon, but I do think it's worth 14 realizing that the taxing power is limited in the 15 16 ability to impose direct taxes. 17 And the one thing I think the framers would 18 have clearly identified as a direct tax is a tax on not 19 having something. 20 I mean, the framing generation was divided over whether a tax on carriages was a direct tax or not. 21 22 Hamilton thought that was a indirect tax; Madison 23 thought it was a direct tax. I have little doubt that 24 both of them would have agreed that a tax on not having a carriage would have clearly been a direct tax. I also 25

59

think they would have thought it clearly wasn't a valid
 regulation of the market in carriages.

And, you know, I mean, if you look at Hilton against the United States, that's this Court's first direct tax --

JUSTICE BREYER: Let me ask -- can I go back
for a step, because I don't want to get into a
discussion of whether this is a good bill or not. Some
people think it's going to save a lot of money. Some
people think it won't.

11 So I'm focusing just on the Commerce Clause; 12 not on the Due Process Clause, the Commerce Clause. And 13 I look back into history, and I think if we look back 14 into history we see sometimes Congress can create 15 commerce out of nothing. That's the national bank, 16 which was created out of nothing to create other 17 commerce out of nothing.

I look back into history, and I see it seems pretty clear that if there are substantial effects on interstate commerce, Congress can act.

And I look at the person who's growing marijuana in her house, or I look at the farmer who is growing the wheat for home consumption. This seems to have more substantial effects.

25 Is this commerce? Well, it seems to me more

60

1 commerce than marijuana. I mean, is it, in fact, a
2 regulation? Well, why not? If creating a bank is, why
3 isn't this?

And then you say, ah, but one thing here out of all those things is different, and that is you're making somebody do something.

I say, hey, can't Congress make people drive faster than 45 -- 40 miles an hour on a road? Didn't they make that man growing his own wheat go into the market and buy other wheat for his -- for his cows? Didn't they make Mrs. -- if she married somebody who had marijuana in her basement, wouldn't she have to go and get rid of it? Affirmative action?

I mean, where does this distinction come from? It sounds like sometimes you can, and sometimes you can't.

So what is argued here is there is a large group of -- what about a person that we discover that there are -- a disease is sweeping the United States, and 40 million people are susceptible, of whom 10 million will die; can't the Federal Government say all 40 million get inoculation? So here, we have a group of 40 million, and

24 57 percent of those people visit emergency care or other 25 care, which we are paying for. And 22 percent of those

61

Official - Subject to Final Review

1 pay more than \$100,000 for that. And Congress says they 2 are in the midst of this big thing. We just want to rationalize this system they are already in. 3 So, there, you got the whole argument, and I 4 would like you to tell me --5 6 JUSTICE SCALIA: We'll get to those 7 questions in inverse order. 8 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, no, it's one question. It's looking back at that -- looking back at 9 10 that history. The thing I can see that you say to some 11 12 people, go buy; why does that make a difference in terms of the Commerce Clause? 13 MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Breyer, let me 14 start at the beginning of your question with McCulloch. 15 McCulloch was not a commerce power case. 16 JUSTICE BREYER: It was both? 17 18 MR. CLEMENT: No, the bank was not justified 19 and the corporation was not justified as an exercise of 20 commerce power. So that is not a case that says that it's okay to conjure up the bank as an exercise of the 21 2.2 commerce power. 23 What, of course, the Court didn't say, and I 24 think the Court would have had a very different reaction 25 to, is, you know, we are not just going to have the

62

1 bank, because that wouldn't be necessary and proper, we 2 are going to force the citizenry to put all of their 3 money in the bank, because, if we do that, then we know 4 the Bank of the United States will be secure.

I think the framers would have identified the difference between those two scenarios, and I don't think that the great Chief Justice would have said that forcing people to put their deposits in the Bank of the United States was necessary and proper.

Now, if you look through all the cases you 10 mentioned, I do not think you will find a case like 11 12 this. And I think it's telling that you won't. I mean, the regulation of the wheat market in Wickard against 13 14 Filburn, all this effort to address the supply side and 15 what producers could do, what Congress was trying to do was support the price of wheat. It would have been much 16 more efficient to just make everybody in America buy 10 17 18 loaves of bread. That would have had a much more direct 19 effect on the price of wheat in the prevailing market.

But we didn't do that. We didn't say when we had problems in the automobile industry that we are not just going to give you incentives, not just cash for clunkers, we are going to actually have ever everybody over 100,000 has to buy a new car --

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Clement,

63

the key to the government's argument to the contrary is that everybody is in this market. It's all right to regulate Wickard -- again, in Wickard against Filburn, because that's a particular market in which the farmer had been participating.

Everybody is in this market, so that makes it very different than the market for cars or the other hypotheticals that you came up with, and all they're regulating is how you pay for it.

10 MR. CLEMENT: Well, with respect, Mr. Chief Justice, I suppose the first thing you have to say is 11 12 what market are we talking about? Because the government -- this statute undeniably operates in the 13 14 health insurance market. And the government can't say 15 that everybody is in that market. The whole problem is 16 that everybody is not in that market, and they want to make everybody get into that market. 17

JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, doesn't that seem a little bit, Mr. Clement, cutting the bologna thin? I mean, health insurance exists only for the purpose of financing health care. The two are inextricably interlinked. We don't get insurance so that we can stare at our insurance certificate. We get it so that we can go and access health care.

25 MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Kagan, I'm not

64

1 sure that's right. I think what health insurance does and what all insurance does is it allows you to 2 diversify risk. And so it's not just a matter of I'm 3 paying now instead I'm paying later. That's credit. 4 5 Insurance is different than credit. Insurance 6 quarantees you an upfront, locked-in payment, and you 7 won't have to pay any more than that even if you incur 8 much great expenses.

9 And in every other market that I know of for 10 insurance, we let people basically make the decision 11 whether they are relatively risk averse, whether they 12 are relatively non-risk averse, and they can make the 13 judgment based on --

14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But we don't in car 15 insurance, meaning we tell people, buy car -- not we, 16 the states do, although you're going to -- I'll ask you the question, do you think that if some states decided 17 18 not to impose an insurance requirement, that the Federal 19 Government would be without power to legislate and 20 require every individual to buy car insurance? MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Sotomayor, let 21 me say this, which is to say -- you're right in the 22 23 first point to say that it's the states that do it, 24 which makes it different right there. But it's also --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, that goes back to 25

65

the substantive due process question. Is this a Lochner era argument that only the states can do this, even though it affects commerce? Cars indisputably affect commerce. So are you arguing that because the states have done it all along, the Federal Government is no longer permitted to legislate in this area?

7 MR. CLEMENT: No. I think you might make a 8 different argument about cars than you would make about 9 health insurance, unless you tried to say -- but, you 10 know, we're --

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Health insurance -- I mean, I've never gotten into an accident, thankfully, and I hope never. The vast majority of people have never gotten into an accident where they have injured others; yet, we pay for it dutifully every year on the possibility that at some point we might get into that accident.

MR. CLEMENT: But, Justice Sotomayor, what I think is different is there is lots of people in Manhattan, for example, that don't have car insurance because they don't have cars. And so they have the option of withdrawing from that market. It's not a direct imposition from the government.

24 So even the car market is difference from 25 this market, where there is no way to get outside of the

66

1 regulatory web. And that's, I think, one of the real 2 problems with this because, I mean, we take as a 3 given --

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But you're -- but the given is that virtually everyone, absent some intervention from above, meaning that someone's life will be cut short in a fatal way, virtually everyone will use health care.

9 MR. CLEMENT: At some point, that's right, 10 but all sorts of people will not, say, use health care 11 in the next year, which is the relevant period for the 12 insurance.

JUSTICE BREYER: But do you think you can, better than the actuaries or better than the members of Congress who worked on it, look at the 40 million people who are not insured and say which ones next year will or will not use, say, emergency care?

Can you do that any better than if we knew that 40 million people were suffering, about to suffer a contagious disease, and only 10 million would get sick --

22 MR. CLEMENT: Of course not --

JUSTICE BREYER: -- and we don't know which?
 MR. CLEMENT: Of course not, Justice Breyer,
 but the point is that once Congress decides it's going

67

1 to regulate extant commerce, it is going to get all 2 sorts of latitude to make the right judgments about 3 actuarial predictions, which actuarial to rely on, which 4 one not to rely on.

5 The question that's a proper question for 6 this Court, though, is whether or not, for the first 7 time ever in our history, Congress also has the power to 8 compel people into commerce, because, it turns out, that 9 would be a very efficient things for purposes of 10 Congress' optimal regulation of that market.

JUSTICE KAGAN: But, Mr. Clement, this goes back to the Chief Justice's question. But, of course, the theory behind, not just the government's case, but the theory behind this law is that people are in this market right now, and they are in this market because people do get sick, and because when people get sick, we provide them with care without making them pay.

18 And it that would be different, you know, if 19 you were up here saying, I represent a class of 20 Christian scientists. Then you might be able to say, look, you know, why are they bothering me. But absent 21 22 that, you're in this market. You're an economic actor. 23 MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Kagan, once 24 again, it depends on which market we're talking about. 25 If we're talking about the health care insurance

68

1 market --

JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, we are talking about the health insurance market, which is designed to access the health care market.

5 MR. CLEMENT: And with respect to the health 6 insurance market that's designed to have payment in the 7 health care market, everybody is not in the market. And 8 that's the premise of the statute, and that's the 9 problem Congress is trying to solve.

And if it tried to solve it through incentives, we wouldn't be here; but, it's trying to solve it in a way that nobody has ever tried to solve an economic problem before, which is saying, you know, it would be so much more efficient if you were just in this market --

JUSTICE KENNEDY: But they are in the market in the sense that they are creating a risk that the market must account for.

MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Kennedy, I don't think that's right, certainly in any way that distinguishes this from any other context. When I'm sitting in my house deciding I'm not to buy a car, I am causing the labor market in Detroit to go south. I am causing maybe somebody to lose their job, and for everybody to have to pay for it under welfare. So the

69

1 cost shifting that the government tries to uniquely to associate with this market, it is everywhere. 2 And even more to the point, the rationale 3 that they think ultimately supports this legislation, 4 5 that look, it's an economic decision, once you make the 6 economic decision, we aggregate the decision, there is a 7 substantial effect on commerce. That argument works here. It works in every single industry. 8 9 JUSTICE BREYER: Of course we do know that there are a few people, more in New York City than there 10 are in Wyoming, who never will buy a car. But we also 11 12 know here, and we don't like to admit it, that because we are human beings we all suffer from the risk of 13 getting sick. And we also all know that we'll get 14 15 seriously sick. And we also know that we can't predict 16 when. And we also know that when we do, there will be our fellow taxpayers through the Federal Government who 17 will pay for this. If we do not buy insurance, we will 18 19 pay nothing. And that happens with a large number of 20 people in this group of 40 million, none of whom can be picked out in advance. 21 2.2 Now, that's guite different from a car

23 situation, and it's different in only this respect. It 24 shows there is a national problem, and it shows there is 25 a national problem that involves money, cost insurance.

70

1 So if Congress could do this, should there be a disease 2 that strikes the United States and they want every one 3 inoculated even though ten million will be hurt, it's 4 hard for me to decide why that isn't interstate 5 commerce, even more so where we know it affects 6 everybody.

7 MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Breyer, there 8 are other markets that affect every one: 9 transportation, food, burial services, though we don't 10 like to talk about that either. There also are 11 situations where there are many economic effects from 12 somebody's failure to purchase a product.

And if I could, if I could talk about the 13 14 difference between the health insurance market and the 15 health care market, I mean, ultimately I don't want you to leave here with the impression that anything turns on 16 that. Because if the government decided tomorrow that 17 they would come up with a great -- some of these -- some 18 19 private companies come up with a great new wonder drug 20 that would be great for everybody to take, would have huge health benefits for everybody; and by the way, also 21 2.2 if everybody had to buy it, it would facilitate 23 economies of scale, and the production would be great, 24 and the price would be cheaper and force everybody in 25 the health care market, the actual health care market to

71

1 buy the wonder drug, I'd be up here making the same argument. I would be saying that's not a power that's 2 within the commerce power of the Federal Government. 3 Τt is something much greater. And it would have been much 4 5 more controversial. That's why the important things. 6 In Federalist 45, Madison says the commerce power. 7 That's a new power, but it's not one anyone has any 8 apprehension about.

9 The reason they didn't have any apprehension about it is because it's a power that only operated once 10 11 people were already in commerce. You see that from the 12 text of the clause. The first kind of commerce Congress gets to regulate is commerce with foreign nations. Did 13 14 anybody think the fledgling Republic had the power to 15 compel some other nation into commerce with us? Of 16 course not. And in the same way, I think if the framers had understood the commerce power to include the power 17 18 to compel people to engage in commerce --

19JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, once again though,20who's in commerce and what are they in commerce?21If the effect of all these uninsured people22is to raise everybody's premiums, not just when they get23sick, if they get sick, but right now in the aggregate,24and Wickard and Raich tell us we should look at the

25 aggregate, and the aggregate of all these uninsured

72

people are increasing the normal family premium,
 Congress says, by a thousand dollars a year. Those
 people are in commerce. They are making decisions that
 are affecting the price that everybody pays for this
 service.

6 MR. CLEMENT: Justice Kagan, again, with all 7 due respect, I don't think that's a limiting principle. 8 My unwillingness to buy an electric car is forcing up 9 the price of an electric car. If only more people 10 demanded an electric car there would be economies of 11 scale, and the price would go down.

JUSTICE KAGAN: Not necessarily, Mr. Clement. And it's different because of the nature of the health care service, that you are entitled to health care when you go to an emergency room, when you go to a doctor, even if you can't pay for it. So the difference between your hypotheticals and the real case is the problem of uncompensated care which --

MR. CLEMENT: Justice Kagan, first of all, I do think there -- this is not the only place where there's uncompensated care. If some -- if I don't buy a car and somebody goes on welfare, I'm going to end up paying for that as well.

24 But let me also say that there is a real 25 disconnect then between that focus on what makes this

73

different and statute that Congresses passed. If all we were concerned about is the cost sharing that took place because of uncompensated care in emergency rooms, presumably we have before us a statute that only addressed emergency care and catastrophic insurance coverage. But it covers everything, soup to nuts, and all sorts of other things.

8 And that gets at the idea that there is two kinds of cost shifting that are going on here. One is 9 the concern about emergency care and that somehow 10 somebody who gets sick is going to shift costs back to 11 12 other policy areas -- holders. But there is a much bigger cost shifting going on here, and that's the cost 13 14 shifting that goes on when you force healthy people into 15 an insurance market precisely because they are healthy, precisely because they are not likely to go to the 16 emergency room, precisely because they are not likely to 17 18 use the insurance they are forced to buy in the health 19 care insurance. That creates a huge windfall. It 20 lowers the price of premiums.

And again, this is not just some lawyer up here telling you that's what it does and trying to second-guess the congressional economic decisions. This is Congress's findings, findings I on page 43 A of the appendix to the government's --

74

JUSTICE BREYER: All that sounds like you're 1 debating the merits of the bill. You ask really for 2 limiting principles so we don't get into a matter that I 3 think has nothing to do with this case: broccoli, okay? 4 5 And the limiting principles, you've heard 6 three. First, the Solicitor General came up with a 7 couple joined, very narrow ones. You've seen in Lopez this Court say that we cannot, Congress cannot get into 8 purely local affairs, particularly where they are 9 10 noncommercial. And, of course, the greatest limiting principle of all, which not too many accept, so I'm not 11 going to emphasize that, is the limiting principle 12 derived from the fact that members of Congress are 13 elected from States and that 95 percent of the law of 14 the United States is State law. That is a principle 15 16 though enforced by the legislature.

The other two are principles, one written into Lopez and one you just heard. It seems to me all of those eliminate the broccoli possibility, and none of them eliminates the possibility that we are trying to take the 40 million people who do have the medical cost, who do affect interstate commerce and provide a system that you may like or not like.

That's where we are in limiting principles.MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Breyer, let me

75

Official - Subject to Final Review

1 take them in turn. I would encourage this Court not to Garcia-ize the Commerce Clause and just simply say it's 2 up to Congress to police the Commerce Clause. So I 3 don't think that is a limiting principle. 4 5 Second of all --6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Yes, but that's exactly what Justice Marshall said in Gibbons. He said that it 7 8 is the power to regulate, the power like all others vested in Congress is complete in itself, may be 9 exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no 10 11 limitations other than those prescribed in the 12 Constitution. But there is no conscription in the, set forth in the Constitution with respect to regulating 13 14 commerce. 15 MR. CLEMENT: I agree 100 percent, and I 16 think that was the Chief Justice's point which was once you open the door to compelling people into commerce 17 18 based on the narrow rationales that exist in this 19 industry, you are not going to be able to stop that 20 process. JUSTICE SCALIA: I would like hear you 21 address Justice Breyer's other, other two principles. 22 23 MR. CLEMENT: Well, the other two principles 24 are Lopez -- and this case really is not -- I mean, you know, Lopez is a limit on the affirmative exercise of 25

76

people who are already in commerce. The question is, is
 there any other limit to people who aren't in commerce?
 And so I think this is the case that really asks that
 question.

5 And then the first point which was I take it 6 to be the Solicitor General's point is, with all due 7 respect, simply a description of the insurance market. It's not a limiting principle, because the justification 8 for why this is a valid regulation of commerce is in no 9 10 way limited to this market. It simply says, these are economic decisions, they have effect on other people, my 11 12 failure to purchase in this market has a direct effect on others who are already in the market. That's true of 13 14 virtually every other market under the sun.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And now maybe return16 to Justice Sotomayor's question.

MR. CLEMENT: I'd be delighted to, which is 17 -- I mean, I -- you are absolutely right. Once you're 18 19 in the commerce power, there is not -- this Court is not 20 going to police that subject maybe to the Lopez limit. And that's exactly why I think it's very important for 21 22 this Court to think seriously about taking an 23 unprecedented step of saying that the commerce power not 24 only includes the power to regulate, prescribe the rule by which commerce is governed, the rule of Gibbons v. 25

77

Ogden. But to go further and say it's not just
 prescribing the rule for commerce that exists but is the
 power to compel people to enter into commerce in the
 first place.

5 I would like to say two very brief things 6 about the taxing power, if I could. There are lots of 7 reasons why this isn't a tax. It wasn't denominated a It's not structured as a tax. If it's any tax at 8 tax. all, though, it is a direct tax. Article I, Section 9, 9 clause 4, the Framers would have had no doubt that a tax 10 11 on not having something is not an excise tax but a 12 forbidden direct tax. That's one more reason why this is not proper legislation because it violates that. 13

14 The second thing is I would urge you to read 15 the License Tax case which the Solicitor General says is 16 his best case for why you ignore the fact that a tax is denominated into something other. Because that is a 17 18 case where the argument was that because the Federal 19 government had passed a license not a tax, that somehow 20 that allowed people to take actions that would have been unlawful under State law, that this was some special 21 2.2 Federal license to do something that was forbidden by 23 This Court looked beyond the label in order State law. 24 to preserve federalism there. What the Solicitor 25 General and the government ask you to do here is exactly

78

1 the opposite, which is to look past labels in order to up-end our basic federalist system. 2 In this --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Would you tell me, do 3 you think the States could pass this mandate. 4 5 MR. CLEMENT: I represent 26 States. I do 6 think the States could pass this mandate, but I --7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Is there any other area 8 of commerce, business, where we have held that there is 9 a concurrent power between the State and the Federal 10 Government to protect the welfare of commerce? MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Sotomayor, I 11 12 have to resist your premise, because I didn't answer yes, the States can do it because it would be a valid 13 14 regulation of intrastate commerce. I said yes, the 15 States can do it because they have a police power, and that is the fundamental difference between the States on 16 the one hand and the limited, enumerated Federal 17 Government on the other. 18 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 20 Mr. Clement. Mr. Carvin. 21 2.2 ORAL ARGUMENT OF MICHAEL A. CARVIN 23 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS NFIB, ET AL. 24 MR. CARVIN: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, 25 may it please the Court:

79

I'd like to begin with the Solicitor General's main premise, which is that they can compel the purchase of health insurance in order to promote commerce in the health market because it will reduce uncompensated care. If you accept that argument, you have to fundamentally alter the text of the Constitution and give Congress plenary power.

8 It simply doesn't matter whether or not this regulation will promote health care commerce by reducing 9 10 uncompensated care; all that matters is whether the activity actually being regulated by the act negatively 11 affects Congress or negatively affects commerce 12 regulation, so that it's within the commerce power. 13 If you agree with us that this is -- exceeds commerce 14 15 power, the law doesn't somehow become redeemed because 16 it has beneficial policy effects in the health care 17 market.

In other words, Congress does not have the power to promote commerce. Congress has -- Congress has the power to regulate commerce. And if the power exceeds their permissible regulatory authority, then the law is invalid.

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, surely -24 MR. CARVIN: I'm sorry.
25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, surely

80

Official - Subject to Final Review

1 regulation includes the power to promote. Since the New Deal we've said that regulation in -- there is a market 2 agricultural products; Congress has the power to 3 subsidize, to limit production, all sorts of things. 4 5 MR. CARVIN: Absolutely, Chief Justice, and 6 that's the distinction I'm trying to draw. When they 7 are acting within their enumerated power then obviously 8 they are promoting commerce, but the Solicitor General wants to turn it into a different 9 10 power. He wants to say we have the power to promote commerce, to regulate anything to promote commerce, and 11 12 if they have the power to promote commerce then they have the power to regulate everything, right? 13 14 Because --15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I don't -- I don't 16 think you're addressing their main point, which is that they are not creating commerce in -- in health care. 17 It's already there, and we are all going to need some 18 19 kind of health care; most of us will at some point. 20 MR. CARVIN: I'd -- I'd like to address that in two ways, if I could, Mr. Chief Justice. In the 21 22 first place they keep playing mix and match with the 23 statistics. They say 95 percent of us are in the health 24 care market, okay? But that's not the relevant 25 statistic, even from -- as the government frames the

81

1 issue. No one in Congress and the Solicitor General is arguing that going to the doctor and fully paying him 2 creates a problem. The problem is uncompensated care, 3 and they say the uncompensated care arises if you have 4 5 some kind of catastrophe -- hit by a bus, have some 6 prolonged illness. Well, what is the percentage of the 7 uninsured that have those sorts of catastrophes? We know it has got to be a relative small fraction. So in 8 other words, the relevant --9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yet we don't know 10 11 who they are. 12 MR. CARVIN: We don't. No, and we don't know in advance, and -- and -- but that doesn't change 13 14 the basic principle, that you are nonetheless forcing 15 people for paternalistic reasons to go into the insurance market to ensure against risk that they have 16 made the voluntary decision that they are not -- have 17 18 decided not to. But even --19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the problem is -- the 20 problem is this they are making the reinvent of us pay for it, because as much as they say, well, we are not in 21 2.2 the market, we don't know when the -- the timing when 23 they will be. 24 MR. CARVIN: Which is --25 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And the -- the figures

82

that how much more families are paying for insurance because people get sick, they may have intended to self-insure, they haven't been able to meet the bill for -- for cancer, and the rest of us end up paying because these people are getting cost-free health care, and the only way to prevent that is to have them pay sooner rather than later, pay up front.

8 MR. CARVIN: Yes, but my point is this. 9 That, with respect, Justice Ginsburg, conflicts the 10 people who do result in uncompensated care, the free 11 riders. Those are people who default on their health 12 care payments. That is an entirely different group of 13 people, an entirely different activity than being 14 uninsured.

15 So the question is whether or not you can 16 regulate activity because it has a statistical connection to an activity that harms Congress. And my 17 18 basic point to you is this: the Constitution only gives 19 Congress the power to regulate things that negatively 20 affect commerce or commerce regulation. It doesn't give them the power to regulate things that are statistically 21 22 connected to things that negatively affect the 23 commerce --

24JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, Mr. Carvin --25MR. CARVIN: Because -- I'm sorry.

83

1	JUSTICE KAGAN: Please.
2	MR. CARVIN: I was just going to say,
3	because if they have that power, then they obviously
4	have the power to regulate everything because everything
5	in the aggregate is statistically connected to something
6	that negatively affects commerce, and every compelled
7	purchase promotes commerce.
8	JUSTICE BREYER: In your view, right
9	there in your view right there
10	MR. CARVIN: Justice Breyer
11	JUSTICE BREYER: Can I just
12	MR. CARVIN: I'm sorry.
13	JUSTICE BREYER: I'm just picking on
14	something. I'd like to just if it turned out there
15	was some terrible epidemic sweeping the United States,
16	and we couldn't say that more than 40 or 50 percent I
17	can make the number as high as I want but the the
18	you'd say the Federal Government doesn't have the
19	power to get people inoculated, to require them to be
20	inoculated, because that's just statistical.
21	MR. CARVIN: Well, in all candor, I think
22	Morrison must have decided that issue, right? Because
23	people who commit violence against
24	JUSTICE BREYER: Is your answer to that yes
25	or no?

84

1	MR. CARVIN: Oh, I'm sorry; my answer is no,
2	they couldn't do it, because Morrison
3	JUSTICE BREYER: No, they could not do it.
4	MR. CARVIN: Yes.
5	JUSTICE BREYER: They cannot require people
6	even if this disease is sweeping the country to be
7	inoculated. The Federal Government has no power, and if
8	there's okay, fine. Go ahead.
9	MR. CARVIN: May
10	JUSTICE BREYER: Please turn to Justice
11	Kagan.
12	MR. CARVIN: May I just please explain why?
13	JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.
14	MR. CARVIN: Violence against women
15	obviously creates the same negative impression on fellow
16	citizens as this communicable disease, but the and
17	it has huge effects on the health care of our country.
18	Congress found that it increased health care costs by
19	JUSTICE BREYER: I agree with you that
20	MR. CARVIN: Well, but
21	JUSTICE BREYER: that it had huge
22	negative effects but the majority thought that was a
23	local matter.
24	JUSTICE SCALIA: I think that's his point.
25	(Laughter.)

85

1	MR. CARVIN: I I don't know why having a
2	disease is any more local than that beating up a
3	woman. But but my basic point is, is that
4	notwithstanding its very profound effect on the health
5	care market, this Court said the activity being
6	regulated, i.e., violence against women, is outside the
7	Commerce Clause power. So regardless of whether it has
8	beneficial downstream effects, we must say no, Congress
9	doesn't have that power. Why not? Because everything
10	has downstream effects on commerce and every compelled
11	purchase promotes commerce. It by definition helps the
12	sellers of existing

JUSTICE ALITO: Mr. Carvin, isn't there this 13 difference between Justice Breyer's hypothetical and the 14 law that we have before us here? In his hypothetical 15 harm to other people from the communicable disease is 16 17 the result of the disease. It is not the result of 18 something that the government has done, whereas here the reason why there is cost shifting is because the 19 20 government has mandated that. It has required hospitals to provide emergency treatment, and instead of paying 21 22 for that through a tax which would be born by everybody, 23 it has required -- it has set up a system in which the cost is surreptitiously shifted to people who have 24 health insurance and who pay their bills when they go to 25

86

1 the hospital. 2 MR. CLEMENT: Justice Alito, that is exactly 3 the government's argument. It's an extraordinarily illogical argument. 4 5 JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. Then if that's so, 6 is -- let me just change my example under pressure --7 (Laughter.) JUSTICE BREYER: -- and say that in fact it 8 turns out that 90 percent of all automobiles driving 9 interstate without certain equipment put up pollution, 10 which travels interstate -- not 100 percent, maybe only 11 12 60 percent. Does the EPA have the power then to say you've got to have an antipollution device? It's 13 14 statistical. 15 MR. CARVIN: What they can't do -- yes, if 16 you have a car, they can require you to have an anti-pollution --17 18 Then you're not going on JUSTICE BREYER: 19 statistics; you're going on something else which is what 20 I'd like to know what it is. MR. CARVIN: It's this. They can't require 21 you to buy a car with an anti-pollution device. Once 22 23 you've entered the market and made a decision they can 24 regulate the terms and conditions of the car that you do, and they can do it for all sorts of reasons. What 25

87

1	they can't do it compel you to enter the market.
2	JUSTICE BREYER: Now we now you've
3	changed the ground of argument, which I accept as as
4	totally legitimate. And then the question is when you
5	are born, and you don't have insurance, and you will in
6	fact get sick, and you will in fact impose costs, have
7	you perhaps involuntarily perhaps simply because you
8	are a human being entered this particular market,
9	which is a market for health care?
10	MR. CARVIN: If being born is entering the
11	market, then I can't think of a more plenary power
12	Congress can have, because that literally means they can
13	regulate every human activity from cradle to grave. I
14	thought that's what distinguished the plenary police
15	power from the very limited commerce power.
16	I don't disagree that giving the Congress
17	plenary power to mandate property transfers from A to B
18	would be a very efficient way of helping B and of
19	accomplishing Congress's objectives. But the framers
20	JUSTICE BREYER: I see the point. You can
21	go back to, go back to Justice Kagan. Don't forget her
22	question.
23	JUSTICE KAGAN: I've forgotten my question.
24	(Laughter.)
25	MR. CARVIN: I I was facing the same

88

1 dilemma, Justice Kagan. 2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Let me -- let me ask a 3 question I asked Mr. Clement. It just seems --JUSTICE KAGAN: See what it means to be the 4 junior justice? 5 6 (Laughter.) 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: It just seems very 8 strange to me that there's no question we can have a Social Security system besides all the people who say: 9 I'm being forced to pay for something I don't want. 10 And this it seems to me, to try to get care for the ones who 11 12 need it by having everyone in the pool, but is also trying to preserve a role for the private sector, for 13 14 the private insurers. There's something very odd about 15 that, that the government can take over the whole thing 16 and we all say, oh, yes, that's fine, but if the government wants to get -- to preserve private insurers, 17 18 it can't do that.

MR. CARVIN: Well I don't think the test of a law's constitutionality is whether it more adheres to the libertarian principles of the Cato Institute or the statist principles of someone else. I think the test of a law's constitutionality is not those policy questions; it's whether or not the law is regulating things that negatively affect commerce or don't.

89

And since obviously the failure to purchase an item doesn't create the kind of effects on supply and demand that the market participants in Wickard and Raich did and doesn't in any way interfere with regulation of the insurance companies, I don't think it can pass the basic --

JUSTICE GINSBURG: I thought -- I thought that Wickard was you must buy; we are not going to let you use the home-grown wheat. You have got to go out in the market and buy that wheat that you don't want.

11 MR. CARVIN: Oh, but let's be careful about 12 what they were regulating in Wickard, Justice Ginsburg. What they were regulating was the supply of wheat. 13 It didn't in any way imply that they could require every 14 American to go out and buy wheat. And yes, one of the 15 consequences of regulating local market participants is 16 it'll affect the supply and the demand for the product. 17 18 That's why you can regulate them, because those local 19 market participants have the same effect on the 20 interstate market that a black market has on a legal 21 market.

But none of that is true -- in other words, you can regulate local bootleggers, but that doesn't suggest you can regulate teetotalers, people who stay out of the liquor market, because they don't have any

90

negative effect on the existing market participants or
 on regulation of those market participants.

JUSTICE KAGAN: That's why I suggested, Mr. 3 Carvin, that it might be different if you were raising 4 5 an as-applied challenge and presenting a class of people 6 whom you could say clearly would not be in the health 7 care market. But you're raising a facial challenge and 8 we can't really know which, which of the many, many, people that this law addresses in fact will not 9 participate in the health care market and in fact will 10 11 not impose costs on all the rest of us.

So the question is can Congress respond to those facts, that we have no crystal ball, that we can't tell who is and isn't going to be in the health insurance market, and say most of these people will be and most of these people will thereby impose costs on the rest of us and that's a problem that we can deal with on a class-wide basis?

MR. CARVIN: No again. The people who impose the costs on the rest of us are people who engage in a different activity at a different time, which is defaulting on their health care payments. It's not the uninsured. Under your theory you could regulate anybody if they have got a statistical connection to a problem. You could say, since we could regulate people who enter

91

into the mortgage market and impose mortgage insurance on them, we can simply impose the requirement to buy private mortgage insurance on everybody before they have entered the market because we are doing it in this prophylactic way before it develops.

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, no, that's not 7 -- I don't think that's fair, because not everybody is 8 going to enter the mortgage market. The government's 9 position is that almost everybody is going to enter the 10 health care market.

MR. CARVIN: Two points, one of which 11 12 Mr. Clement's already made, which is the health insurance market is different than the health care 13 14 market. But let me take it on full-stride. I think 15 everybody is in the milk market. I think everybody is 16 in the wheat product market. But that doesn't suggest that the government compel you to buy five gallons of 17 18 meat or five bushels of wheat because they are not 19 regulating commerce.

Whether you're a market participant or not, they are still requiring you to make a purchase that you don't want to do, and to get back to your facial example --

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I mean, but that's true 25 of almost every product.

92

1	MR. CARVIN: I've sorry?
2	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It's true of almost
3	every product, directly or indirectly by government
4	regulation. The government says, borrowing my
5	colleague's example, you can't buy a car without
6	emission control. I don't want a car with emission
7	control. It's less efficient in terms of the
8	horsepower. But I'm forced to do something I don't want
9	to do by government regulation.
10	MR. CARVIN: You are not forced to buy a
11	product you don't want. And I agree with you that since
12	the government regulates all markets there is no
13	limiting principle on their compelled purchase. When
14	they put these environmental controls on the
15	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: They force me to buy
16	MR. CARVIN: I'm sorry.
17	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: They forced me to buy if
18	I need unpasteurized foods, goods that don't have
19	certain pesticides but have others. There is government
20	compulsion in almost every economic decision because the
21	government regulates so much. It's a condition of life
22	that some may rail against, but
23	MR. CARVIN: Let's think about it this way.
24	Yes, when you've entered the marketplace they can impose
25	all sorts of restrictions on you, and they can impose,

93

for example, all kinds of restrictions on States after
 they have enacted laws. They can wipe out the laws.
 They can condition them.

But what can't they do? They can't compel States to enact laws. They can't compel States to carry out Federal law. And I am arguing for precisely the same distinction, because everyone intuitively understands that regulating participants after A and B have entered into a contract is fundamentally less intrusive than requiring the contract.

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: We let the government 12 regulate the manufacturing process whether or not the goods will enter into interstate commerce, merely 13 14 because they might statistically. We -- there is all 15 sorts of government regulation of manufacturing plants, of agricultural farms, of all sorts of activity that 16 will be purely intrastate because it might affect 17 18 interstate activity.

MR. CARVIN: I fully agree with you, Justice
Sotomayor. But I think --

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So how is that different from saying you are self-insuring today, you're foregoing insurance? Why isn't that a predecessor to the need that you're eventually going to have? MR. CARVIN: The cases you referred to I

94

Official - Subject to Final Review

think effectively eliminated the distinction between participants in the intrastate market vis-à-vis participants in the interstate market. None of those cases suggest that you can regulate people who are outside of the market on both an intrastate and interstate level by compelling them to enter into the market. And that --

3 JUSTICE BREYER: What about -- the simplest 9 counter-example for me to suggest is you've undoubtedly 10 read Judge Sutton's concurring opinion. He has about 11 two pages, it seemed to me, of examples where everyone 12 accepts the facts that under these kinds of regulations 13 the government can compel people to buy things they 14 don't otherwise want to buy.

For example, he gives, even in that farm case, the farmer who was being forced to go out and buy grain to feed to his animals because he couldn't raise it at home. You know and he goes through one example after another. So what -- what is your response to that, which you've read?

21 MR. CARVIN: Judge Sutton is wrong in each 22 and every example. There was no -- there was no 23 compulsion in Raich for him to buy wheat. He could have 24 gotten wheat substitutes or he could have not sold 25 wheat, which is actually what he was doing. There is a

95

Official - Subject to Final Review

1 huge difference between conditioning regulation, i.e., 2 conditioning access to the health care market and saying you must buy a product, and forcing you to buy a 3 product. And that, that -- I'm sorry. 4 5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: I thought it was common 6 ground that the requirement that the insurers -- what 7 was it, the community-based one and they have to insure 8 you despite your health status; they can't refuse because of preexisting conditions. The government tells 9 us and the Congress determined that those two won't work 10 11 unless you have a pool that will include the people who 12 are now healthy. But so -- well, first, do you agree with your colleague that the community-based -- and 13 what's the name that they give to the other? 14 15 MR. CARVIN: The guaranteed-issue. JUSTICE GINSBURG: Yes. 16 That that is 17 legitimate Commerce Clause legislation? 18 MR. CARVIN: Oh, sure. And that's why --19 but we don't in any way impede that sort of regulation. 20 These nondiscrimination regulations will apply to every insurance company just as Congress intended whether or 21 22 not we buy insurance. 23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well then, what about the 24 determination that they can't possibly work if people 25 don't have to buy insurance until they are -- their

96

health status is such that the insurance company just dealt with them on its -- as it will? I won't insure you because you're -- you're already sick.

MR. CARVIN: It depends what you mean by "work." It'll work just fine in ensuring that no sick people are discriminated against. What -- what -- but when you do that -- Congress --

8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the sick people, why 9 would they insure early if they had to be protected if 10 they get insurance late?

11 MR. CARVIN: Yes. Well, that's -- this is 12 the government's very illogical argument. They seem to be saying look, we couldn't just force people to buy 13 14 insurance to lower health insurance premiums. That 15 would be no good. But we can do it because we've 16 created the problem. We, Congress, have driven up the health insurance premiums, and since we've created that 17 problem, this somehow gives us authority that we 18 19 wouldn't otherwise have. That can't possibly be right. 20 That would --

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Do you think that there's -- what percentage of the American people who took their son or daughter to an emergency room and that child was turned away because the parent didn't have insurance -- do you think there's a large percentage of

97

1 the American population who would stand for the death of 2 that child --

MR. CARVIN: One of the most --3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: They had an allergic 4 reaction and a simple shot would have saved the child? 5 6 MR. CARVIN: One of the more pernicious, 7 misleading impressions that the government has made is that we are somehow advocating that people be -- could 8 get thrown out of emergency rooms, or that this 9 alternative that they've hypothesized is going to be 10 enforced by throwing people out of emergency rooms. 11 12 This alternative; i.e. conditioned access to health care on buying health insurance, is enforced in precisely the 13 14 same way that the Act does. You either buy health 15 insurance or you pay a penalty of \$695. You don't have doctors throwing people out on the street. And -- and 16 so the only --17

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry, did you say the penalty's okay but not the mandate? I'm sorry. Maybe I've misheard you.

21 MR. CARVIN: No. No. I was -- they create 22 this strawman that says look, the only alternative to 23 doing it the way we've done it, if we condition access 24 to health care on buying health insurance, the only way 25 you can enforce that is making sick people not get care.

98

1 I'm saying no, no. There's a perfectly legitimate way they could enforce their alternative; i.e. requiring you 2 to buy health insurance when you access health care, 3 which is the same penalty structure that's in the Act. 4 5 There is no moral dilemma between having 6 people have insurance and denying them emergency 7 service. Congress has made a perfectly legitimate value judgment that they want to make sure that people get 8 emergency care. Since the founding, whenever Congress 9 10 has imposed that public responsibility on private 11 actors, it has subsidized it from the Federal Treasury. It has not conscripted a subset of the citizenry and 12 made them subsidize the actors who are being hurt, which 13 14 is what they're doing here. 15 They're making young healthy people 16 subsidize insurance premiums for the cost that the 17 nondiscrimination provisions have put on insurance 18 premiums and insurance companies. 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So the --20 MR. CARVIN: -- and that -- that is the fundamental problem here. 21 2.2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So the -- I -- I want to 23 understand the choices you're saying Congress has. 24 Congress can tax everybody and set up a public health 25 care system.

99

1	MR. CARVIN: Yes.
2	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That would be okay.
3	MR. CARVIN: Yes. Tax power is
4	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Okay.
5	MR. CARVIN: I would accept that.
6	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Congress can you're
7	taking the same position as your colleague, Congress
8	can't say we're going to set up a public health system,
9	but you can get a tax credit if you have private health
10	insurance because you won't access the public system.
11	Are you taking the same position as your
12	colleague?
13	MR. CARVIN: There may have been some
14	confusion in prior colloquy. I fully agree with my
15	brother Clement that a direct tax would be
16	unconstitutional. I don't think he means to suggest,
17	nor do I, that a tax credit that incentivizes you to buy
18	insurance creates problems. Congress incentivizes all
19	kinds of activities. If they gave us a tax credit for
20	buying insurance, then it would be our choice whether or
21	not that makes economic sense, even though
22	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So how is this different
23	than this Act which says if a taxpayer fails to meet the
24	requirement of having minimum coverage, then they are
25	responsible for paying the shared responsibility

100

1 payment?

MR. CARVIN: The difference is that the 2 taxpayer is not given a choice. It's the difference 3 between banning cigarettes and saying I'm going to 4 5 enforce that legal ban through a \$5 a pack penalty, and 6 saying look, if you want to sell cigarettes, fine. I'm 7 going to charge you a tax of \$5 a pack. And that's --8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I think -- I think that's what's happening, isn't it? 9 10 MR. CARVIN: No. Not --11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: We're paying -- I 12 thought that everybody was paying, what is it, \$10 a pack now? I don't even know the price. It's pretty 13 high. 14 15 MR. CARVIN: Right. And everyone 16 understands --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I think everybody 17 recognizes that it's all taxation for the purposes of 18 19 dissuading you to buy it. 20 MR. CARVIN: That's precisely my point. And everyone intuitively understands that that system is 21 22 dramatically different than saying cigarettes tomorrow 23 are illegal. It is different. 24 JUSTICE BREYER: It is different. It is 25 different. I agree with that. But you pointed out, and

101

1 I agree with you on this, that the government set up these emergency room laws. The government set up 2 The government set up Medicare. 3 Medicaid. The government set up CHIP, and there are 40 million people 4 5 who don't have the private insurance. In that world, 6 the government has set up commerce. It's all over the 7 United States. And in that world, of course, the 8 decision by the 40 million not to buy the insurance affects that commerce, and substantially so. 9 10 So I thought the issue here is not whether 11 it's a violation of some basic right or something to 12 make people buy things they don't want, but simply whether those decisions of that group of 40 million 13 people substantially affect the interstate commerce that 14 15 has been set up in part through these other programs. 16 So that's the part of your argument I'm not 17 hearing. 18 MR. CARVIN: Let me --19 JUSTICE BREYER: Please. 20 MR. CARVIN: It is clear that the failure to buy health insurance doesn't affect anyone. Defaulting 21 2.2 on your payments to your health care provider does. 23 Congress chose for whatever reason not to regulate the 24 harmful activity of defaulting on your health care 25 provider. They used the 20 percent or whoever among the

102

uninsured as a leverage to regulate the 100 percent of
 the uninsured.

3 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I agree -- I agree that 4 that's what's happening here.

5 MR. CARVIN: Okay.

6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And the government tells 7 us that's because the insurance market is unique. And 8 in the next case, it'll say the next market is unique. But I think it is true that if most questions in life 9 are matters of degree, in the insurance and health care 10 world, both markets -- stipulate two markets -- the 11 young person who is uninsured is uniquely proximately 12 very close to affecting the rates of insurance and the 13 costs of providing medical care in a way that is not 14 true in other industries. 15

16 That's my concern in the case.

MR. CARVIN: And, Your -- I may be 17 misunderstanding you, Justice Kennedy. I hope I'm not. 18 19 Sure. It would be perfectly fine if they 20 allowed -- you do actuarial risk for young people on the basis of their risk for disease, just like you judge 21 2.2 flood insurance on the homeowner's risk of flood. One 23 of the issues here is not only that they're compelling 24 us to enter into the marketplace, they're not -- they're prohibiting us from buying the only economically 25

103

sensible product that we would want. Catastrophic
 insurance.

Everyone agrees the only potential problem that a 30-year-old, as he goes from the healthy 70 percent of the population to the unhealthy 5 percent. And yet Congress prohibits anyone over 30 from buying any kind of catastrophic health insurance. And the reason they do that is because they needed this massive subsidy.

10 Justice Alito, it's not our numbers. CBO said that injecting my clients into the risk pool lowers 11 premiums by 15 to 20 percent. So, Justice Kennedy, even 12 if we were going to create exceptions for people that 13 are outside of commerce and inside of commerce, surely 14 we'd make Congress do a closer nexus and say look, we're 15 really addressing this problem. We want these 16 30-year-olds to get catastrophic health insurance. 17 18 And not only did they -- they deprived them 19 of that option. And I think that illustrates the 20 dangers of giving Congress these plenary powers, because they can always leverage them. They can always come up 21 with some public policy rationale that converts the 22 23 power to regulate commerce into the power to promote 24 commerce, which, as I was saying before, is the one that

25 I think is plenary.

104

1 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Carvin, a large part of this argument has concerned the question of whether 2 certain kinds of people are active participants in a 3 market or not active participants in a market. 4 In your 5 test, which is a test that focuses on this 6 activity/inactivity distinction, would force one to confront that problem all the time. 7 Now, if you look over the history of the 8 Commerce Clause, what you see is that there were sort of 9 unhappy periods when the Court used tests like this --10 direct versus indirect, commerce versus manufacturing. 11 I think most people would say that those things didn't 12 really work. And the question is, why should this test, 13 inactive versus active, work any better? 14 15 MR. CARVIN: The problem you identify is exactly the problem you would create if you bought the 16 government's bogus limiting principles. You'd have to 17 18 draw distinctions between the insurance industry and the 19 car industry and all of that. 20 We turn you to the Commerce Clause jurisprudence that bedeviled the Court before the 1930s, 21 22 where they were drawing all these kinds of distinctions 23 among industries; whereas our test is really very 24 simple. Are you buying the product or is Congress compelling you to buy the product? I can't think of a 25

105

1 brighter line.

2	And again, if Congress has the power to
3	compel you to buy this product, then obviously, they
4	have got the power to provide you to compel you to
5	buy any product, because any purchase is going to
6	benefit commerce, and this Court is never going to
7	second-guess Congress's policy judgments on how
8	important it is this product versus that product.
9	JUSTICE ALITO: Do you think they are
10	drawing a line between commerce and everything else that
11	is not commerce is drawing an artificial line, drawing a
12	line between Congress and manufacturing?
13	MR. CARVIN: The words "inactivity" and
14	"activity" are not in the Constitution. The words
15	"commerce" and "noncommerce" are. And again, it's a
16	distinction that comes, Justice Kagan, directly from the
17	text of the Constitution.
18	The Framers consciously gave Congress the
19	ability to regulate commerce, because that's not a
20	particularly threatening activity that deprives you of
21	individual freedom. If you were required, if you were
22	authorized to require A to transfer property to B, you
23	have, as the early cases put it, a monster in
24	legislation which is against all reason in justice,
25	because everyone intuitively understands that regulating

106

1	people who voluntarily enter into contracts in setting
2	changing conditions does not create the possibility of
3	Congress compelling wealth transfers among the
4	citizenry. And that is precisely why the Framers denied
5	them the power to compel commerce, and precisely why
6	they didn't give them plenary power.
7	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
8	Mr. Carvin.
9	General Verrilli, you have four minutes
10	remaining.
11	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR.,
12	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
13	GENERAL VERRILLI: Thank you, Mr. Chief
14	Justice.
15	Congress confronted a grave problem when it
16	enacted the Affordable Care Act. The 40 million
17	Americans who can't get health insurance and suffered
18	often very terrible consequences. Now, we agree, I
19	think everyone arguing this case agrees that Congress
20	could remedy that problem by imposing the insurance
21	requirement at the point of sale.
22	That won't work. The reason it won't work
23	is because people will still show up at the hospital or
24	at their physician's office seeking care without
25	insurance, causing the cost shifting problem. And

107

1 Mr. Clement's suggestion that they can be signed up for a high risk pool at that point is utterly unrealistic. 2 Think about how much it would cost to get 3 the insurance when you are at the hospital or at the 4 5 doctor. It would be -- it would be unfathomably high, 6 that will never work. Congress understood that. It 7 chose a means that will work. The means that it saw 8 work in the States and in the State of Massachusetts and that, and that it had every reason to think would work 9 10 on a national basis.

11 That is the kind of choice of means that 12 McCulloch says that the Constitution leaves to the democratically accountable branches of government. 13 14 There is no temporal limitation in the Commerce Clause. 15 Everyone subject to this regulation is in or will be in the health care market. They are just being regulated 16 in advance. That's exactly the kind of thing that ought 17 to be left to the judgment of Congress and the 18 19 democratically accountable branches of government. 20 And I think this is actually a paradigm example of the kind of situation that Chief Justice 21 2.2 Marshall envisioned in McCulloch itself, that the

23 provisions of the Constitution needed to be interpreted 24 in a manner that would allow them to be effective in 25 addressing the great crises of human affairs that the

108

1 Framers could not even envision.

But if there is any doubt about that under the Commerce Clause, then I urge this Court to uphold the minimum coverage provision as an exercise of the taxing power.

6 Under New York v. United States, this is 7 precisely a parallel situation. If the Court thinks 8 there is any doubt about the ability of Congress to 9 impose the requirement in 5000A(a), it can be treated as 10 simply the predicate to which the tax incentive of 11 5000A(b) seeks accomplishment. And the Court -- as the 12 Court said in New York, has a solemn obligation to respect the judgments of the democratically accountable 13 branches of government, and because this statute can be 14 15 construed in a manner that allows it to be upheld in that way, I respectfully submit that it is this Court's 16 17 duty to do so.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, General.19 Counsel, we'll see you tomorrow.

20 (Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., the case in the 21 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Alderson Reporting Company

A	24:5 25:10,12	9:13 25:24	85:19 93:11	3:18,20 107:17
ability 20:1,12	25:14 30:11,20	46:21 81:16	94:19 96:12	amount 24:22
41:16 59:16	33:11 60:20	104:16 108:25	100:14 101:25	33:5,25 58:9,11
106:19 109:8	80:11 98:14	adheres 89:20	102:1 103:3,3	analogy 51:18
able 6:18 22:8	99:4 100:23	administered	107:18	analysis 17:2
58:22 68:20	107:16	45:18	agreed 23:25	24:17 26:18
76:19 83:3	acting 81:7	administrative	24:3 59:24	29:15
above-entitled	action 19:7 61:13	50:21	agrees 22:9	animals 95:17
1:12 109:21	actions 48:14	admit 70:12	104:3 107:19	annuity 57:17
absence 11:7	78:20	adopted 38:8	agricultural 81:3	answer 15:10,15
absent 30:15	active 105:3,4,14	adult 55:23	94:16	15:16,23 18:19
67:5 68:21	activities 100:19	advance 12:10	ah 61:4	24:24 40:9
absolutely 8:7	activity 5:7 14:6	43:22 70:21	ahead 21:23 85:8	42:20 79:12
19:6 77:18 81:5	17:8 18:9 19:8	82:13 108:17	al 1:4,7,20,22 2:7	84:24 85:1
accept 39:5 42:4	23:5 28:10	advancing 16:12	2:10 53:2 79:23	answering 22:19
53:18 75:11	29:11 30:7	advocating 16:19	Alito 7:12,15,16	40:12
80:5 88:3 100:5	43:14 80:11	18:13 42:19,21	7:18 8:5,21 9:2	answers 15:6
accepted 40:6	83:13,16,17	44:7 98:8	9:5,9,23 33:3	antipollution
accepts 95:12	86:5 88:13	affairs 75:9	33:19 34:6	87:13
access 3:19,20	91:21 94:16,18	108:25	42:23 51:10	anti-pollution
22:8 64:24 69:3	102:24 106:14	affect 19:4,4	86:13 87:2	87:17,22
96:2 98:12,23	106:20	41:5 47:12 66:3	104:10 106:9	anybody 58:20
99:3 100:10	activity/inactiv	71:8 75:22	Alito's 56:9	72:14 91:23
accident 66:12	105:6	83:20,22 89:25	allergic 98:4	anyway 20:2
66:14,17	actor 68:22	90:17 94:17	allocation 55:25	24:21,22
accomplish	actors 99:11,13	102:14,21	allow 20:3 42:21	apparatus 50:21
56:22	actual 71:25	affirmative	108:24	51:8
accomplishing	actuarial 33:15	11:20 30:11	allowed 11:19	APPEARANC
49:17 88:19	55:24 56:3,11	61:13 76:25	78:20 103:20	1:15
accomplishment	56:15 68:3,3	affirmatively	allows 14:2 65:2	appears 9:25
109:11	103:20	22:19	109:15	appendix 74:25
accord 39:13	actuaries 67:14	afford 11:2 18:25	alter 80:6	applies 20:17
account 20:9	adapted26:14	21:17 44:3	alternate 24:14	43:24
33:20 69:18	26:22,23,25	affordable 3:11	alternative 23:15	apply 4:7 32:16
accountable	addition 6:16	3:25 24:5 28:17	23:20 98:10,12	96:20
108:13,19	26:23	33:11 38:3,5	98:22 99:2	apportioned
109:13	additional 9:21	107:16	alternatives	50:12
accurately 55:23	11:2	age 52:6 57:7	23:12,13,18	apprehension
achieve 24:4,6	address 4:11,12	aggregate 70:6	ambulance 6:2	72:8,9
acknowledge	63:14 76:22	72:23,25,25	7:3	appropriate 32:3
8:15 28:1	81:20	84:5	Amendment 29:1	April 45:19 49:19
acknowledges	addressed 74:5	agree 12:19	America 63:17	arbitrary 41:3
76:10	addresses 3:11	25:21 30:1	American 90:15	area 39:12,14,22
act 3:11 4:14,16	26:21 91:9	41:11 42:13	97:22 98:1	42:7,8 66:6
10:10 11:20	addressing 4:13	76:15 80:14	Americans 3:17	79:7
	I	1	I	1

areas 74:12	attacked48:24	65:13 76:18	bill 60:8 75:2	broadly 12:23
argue 10:17	attributable	basement 61:12	83:3	broccoli 13:9
argued 24:18	43:13	basic 18:6 79:2	billion 28:16	17:16,18,20,24
61:17	attributes 32:23	82:14 83:18	billions 9:14	18:2 75:4,19
arguing 66:4	authority 8:16	86:3 90:6	bills 14:18 36:1	brother 100:15
82:2 94:6	12:8 24:1,3	102:11	86:25	burden11:21
107:19	41:14 42:19	basically 65:10	bit 59:10 64:19	12:1
argument 1:13	43:10,11 55:7	basis 5:4 13:19	black 90:20	burial 7:13,14,22
2:2,5,8,11 3:4,7	80:21 97:18	13:23,24,25	blah 52:1,1,1	7:24 8:11,22
6:25 8:19 10:19	authorization	14:9 34:3 49:8	blind 30:14	15:19,20,20,20
18:21 21:8,10	12:2	91:18 103:21	blue 13:22	15:21,21 71:9
21:18 22:1,1	authorized	108:10	bogus 105:17	burials 15:17
23:1,2 24:23	106:22	Baucus 48:17	bologna 64:19	buried 8:24
25:2 27:3 29:4	automobile 18:4	bears 46:3	bootleggers	bus 33:18,21
38:14 40:6,10	63:21	beating 86:2	90:23	82:5
42:2 53:1 55:22	automobiles 87:9	bedeviled 105:21	born 86:22 88:5	bushels 92:18
56:5 62:4 64:1	available 4:2,3	begets 4:8	88:10	business 79:8
66:2,8 70:7	58:7	beginning 57:14	borrowing 93:4	buy 6:9 13:6,8
72:2 78:18	average 10:1,6	62:15	bothering 68:21	14:13,23,25
79:22 80:5 87:3	averse 65:11,12	behalf 1:17,19	bought 105:16	15:17,17 16:4
87:4 88:3 97:12	avoiding 49:1	1:21 2:4,7,10	boundary 28:7	19:12,12 21:23
102:16 105:2	a.m 1:14 3:2	2:13 3:8 53:2	30:6	21:23 29:5 35:3
107:11		79:23 107:12	branches 108:13	35:21 36:1,5
arguments 20:23	<u> </u>	behavior 47:23	108:19 109:14	47:10,13,13
46:19	B 1:16 2:3,12 3:7	beings 70:13	bread 63:18	52:5 57:17
arises 82:4	10:23 88:17,18	belong 27:25	Breyer 15:4,25	61:10 62:12
Article 8:16	94:8 106:22	beneficial 80:16	16:7,9 18:18	63:17,24 65:15
22:10 23:25	107:11	86:8	60:6 62:8,14,17	65:20 69:22
78:9	back 18:18 24:25	benefit 34:7,8	67:13,23,24	70:11,18 71:22
articulated 14:5	26:12 35:18	106:6	70:9 71:7 75:1	72:1 73:8,21
27:13	38:23 50:3 60:6	benefits 34:6	75:25 84:8,10	74:18 87:22
artificial 8:2,6	60:13,13,18	57:22 71:21	84:11,13,24	90:8,10,15 92:2
38:12 106:11	62:9,9 65:25	best 7:4 55:5	85:3,5,10,13	92:17 93:5,10
aside 5:16 31:3	68:12 74:11	78:16	85:19,21 87:5,8	93:15,17 95:13
asked 15:7 18:18	88:21,21 92:22	bets 39:14 42:12	87:18 88:2,20	95:14,16,23
22:20 25:1	Bailey 50:23	better 22:16 53:6	95:8 101:24	96:3,3,22,25
26:12 89:3	balance 52:18	57:15 67:14,14	102:19	97:13 98:14
asks 23:17 77:3	ball 91:13	67:18 105:14	Breyer's 76:22	99:3 100:17
assistance 6:3	ban 101:5	beyond 11:19	86:14	101:19 102:8
6:22 7:2,3,3	bank 15:12 60:15	14:1 25:8 46:6	brief 14:17 17:14	102:12,21
associate 70:2	61:2 62:18,21	50:12 78:23	57:1 78:5	105:25 106:3,5
assume 11:17,18	63:1,3,4,8	big 9:1,2 51:25	briefs 20:23	buying 19:11,15
24:14	banning 101:4	54:16 57:13	brighter 106:1	19:23 54:3
assumption 54:9	bans 28:18	62:2	bring 19:14	98:13,24
as-applied91:5	based 4:6,20	bigger 74:13	broad 38:22	100:20 103:25

	1	1	1	1
104:6 105:24	54:13 55:17	94:25 95:21	24:22 31:21	102:4
	58:18,19 61:24	96:15,18 97:4	43:25 50:5 51:9	choice 14:13,23
<u> </u>	61:25 64:21,24	97:11 98:3,6,21	52:5 56:15	19:3 24:8 25:5
C 2:1 3:1	67:8,10,17	99:20 100:1,3,5	87:10 93:19	100:20 101:3
calculate 33:24	68:17,25 69:4,7	100:13 101:2	105:3	108:11
58:11	71:15,25,25	101:10,15,20	certainly 50:1	choices 99:23
calculated 33:5	73:14,15,18,21	102:18,20	54:19 69:20	choose 24:10,12
51:5	74:3,5,10,19	103:5,17 105:1	certificate 64:23	choosing 26:13
calculation 36:17	80:5,9,10,16	105:15 106:13	challenge 91:5,7	chose 5:16 24:12
call 49:10	81:17,19,24	107:8	change 82:13	25:3 102:23
called 48:16	82:3,4 83:5,10	case 3:4 5:5	87:6	108:7
49:23	83:12 85:17,18	10:11 22:10	changed 88:3	chosen 23:3
calling 49:16	86:5 88:9 89:11	25:12 39:6 40:5	changes 30:21	24:10 26:16
calls 34:18	91:7,10,22	40:5 44:9,15,20	changing 11:23	28:24 39:22
cancer 83:4	92:10,13 96:2	44:23 46:2	107:2	Christian 68:20
candor 84:21	98:12,24,25	48:11 51:18	characterization	cigarettes 101:4
capable 46:8	99:3,9,25	62:16,20 63:11	35:17 45:13,17	101:6,22
capture 55:15,18	102:22,24	68:13 73:17	48:14	citizen 30:20
captured 56:17	103:10,14	75:4 76:24 77:3	characterized	citizenry 63:2
car 16:4 17:16,18	107:16,24	78:15,16,18	5:15 45:13	99:12 107:4
19:11,15 30:14	108:16	95:16 103:8,16	charge 9:17	citizens 85:16
63:24 65:14,15	careful 38:6	107:19 109:20	11:13 36:20	City 70:10
65:20 66:20,24	90:11	cases 11:19	101:7	class 20:17 32:8
69:22 70:11,22	caring 59:8	26:24 28:7 30:3	cheaper 71:24	34:6 43:23
73:8,9,10,22	carriage 59:25	30:21 46:5	Chief 3:3,9 5:25	68:19 91:5
87:16,22,24	carriages 59:21	63:10 94:25	6:13,20 7:7	class-wide 91:18
93:5,6 105:19	60:2	95:4 106:23	17:12,22,25	clause 4:17 15:8
care 3:11,12,14	carry 4:23 22:12	cash 63:22	18:5 29:18 30:2	16:15,16,18
3:16 4:15,15	94:5	catastrophe 82:5	31:6,19 32:14	18:14 20:8
5:7,14,15 6:5	cars 19:12,12	catastrophes	38:14,18 39:18	26:18 37:17
7:1 8:7,8,13,23	59:6 64:7 66:3	82:7	39:21 40:8,24	38:21 43:11,19
9:17,19 12:5,17	66:8,21	catastrophic	41:20,24 42:18	44:10,12 52:1
12:21,21,23,24	Carvin 1:21 2:9	54:11 74:5	49:9,12,21	53:7 60:11,12
14:18 17:9,17	79:21,22,24	104:1,7,17	52:19,23 53:3	60:12 62:13
17:24 18:11,11	80:24 81:5,20	Cato 89:21	54:11 63:7,25	72:12 76:2,3
19:25 20:2,4	82:12,24 83:8	cause 40:14	64:10 68:12	78:10 86:7
21:14,19 22:9	83:24,25 84:2	causes 40:14,15	76:16 77:15	96:17 105:9,20
23:6,17 24:5	84:10,12,21	causing 69:23,24	79:19,24 80:23	108:14 109:3
25:22,23 26:9	85:1,4,9,12,14	107:25	80:25 81:5,15	clear 46:15 57:2
28:15 31:1,10	85:20 86:1,13	CBO 10:1	81:21 82:10	60:19 102:20
31:22 33:5,11	87:15,21 88:10	104:10	92:6 107:7,13	clearly 48:1
38:15,20 39:17	88:25 89:19	cell 6:10 15:17	108:21 109:18	59:18,25 60:1
39:23 40:15	90:11 91:4,19	16:1	child 50:25 97:24	91:6
41:6,18,23 44:3	92:11 93:1,10	century 34:14	98:2,5	Clement 1:19 2:6
47:8,9,15 54:11	93:16,23 94:19	certain 16:4	CHIP 15:20	52:21,25 53:1,3
				l

Alderson Reporting Company

53:22 54:6 55:2	29:12 30:8	8:17 10:25 11:6	concurring 95:10	55:18 56:22
55:11 56:6 57:3	34:12,14 35:3,4	11:12 22:14	condition 28:19	57:5,20 60:14
58:5,22 59:3,9	37:17 38:21,25	36:9 38:9 56:18	37:4 93:21 94:3	60:20 61:7 62:1
62:14,18 63:25	39:1,12 41:2	56:19 58:11	98:23	63:15 67:15,25
64:10,19,25	42:11,20 43:3	community-ba	conditioned	68:7,10 69:9
65:21 66:7,18	43:19 44:9 52:1	96:7,13	98:12	71:1 72:12 73:2
67:9,22,24	53:6,6,7,8,10	community-rat	conditioning 96:1	75:8,13 76:3,9
68:11,23 69:5	53:10,14,25	22:6	96:2	80:7,12,18,19
69:19 71:7 73:6	54:1 60:11,12	companies 9:19	conditions 4:21	80:19 81:3 82:1
73:13,19 75:25	60:15,17,20,25	10:9 11:1,8,11	87:24 96:9	83:17,19 85:18
76:15,23 77:17	61:1 62:13,16	36:25 54:5,21	107:2	86:8 88:12,16
79:5,11,20 87:2	62:20,22 66:3,4	56:1 71:19 90:5	conduct 47:12,13	91:12 96:10,21
89:3 100:15	68:1,8 70:7	99:18	50:19	97:7,16 99:7,9
Clement's 92:12	71:5 72:3,6,11	company 37:3	conflicts 83:9	99:23,24 100:6
108:1	72:12,13,15,17	96:21 97:1	confront 105:7	100:7,18
clients 104:11	72:18,20,20	company's 50:24	confronted	102:23 104:6
close 103:13	73:3 75:22 76:2	comparable	107:15	104:15,20
closer 104:15	76:3,14,17 77:1	15:18	confronting	105:24 106:2
closing 45:4	77:2,9,19,23	compel 40:4	26:15	106:12,18
club 40:17,21	77:25 78:2,3	42:22 53:5,9	confusion 100:14	107:3,15,19
clunkers 63:23	79:8,10,14 80:4	68:8 72:15,18	Congress 4:18	108:6,18 109:8
code 44:18 45:18	80:9,12,13,14	78:3 80:2 88:1	5:16 7:9,9 8:16	Congresses 74:1
45:22 47:20	80:19,20 81:8	92:17 94:4,5	9:13,20 12:8,19	congressional
49:18	81:11,11,12,17	95:13 106:3,4	14:6 15:8,12,22	74:23
colleague 96:13	83:20,20,23	107:5	16:8,25,25 17:6	Congress's 19:7
100:7,12	84:6,7 86:7,10	compelled 84:6	17:7 19:8 20:9	22:10 37:22
colleagues 22:19	86:11 88:15	86:10 93:13	20:25 22:4 23:3	38:2,13,21 39:3
colleague's 93:5	89:25 92:19	compelling 76:17	23:12,18,25	41:2,13 42:5
collected 49:19	94:13 96:17	95:6 103:23	24:3,7,9,10,12	74:24 88:19
51:3	102:6,9,14	105:25 107:3	24:14,21 25:3	106:7
colloquy 100:14	104:14,14,23	complete 76:9	26:13,14,16	conjunction 23:8
come 54:22	104:24 105:9	completely 8:10	28:9,12 29:10	44:8
61:14 71:18,19	105:11,20	comprehensive	32:2,21,22,25	conjure 62:21
104:21	106:6,10,11,15	26:4 43:8,9,20	33:2 35:9 37:10	connected 83:22
comes 106:16	106:19 107:5	compulsion	37:14,23 38:5	84:5
commerce 4:17	108:14 109:3	93:20 95:23	38:19 39:8,11	connection 83:17
4:25 5:8 8:16	commit 84:23	computers 16:1	39:14,22 41:11	91:24
11:20 12:8 14:7	commodities	conceded 53:19	41:15 42:8,13	consciously
15:7,8,14 16:14	16:20	concern 41:1	42:21,25 43:8	106:18
16:16,18 17:1,7	common 41:8	59:10,11 74:10	43:21 44:16	conscripted
17:8,11 18:9,12	96:5	103:16	46:14 48:7,11	99:12
18:13,15,16	commonly 47:19	concerned 42:3	48:14,22 49:1,2	conscripting
20:8 22:21 23:7	communicable	74:2 105:2	49:9 50:4 53:5	36:25
23:10 25:18,19	85:16 86:16	concerning 30:10	53:7,9,12,20	conscription
26:2,5,18 28:11	community 4:22	concurrent 79:9	54:1 55:4,7,13	76:12

	1	1	1	1
consequences	controls 93:14	24:21 25:11,13	creates 74:19	decision 21:2
90:16 107:18	controversial	25:14 27:13	82:3 85:15	53:15 65:10
consider 23:18	72:5	28:7 29:8,10,16	100:18	70:5,6,6 82:17
considered 46:4	converts 104:22	30:2 34:23 39:3	creating 61:2	87:23 93:20
considering	corporation	44:23,24 46:2	69:17 81:17	102:8
43:19	62:19	49:6 50:13,16	creation 18:12	decisions 73:3
consistent 53:23	correct 9:24 13:2	51:17,19 53:4	18:14 38:2,13	74:23 77:11
Constitution	24:20	62:23,24 68:6	credit 59:7 65:4	102:13
12:2 27:5 50:10	cost 8:1 9:3,18	75:8 76:1 77:19	65:5 100:9,17	deduction 47:24
76:12,13 80:6	14:24 21:17	77:22 78:23	100:19	47:25
83:18 106:14	22:17 33:7,8	79:25 86:5	credits 59:4,5	deeply 20:9
106:17 108:12	70:1,25 74:2,9	105:10,21	cremated 8:25	default 83:11
108:23	74:13,13 75:21	106:6 109:3,7	crises 108:25	defaulting 91:22
constitutional	86:19,24 99:16	109:11,12	critical 31:7	102:21,24
11:23 27:2,18	107:25 108:3	Court's 30:3	criticisms 30:16	defend 5:4 16:11
27:22 45:14	costs 9:15,22	53:24 60:4	crystal 91:13	defended 48:18
48:16,23 57:19	14:19,21 33:24	109:16	cut 67:7	49:13
59:11	34:3,16 40:15	cover 9:18 11:2,9	cuts 24:14	deference 24:7
constitutionality	44:4 74:11	11:14 32:1 33:7	cutting 64:19	39:13
89:20,23	85:18 88:6	36:21 37:1		define 12:23 13:5
construe 49:6	91:11,16,20	coverage 4:23	D	13:7 31:7,17
construed	103:14	5:17 8:18 11:7	D 1:19 2:6 3:1	32:23
109:15	cost-free 83:5	12:6 22:11,14	53:1	definitely 15:2
consume 10:14	Counsel 109:19	23:4 24:4 26:7	dairy 25:15,16	definition 86:11
20:21 21:22	counteract 37:23	31:18 32:3,20	34:22,23	definitive 33:18
33:6,8 53:20	43:13	32:24 38:10	danger 30:14	degree 103:10
consumed 43:23	counterproduc	54:11 74:6	dangers 104:20	deliberation 38:6
consumes 10:7	36:10	100:24 109:4	daughter 97:23	delighted77:17
consuming 20:18	counter-exam	covered21:15	day 32:10,12	demand 16:20
consumption	95:9	22:17 25:20	35:15 51:1	90:3,17
17:17 40:22	country 3:15,16	36:12,13 54:13	deal 17:10 22:6	demanded73:10
54:4 60:23	28:14 34:13	covering 17:17	23:14 81:2	democratically
contagious 67:20	85:6,17	17:20	91:17	108:13,19
contain 31:9	counts 25:7	covers 36:22	dealing 23:20	109:13
context 35:11	26:17	74:6	dealt 97:2	denied 107:4
69:21	couple 7:20	cows 61:10	death 98:1	denominated
continue 3:3	23:12 75:7	cradle 88:13	debating 75:2	44:16,24 78:7
contract 33:22	course 15:23	create 4:25 15:8	December 48:15	78:17
94:9,10	28:2 33:16	15:12,13 17:7	decide 29:5 40:1	denying 33:3
contracts 34:25	50:10 62:23	53:10 60:14,16	55:8 71:4	99:6
107:1	67:22,24 68:12	90:2 98:21	decided 65:17	Department 1:3
contrary 64:1	70:9 72:16	104:13 105:16	71:17 82:18	1:17 3:4 51:2
contribute 57:12	75:10 102:7	107:2	84:22 decides 67:25	departure 29:9
control 5:22 6:19	Court 1:1,13	created 60:16	decides 67:25	depend 16:5 59:9
93:6,7	3:10 14:5 15:11	97:16,17	deciding 69:22	depends 68:24

	1	1	1	1
97:4	94:21 100:22	95:1 105:6	driving 16:2 87:9	effectively 95:1
deposits 63:8	101:22,23,24	106:16	drug 71:19 72:1	effects 5:8 9:13
deprived 104:18	101:25	distinctions	due 29:14,17	17:10 23:7
deprives 106:20	dilemma 89:1	105:18,22	60:12 66:1 73:7	55:13 60:19,24
derived 75:13	99:5	distinguish13:22	77:6	71:11 80:16
description 77:7	direct 50:12	distinguished	dutifully 66:15	85:17,22 86:8
designed 24:5	59:12,16,18,21	88:14	duty 11:20 30:13	86:10 90:2
47:12,15 69:3,6	59:23,25 60:5	distinguishes	30:15,19	efficiency 25:4
despite 96:8	63:18 66:23	15:2 69:21	109:17	efficient 59:6
determination	77:12 78:9,12	distinguishing	D.C 1:9,17,19,21	63:17 68:9
96:24	100:15 105:11	5:21 13:20		69:14 88:18
determined 48:6	directed4:19	diversify 65:3	<u> </u>	93:7
96:10	direction 46:6	divided 59:20	E 2:1 3:1,1	effort 53:5 63:14
determinedly	directly 4:11,13	doctor 73:16	earlier 25:1	efforts 48:6
48:11	4:14 9:15,16	82:2 108:5	51:25 54:12	either 3:21 5:20
Detroit 69:23	93:3 106:16	doctors 98:16	55:10 56:10	17:19 20:17
develops 92:5	disabled 57:11	doing 7:21 8:3,7	early 97:9	43:24 71:10
device 47:6	disadvantageo	9:24 10:12	106:23	98:14
87:13,22	34:24	13:25 21:10	echoed 20:24	elected75:14
diagnosed 33:22	disagree 11:17	24:18 33:2 56:3	economic 4:8,8	electric 73:8,9
diagnosis 33:18	88:16	92:4 95:25	5:7 9:13 14:6	73:10
dial 6:11	disaster 14:15	98:23 99:14	17:8 19:8 23:5	eliminate 75:19
die 7:23 61:21	disavowed 49:3	dollar 4:2	28:9,29:11 30:7	eliminated 95:1
difference 7:7	disconnect 73:25	dollars 9:14,21	32:22 33:1,1	eliminates 75:20
8:11,21,25 9:1	discourage 47:23	14:20 73:2	37:15,19,22	else's 19:1
9:2,11,12 15:2	discover 61:18	DONALD 1:16	43:14 53:15	embark 29:13,14
15:5,5 17:4,22	discriminated	2:3,12 3:7	68:22 69:13	29:16
18:9 23:23 24:9	97:6	107:11	70:5,6 71:11	embedded20:10
26:1 32:12 45:8	discrimination	door 76:17	74:23 77:11	43:20
48:8 62:12 63:6	4:6,20 28:19	doubled36:11	93:20 100:21	emergency 6:2
66:24 71:14	discussed 51:14	doubt 25:18	economically	6:11,23 15:21
73:17 79:16	discussion 51:25	40:14 51:16	103:25	16:3 23:16
86:14 96:1	54:8 60:8	59:23 78:10	economies 71:23	54:10,18 61:24
101:2,3	disease 33:22	109:2,8	73:10	67:17 73:15
different 6:14	61:19 67:20	downstream 86:8	economists 10:4	74:3,5,10,17
8:10 9:8 13:11	71:1 85:6,16	86:10	economy 3:13	86:21 97:23
13:11 21:9	86:2,16,17	downtown 7:19	effect 11:1 14:7	98:9,11 99:6,9
26:16 29:22	103:21	dramatically	21:1,2,2 28:10	102:2
30:20 40:2 43:7	disguised 59:12	101:22	29:11 30:7 43:2	eminently 24:11
61:5 62:24 64:7	disproportionate	draw 81:6 105:18	63:19 70:7	emission 93:6,6
65:5,24 66:8,19	50:19	drawing 105:22	72:21 77:11,12	emphasize 75:12
68:18 70:22,23	dissuading	106:10,11,11	86:4 90:19 91:1	employer 3:21
73:13 74:1 81:9	101:19	Drexel 50:14,23	effective 3:19	4:3 28:15
83:12,13 91:4	distinction 17:21	drive 61:7	26:7 49:17,22	enact 4:18 11:5
91:21,21 92:13	61:14 81:6 94:7	driven97:16	108:24	16:8 43:10 94:5
	l	l	I	I

	1	1	1	1
enacted 22:4	environmental	101:12,17	46:16	factors 14:9
94:2 107:16	93:14	everybody's	exist 15:13,14	50:16
enacting 32:22	envision 109:1	13:12 39:23	76:18	facts 91:13 95:12
43:9	envisioned	40:1 72:22	existed 15:9	fails 100:23
encourage 76:1	108:22	evident 27:5,21	existing 17:7,10	failure 5:11 43:1
ends 36:23	EPA 87:12	exact 11:4	17:10 18:9,15	71:12 77:12
enduring 3:12	epidemic 84:15	exaction 47:7	19:8 53:8 86:12	90:1 102:20
enforce 50:22	equally 8:6 27:5	exactly 36:7	91:1	fair 35:17 47:3
98:25 99:2	27:21	39:18 40:25	exists 26:2,5	48:14 49:5 92:7
101:5	equation 33:15	76:6 77:21	27:19 64:20	families 14:19
enforced45:21	equipment 87:10	78:25 87:2	78:2	83:1
51:2 75:16	equivalent 51:6	105:16 108:17	expand 20:12	family 9:9,21
98:11,13	era 66:2	example 8:11	expenses 65:8	73:1
enforcement	ERISA 4:4 15:21	15:6,18 36:11	expensive 18:23	far 53:9 54:8
51:8	28:17 42:14	50:24 66:20	33:23	farm 95:15
engage 43:14	especially 35:6	87:6 92:23 93:5	experience	farmer60:22
72:18 91:20	ESQ 1:16,19,21	94:1 95:15,18	22:15 36:8	64:4 95:16
engaging 33:1	2:3,6,9,12	95:22 108:21	experiences 38:6	farms 94:16
enormously 34:8	essential 26:22	examples 95:11	explain 85:12	faster 61:8
ensure 12:9	31:18 32:23,24	exceeds 80:14	explaining 48:22	fatal 67:7
28:18 30:4	essentially 53:10	80:21	explains 13:24	feature 5:21 25:2
82:16	55:19	exception 21:16	explicitly 49:2	features 41:15
ensuring 97:5	establish 38:19	exceptions	exports 50:11	federal 4:11 16:3
enter 5:22,23	estimate 10:5	104:13	express 42:24	27:6,23,25
6:17,18,19	estimated 10:1	excise 78:11	extant 68:1	28:16,24 29:2
37:24,24 44:2	et 1:4,7,20,22 2:7	excludes 31:4	extent 6:7,23 7:4	29:21,24 30:4
53:6,9 78:3	2:10 53:2 79:23	Excuse 3:19	26:3 76:10	30:19,22 40:16
88:1 91:25 92:8	eventually 7:23	execution 4:23	extraordinarily	42:16 48:2 52:2
92:9 94:13 95:6	35:11 94:24	22:12	87:3	61:21 65:18
103:24 107:1	everybody 5:19	exempt 5:17	Extraordinary	66:5 70:17 72:3
entered 87:23	8:24,24 12:16	58:21	52:16	78:18,22 79:9
88:8 92:4 93:24	12:24,25 13:1,6	exemption 58:17	eyes 13:22	79:17 84:18
94:9	13:7 19:1 22:9	exercise 25:3	F	85:7 94:6 99:11
entering 88:10	31:4,12,21	34:12,14 35:4	facial 91:7 92:22	federalism78:24
entire 55:20	32:18 34:20,20	40:13,14,17	facilitate 6:10	federalist 72:6
entirely 29:22	40:7,13,16 41:6	44:25 45:14,25		79:2
83:12,13	41:10 42:4 45:6	46:4,9 47:4	71:22 facing 88:25	fee 44:24 45:8
entitled 11:13	52:5 57:8 58:13	48:1,3,18,23	fact 5:16 11:4	feed 95:17
32:2 73:14	58:17 63:17,23	49:3,5,7 58:24	15:16 44:8 46:5	fees 45:5,6,6
entry 44:1	64:2,6,15,16	62:19,21 76:25	48:16 55:24	fellow 70:17
enumerated 14:2	64:17 69:7,25	109:4	48:16 55:24 61:1 75:13	85:15
27:23 29:20	71:6,20,21,22	exercised 76:10	78:16 87:8 88:6	fewer 11:9,10
79:17 81:7	71:24 73:4	exercises 45:25	88:6 91:9,10	22:16 36:21,22
environment	86:22 92:3,7,9	47:21	factor 24:17	36:22,22
16:5 22:9	92:15,15 99:24	exercising 46:14	14CIVI 24.17	figure 56:1 58:9

figured 33:6	71:24 74:14	fundamental	49:15,24 50:2,5	78:1 82:15 85:8
figures 9:25	93:15 97:13	3:12 7:6 10:18	50:9 51:13 52:7	86:25 88:21,21
10:11 82:25	105:6	30:23 32:12	52:11,14,17	90:9,15 95:16
Filburn 63:14	forced 16:19	79:16 99:21	75:6 78:15,25	goes 23:16 24:23
64:3	32:6,9 34:25	fundamentally	81:9 82:1 107:9	50:3 65:25
financing 5:6	58:19 74:18	80:6 94:9	107:13 109:18	68:11 73:22
7:22 8:7 17:16	89:10 93:8,10	Furniture 50:14	generally 5:22	74:14 95:18
64:21	93:17 95:16	50:23	30:17 58:13	104:4
find 56:13 63:11	forcing 10:8 11:1	further78:1	General's 53:19	going 5:2 6:3,5
Finding 56:25	14:24 36:25	fuss 57:13	77:6 80:2	6:22 7:4,23,23
findings 53:13	57:18 63:8 73:8		generation 59:20	8:1,23,24 9:6,9
57:2 74:24,24	82:14 96:3	<u> </u>	gentlemen 52:20	10:14,20 13:3
fine 85:8 87:5	forego 53:15	G 3:1	getting 20:2	14:1 17:8 19:4
89:16 97:5	foregoing 94:23	gallons 92:17	26:11 70:14	19:22,25,25
101:6 103:19	foreign 72:13	Garcia-ize 76:2	83:5	29:13,23 31:12
fire 6:2 7:3	forever 33:14	geese 55:19	Gibbons 76:7	31:23 32:13,18
first 12:4 14:5	forget 88:21	General 1:16 3:6	77:25	33:10,14,14,17
20:24 23:1 43:7	forgone 51:7	3:9 4:12 5:2,13	Ginsburg 10:20	33:20,21,25
46:13,21 50:18	forgotten88:23	6:13 7:6,14,16	14:11 18:17	35:21 36:5,17
53:10 60:4	Form 45:19	8:4,9 9:1,8,11	45:20 46:1 47:5	37:5 38:23
64:11 65:23	forms 8:18	10:16,22 12:3	47:18 57:3 58:6	39:24 40:2,3
68:6 72:12	formulated 59:10	13:2,10 14:4	82:19,25 83:9	53:20 57:10,22
73:19 75:6 77:5	forth 76:13	15:1,24 16:7,10	89:2,7 90:7,12	60:9 62:25 63:2
78:4 81:22	found 7:20 9:20	16:17 17:3,22	96:5,16,23 97:8	63:22,23 65:16
96:12	85:18	18:2,8,17 19:6	give 24:22 53:8	67:25 68:1
five 92:17,18	foundation 23:9	19:10,16,20,24	63:22 80:7	73:22 74:9,11
five-year 12:15	founding 99:9	20:7,14,19,20	83:20 96:14	74:13 75:12
fledgling 72:14	four 107:9	20:22 22:3,22	107:6	76:19 77:20
flood 103:22,22	fraction 82:8	22:25 23:11,22	given 29:2 39:13	81:18 82:2 84:2
floor 48:17	framers 59:17	24:24 26:3	49:3 55:8 67:3	87:18,19 90:8
Florida 1:7,20	63:5 72:16	27:12,20 28:2,6	67:5 101:3	91:14 92:8,9
2:7 3:5 53:2	78:10 88:19	28:22,25 29:7	gives 41:14	94:24 98:10
focus 73:25	106:18 107:4	30:1,24 31:15	43:11 53:7	100:8 101:4,7
focuses 105:5	109:1	31:25 32:21	83:18 95:15	104:13 106:5,6
focusing 60:11	frames 81:25	33:12 34:5,19	97:18	golden 55:19
food 13:6,7,11	framing 59:20	35:7,8,13,23	giving 88:16	good 18:24 39:6
14:12 17:21	free 19:2 83:10	36:3,6 37:9,14	104:20	42:3 60:8 97:15
71:9	freedom 106:21	37:19 38:1,16	go 11:20 13:15	goods 93:18
foods 93:18	friends 8:14	39:16,19 40:8	13:16 18:18	94:13
forbid 12:21 20:9	23:23 29:15	40:19 41:8,22	21:19 35:3	gotten 66:12,14
forbidden78:12	front 30:14 83:7	42:13 43:6	40:15 57:16	95:24
78:22	fuel 59:6	44:11,13,22	60:6 61:9,12	governed77:25
force 22:20	fully 82:2 94:19	45:10,24 46:12	62:12 64:24	government 3:22
42:25 54:4	100:14	46:22,25 47:17	69:23 73:11,15	4:11 6:9,24 7:1
56:22 63:2	full-stride 92:14	48:5,13 49:11	73:16 74:16	7:4 11:24 13:25
	I	I	I	I

Alderson Reporting Company

14:3 15:16 21:6	61:18,23 70:20	28:15 31:1,21	helps 36:21	96:1
21:9,11 22:20	83:12 102:13	33:5 38:15,20	86:11	human 1:4 3:5
24:18 27:6,7,8	groups 5:16 31:3	39:17.23 40:15	hey 61:7	18:6 70:13 88:8
27:10,23,23,25	growing 60:21,23	40:21 41:6,18	high 35:25 84:17	88:13 108:25
28:24 29:2,21	61:9	41:22 47:8,13	101:14 108:2,5	hunting 45:6
30:4,6,18,19	guarantee 21:14	47:14 52:5	higher 9:18,19	hurt 16:4 71:3
30:22 40:16	36:16	53:16,20 55:16	9:20 19:13	99:13
48:3 52:3 57:16	guaranteed4:21	55:17,25,25	34:16 36:21,21	hurting 19:14
57:24 58:2,2,17	10:24 11:5,12	56:4 58:18,19	56:20,20	hypothesized
58:20,21,22	22:14 56:18,18	59:7 64:14,20	highly 36:10	98:10
59:8 61:21	58:10	64:21,24 65:1	38:12	hypothetical
64:13,14 65:19	guaranteed-iss	66:9,11 67:8,10	highway 16:2	6:21 86:14,15
66:5,23 70:1,17	8:17 22:5 34:7	68:25 69:3,4,5	high-risk 54:22	hypotheticals
71:17 72:3	36:9 38:8 96:15	69:7 71:14,15	Hilton 60:3	64:8 73:17
78:19,25 79:10	guarantees 65:6	71:21,25,25	HIPAA 4:5 28:17	
79:18 81:25	guise 50:15	73:14,15 74:18	42:15	I
84:18 85:7		80:3,4,9,16	history 4:7 28:12	idea 42:1 74:8
86:18,20 89:15	H	81:17,19,23	48:21 60:13,14	identified 14:10
89:17 92:17	Hamilton 59:22	83:5,11 85:17	60:18 62:10	50:14,16 59:18
93:3,4,9,12,19	hand 24:20 79:17	85:18 86:4,25	68:7 105:8	63:5
93:21 94:11,15	handle 38:7	88:9 91:6,10,14	hit 33:17,21 82:5	identify 16:15
95:13 96:9 98:7	51:18,20	91:22 92:10,12	holders 74:12	105:15
102:1,2,3,4,6	happening 101:9	92:13 96:2,8	home 56:2 60:23	identifying 10:24
103:6 108:13	103:4	97:1,14,17	95:18	ignore 78:16
108:19 109:14	happens 11:4	98:12,13,14,24	homeowner's	illegal 101:23
government's	21:17 31:2	98:24 99:3,3,24	103:22	illegitimate
55:21 57:1 64:1	70:19	100:8,9 102:21	homes 59:5	34:11
68:13 74:25	hard 71:4	102:22,24	home-grown	illness 40:15
87:3 92:8 97:12	harm 86:16	103:10 104:7	90:9	82:6
105:17	harmful 102:24	104:17 107:17	honest 24:19	illogical 87:4
grain 95:17	harms 83:17	108:16	Honor 17:6 28:3	97:12
grasp17:14	health 1:3 3:5,12	healthy 7:20 10:6	29:8 32:1 49:16	illuminates 50:1
grave 88:13	3:14,16,20,25	14:24 32:5,8,10	51:16	illustrates
107:15	4:15,15 5:6,7	33:13,14 35:15	hope 66:13	104:19
great 57:17 63:7	5:14,15 6:5 7:1	37:7 56:14 57:9	103:18	imagine 20:7
65:8 71:18,19	8:7,8,13,22,23	74:14,15 96:12	horsepower93:8	immutable 32:8
71:20,23	9:17,21 10:7	99:15 104:4	hospital 14:18	impede 96:19
108:25	11:15 12:5,17	hear 76:21	23:16 87:1	impermissible
greater 53:9 72:4	12:20,21,23,24	heard 75:5,18	107:23 108:4	59:12
greatest 75:10	17:9,15,17,23	hearing 102:17	hospitals 86:20	implicate 32:25
ground 22:18	17:24 18:10,11	heart 6:6 12:25	hour 7:19 61:8	implicit 27:2
41:9 88:3 96:6	19:25 20:2,4	heavy 11:21 12:1	house 60:22	imply 90:14
group 33:4,6,8	21:12,14,19,20	held 26:24 79:8	69:22	import 29:16
33:17,20,21	22:9 23:6 24:16	help 11:16,16	huge 10:8 71:21	important 6:25
55:14 57:21	25:22,23 26:9	helping 88:18	74:19 85:17,21	35:18 72:5
	1	1	1	1

	1	1	1	1
77:21 106:8	indirect 59:22	33:7 35:21 36:1	intended83:2	IRS 45:18 49:19
impose 8:17,18	105:11	36:17,19,22,25	96:21	issuance 21:3
24:1 41:11,16	indirectly 93:3	37:3,25 38:4,5	intent 14:14	issue 4:21 7:8,8
51:11 59:16	indisputably 66:3	38:15,17,25	interfere 27:14	10:25 11:6,12
65:18 88:6	individual 3:24	39:7,16 40:4	90:4	20:12 21:21
91:11,16,20	4:4,7,19 10:6	41:12,16,17,17	interlinked64:22	22:14 29:25
92:1,2 93:24,25	11:24 28:20	43:22 47:2,10	Internal 45:17	44:15 54:9
109:9	30:11,19,22	47:14 51:7 52:5	49:18 51:3	56:18,19 58:10
imposed 54:11	65:20 106:21	53:16,21 54:3,4	interpreted	82:1 84:22
99:10	individuals 3:23	54:12,21 55:16	108:23	102:10
imposes 50:10	31:1 53:5 56:23	56:1,11,13,23	interrupted	issues 58:23
imposing 43:22	industries	57:7 58:3,9,20	18:19	103:23
107:20	103:15 105:23	59:7 64:14,20	interstate 5:8	item 90:2
imposition 36:8	industry 58:3,10	64:22,23 65:1,2	14:7 16:25 23:7	it'll 90:17 97:5
66:23	63:21 70:8	65:5,5,10,15	28:10 29:12	103:8
impossibility	76:19 105:18	65:18,20 66:9	30:8 41:6,10	i.e 21:1 86:6 96:1
54:3	105:19	66:11,20 67:12	42:11 43:3	98:12 99:2
impossible 28:11	ineffectual 36:10	68:25 69:3,6	60:20 71:4	
impression 71:16	inevitably 20:20	70:18,25 71:14	75:22 87:10,11	J
85:15	inextricably	74:5,15,18,19	90:20 94:13,18	Jersey 36:11
impressions 98:7	64:21	77:7 80:3 82:16	95:3,6 102:14	job 15:13 69:24
inactive 105:14	infer 47:3	83:1 86:25 88:5	intervention 67:6	join 40:17
inactivity 106:13	injecting 104:11	90:5 91:15 92:1	intrastate 79:14	joined75:7
incarcerated	injured66:14	92:3,13 94:23	94:17 95:2,5	Jones 25:15
5:19	inoculated 71:3	96:21,22,25	intrusion 39:3	JR 1:16 2:3,12
incentive 47:2	84:19,20 85:7	97:1,10,14,14	intrusive 94:10	3:7 107:11
109:10	inoculation 61:22	97:17,25 98:13	intuitively 94:7	judge 95:10,21
incentives 51:22	inside 104:14	98:15,24 99:3,6	101:21 106:25	103:21
63:22 69:11	insofar 55:24,25	99:16,17,18	invading 28:12	judgment 35:9
incentivizes	Institute 89:21	100:10,18,20	invalid 80:22	41:3 65:13 99:8
100:17,18	insurance 3:13	102:5,8,21	inverse 62:7	108:18
include 42:6	3:15,18,21,25	103:7,10,13,22	investment	judgments 32:3
43:11 72:17	4:18,19,24 7:10	104:2,7,17	57:17	68:2 106:7
96:11	7:25 8:13,22,23	105:18 107:17	involuntarily	109:13
includes 77:24	9:19,22 10:2,9	107:20,25	6:18 88:7	junior 89:5
81:1	10:21,21,22	108:4	involuntary	jurisprudence
including 43:12	11:1,8,10,11	insurance-based	13:14	53:24 105:21
increase 47:1	12:7,10,18,20	55:9	involve 31:9	justice 1:17 3:3,9
increased85:18	14:13 16:21,22	insure 96:7 97:2	57:24,25	4:10,13,25 5:3
increasing 73:1	17:15,23 18:6	97:9	involved 25:18	5:9,14,25 6:13
incur 65:7	19:23 21:3,13	insured67:16	involves 44:15	6:20 7:7,12,15
incurring 35:25	21:13,20,21	insurer 36:14	70:25	7:16,18 8:5,21
Indian 5:19	22:5,8 23:15	insurers 31:16	ironic 25:7	9:2,5,9,23
indicated 54:12	24:1 25:23,24	57:25 89:14,17	irrelevant 48:12	10:20 11:16
indicia 46:3	29:5 32:1,20	96:6	56:11	12:4,22 13:2,5
	l		l	l

13:19 14:11	76:22 77:15,16	64:18,25 68:11	86:1 87:20 91:8	96:17 106:24
15:4,7,25 16:7	79:3,7,11,19	68:23 69:2	95:18 101:13	legislative 48:21
16:9,13,24	79:24 80:23,25	72:19 73:6,12	knows 45:6	legislature 75:16
17:12,23,25	81:5,15,21	73:19 83:24	Kurth 50:14	legitimate 88:4
18:5,17,18	82:10,19,25	84:1 85:11		96:17 99:1,7
19:10,17,18,21	83:9,24 84:1,8	88:21,23 89:1,4	L	let's 24:14 90:11
20:5,11,19,22	84:10,11,13,24	91:3 105:1	label 78:23	93:23
22:18,23 23:11	85:3,5,10,10	106:16	labels 48:10 79:1	level 42:16 51:20
23:22 24:13,25	85:13,19,21,24	keep 14:23 81:22	labor 25:14 51:2	95:6
25:17 26:4,11	86:13,14 87:2,5	Kennedy 4:25	69:23	leverage 103:1
26:19 27:17,21	87:8,18 88:2,20	5:3 11:16 12:4	laborer 50:25	104:21
28:4,21,23 29:1	88:21,23 89:1,2	15:7 16:13,24	lack 40:14	libertarian 89:21
29:18 30:2,9,24	89:4,5,7 90:7	24:13,25 26:11	large 37:1 61:17	license 44:23
31:6,19 32:14	90:12 91:3 92:6	30:9,25 55:21	70:19 97:25	45:5,6 46:5
33:3,19 34:6,17	92:24 93:2,15	56:7 69:16,19	105:1	78:15,19,22
35:6,10,14,20	93:17 94:11,19	103:3,6,18	larger 43:4	life 67:6 93:21
35:24 36:4,7	94:21 95:8 96:5	104:12	late 97:10	103:9
37:2,10,12,18	96:16,23 97:8	Kentucky 36:14	latitude 24:22	limit 22:23 42:18
37:21 38:14,18	97:21 98:4,18	key 8:14 29:18	32:2,23 68:2	76:25 77:2,20
39:18,21 40:8	99:19,22 100:2	64:1	Laughlin 25:15	81:4
40:11,20,24	100:4,6,22	kids 35:2	Laughter 85:25	limitation 108:14
41:20,24 42:18	101:8,11,17,24	kind 18:19 29:14	87:7 88:24 89:6	limitations 39:11
42:23 44:11,14	102:19 103:3,6	33:9 43:12	law 5:4 20:15	76:11
45:5,20 46:1,10	103:18 104:10	72:12 81:19	30:11,12 31:8	limited 27:8
46:12,18,23	104:12 105:1	82:5 90:2 104:7	45:1,2 48:17,22	29:20 38:15,16
47:5,18 48:5,15	106:9,16,24	108:11,17,21	68:14 75:14,15	42:5 59:15
49:9,12,21 50:2	107:7,14	kinds 28:18	78:21,23 80:15	77:10 79:17
50:7 51:10,24	108:21 109:18	54:14 74:9 94:1	80:22 86:15	88:15
52:9,12,16,19	Justice's 68:12	95:12 100:19	89:24 91:9 94:6	limiting 42:24
52:23 53:3,18	76:16	105:3,22	laws 11:22 16:8	50:3,6,8,13
53:23 54:2,6,12	•	knew 67:18	20:25 94:2,2,5	53:17 73:7 75:3
55:2,11,21 56:7	justification	know 5:10 6:3,5	102:2	75:5,10,12,24
56:9 57:3 58:6	11:21 12:1 19:7	6:21 7:21 13:3	lawyer 74:21	76:4 77:8 93:13
58:16 59:1,4	77:8	13:15,21 20:6	law's 89:20,23 lead 56:16	105:17
60:6 62:6,8,14	justified 53:14	32:13 33:16	leave 71:16	limits 16:14,15
62:17 63:7,25	62:18,19	34:22,25 36:4	leaves 108:12	29:23,24
64:11,18,25	justifies 15:3	44:20 45:5	left 27:9 29:5	line 106:1,10,11
65:14,21,25	justify 16:19,21	49:24,25 56:6	36:14 57:16	106:12
66:11,18 67:4	34:2 40:20	60:3 62:25 63:3	108:18	liquor 90:25
67:13,23,24	justifying 18:14	65:9 66:10	legal 90:20 101:5	listed 45:21
68:11,23 69:2	K	67:23 68:18,21	legislate 65:19	literally 88:12
69:16,19 70:9	Kagan 23:11,23	69:13 70:9,12	66:6	little 25:6 59:10
71:7 72:19 73:6	35:6,10,14 48:5	70:14,15,16	legislation 52:4	59:23 64:19
73:12,19 75:1	48:15 55:2,11	71:5 76:25 82:8	70:4 78:13	live 34:20
75:25 76:6,7,21	TU.13 33.2,11	82:10,13,22	/U.T /0.1J	liver 13:1
	1	1	1	1

Alderson Reporting Company

living 56:3	72:6	12:11,12,13,16	108:16	24:10,12,14,20
loaves 63:18	main 14:12 80:2	12:23 13:6,7,8	marketplace	26:6 38:4,15
local 28:8 75:9	81:16	13:11,13,14,16	93:24 103:24	40:21 42:10
85:23 86:2	maintenance	14:13 15:2 17:9	markets 71:8	88:12 89:4
90:16,18,23	41:17	18:10,11,22	93:12 103:11	100:16 108:7,7
Lochner 29:18	major 18:21,21	19:25 20:1 21:6	103:11	108:11
29:25 38:24	19:4	22:5 23:6 25:4	married 61:11	meant 38:21
66:1	majority 27:24	25:22,24 26:9	Marshall 76:7	measured 56:4
Lochner-style	66:13 85:22	28:13,20 31:1,2	108:22	meat 92:18
29:16	making 18:22	31:5,7,20,24	Maryland 14:17	mechanism 55:9
locked-in 65:6	21:10 32:2	32:4,7,10,11	15:11	mechanisms
long 38:5	46:18 61:6	32:19 36:12,13	Massachusetts	25:4
longer 66:6	68:17 72:1 73:3	36:15,19 37:25	108:8	Medicaid 3:22
look 34:24 39:24	82:20 98:25	38:20,23 39:2,7	massive 21:17	15:20 102:3
40:2 44:14 48:9	99:15	39:15,23 40:2,7	28:15 104:8	medical 4:6
48:9 50:17	man 30:14 61:9	40:23 41:6,10	match 81:22	35:25 37:5 47:8
56:12 60:3,13	mandate 9:24	41:16 42:5,9,14	maternity 31:9	47:14 75:21
60:13,18,21,22	10:6,8,12 20:15	42:14,15,15	31:23 32:17	103:14
63:10 67:15	33:5 51:10 53:4	43:25 44:1,2,3	matter 1:12 6:12	Medicare 3:22
68:21 70:5	53:14 54:21	44:4 52:8 54:16	52:2 55:3,10,12	15:20 102:3
72:24 79:1	79:4,6 88:17	56:11,13,23	65:3 75:3 80:8	Medicare/Me
97:13 98:22	98:19	57:17,25 60:2	85:23 109:21	25:6
101:6 104:15	mandated 86:20	61:10 63:13,19	matters 22:16	meet 83:3 100:23
105:8	mandates 20:13	64:2,4,6,7,12	26:13 46:14	member 9:9
looked 7:10	mandating 23:15	64:14,15,16,17	80:10 103:10	members 48:22
78:23	mandatory 21:2	65:9 66:22,24	McCulloch	67:14 75:13
looking 26:4 62:9	21:4	66:25 68:10,15	15:11 62:15,16	membership
62:9	Manhattan	68:15,22,24	108:12,22	40:21
Lopez75:7,18	66:20	69:1,3,4,6,7,7	mean 13:20,24	mention 49:1
76:24,25 77:20	manner 26:2	69:15,16,18,23	16:5 26:15,22	mentioned 63:11
lose 69:24	108:24 109:15	70:2 71:14,15	29:1 45:7 47:24	merely 51:22
lot 32:16 33:24	manufacturing	71:25,25 74:15	48:8 55:19	94:13
54:7,12 57:14	94:12,15	77:7,10,12,13	56:10,12 59:13	merits 75:2
60:9	105:11 106:12	77:14 80:4,17	59:20 60:3 61:1	met 51:23
lots 11:1 66:19	March 1:10	81:2,24 82:16	61:14 63:12	method 5:6 8:12
78:6	marijuana 47:18	82:22 86:5	64:20 66:12	16:23 20:16
lower 56:16,24	60:22 61:1,12	87:23 88:1,8,9	67:2 71:15	25:5 26:9 39:17
97:14	market 3:24,24	88:11 90:3,10	76:24 77:18	41:4 42:1,6
lowering 55:20	4:3,4,7,19,19	90:16,19,20,20	92:24 97:4	43:21
lowers 74:20	5:10,11,15,15	90:21,25 91:1,2	meaning 65:15	MICHAEL 1:21
104:11	5:20,20,23,24	91:7,10,15 92:1	67:6	2:9 79:22
lunch 7:19	6:1,7,15,15,16	92:4,8,10,13	means 3:14,15	midst 62:2
M	6:17 7:8,8,10	92:14,15,16,20	4:15 17:16,23	miles 61:8
	7:11,13 9:3,16	95:2,3,5,7 96:2	18:3,5,7 19:9	milk 35:2,3 92:15
Madison 59:22	9:17 10:2 12:5	103:7,8 105:4,4	23:3,4 24:7,8,9	million 3:20 22:7
			Ι	I

	1			
38:3 61:20,21	N 2:1,1 3:1	36:5 66:12,13	objectives 24:4	opponents 48:24
61:22,23 67:15	name 96:14	66:14 70:11	88:19	opposed 29:24
67:19,20 70:20	narrow75:7	106:6 108:6	obligate 20:5	opposite 11:4
71:3 75:21	76:18	nevertheless	21:3	46:6 79:1
102:4,8,13	narrower16:12	44:16	obligated 20:4	optimal 68:10
107:16	nation 72:15	new 27:14 36:11	obligation 49:6	option 66:22
mind 46:2	national 24:16	51:19 63:24	109:12	104:19
minimum 4:22	25:13 28:8 30:6	70:10 71:19	obtain 13:17	options 58:6
5:17 8:18 11:7	60:15 70:24,25	72:7 81:1 109:6	obtaining 18:11	oral 1:12 2:2,5,8
12:6 22:11,14	108:10	109:12	obviously 81:7	3:7 53:1 79:22
23:3 24:4 26:7	nations 72:13	newborn 31:10	84:3 85:15 90:1	order 5:1 9:18
31:17 38:9	nature 12:11	nexus 104:15	106:3	12:20 19:13
100:24 109:4	73:13	NFIB 1:22 2:10	occur 8:19 28:20	34:16 48:16,19
minute 52:20	near 55:17	79:23	28:20	53:6 62:7 78:23
minutes 107:9	necessarily	noncommerce	occurring 18:10	79:1 80:3
misheard 98:20	21:22 73:12	106:15	odd 89:14	ordinary 54:13
misleading 98:7	necessary 4:23	noncommercial	offer 11:12 31:16	54:13
missing 41:25	12:9 20:25	75:10	office 54:14	ought 24:19
misunderstand	22:11 26:20,21	nondiscriminat	107:24	29:16 47:1
103:18	26:22,23 27:4	96:20 99:17	offset 58:18	108:17
mix 81:22	41:14 43:10,13	noninsured	Ogden 78:1	outside 66:25
model 25:6 58:1	58:10 63:1,9	55:23	oh 25:17 39:6	86:6 95:5
modern 34:20	need 5:23 6:4,6	nontax 44:24	85:1.89:16	104:14
moment 11:17	6:11,19,22,24	non-group 10:2	90:11 96:18	
11:18 21:21,24	7:1,2 8:23 11:9	non-risk 65:12	okay 28:4 62:21	$\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\mathbf{P}^{2}}$
41:18	13:16 17:20	norm 20:10	75:4 81:24 85:8	P 3:1
money 7:25 9:6	18:6,25 21:14	27:13	98:19 100:2,4	pack 101:5,7,13
14:16 35:22	21:24 31:12,21	normal 73:1	103:5	package 38:8,10
52:6,13 57:10	31:23 35:22	norms 20:3	old 57:6,11	Packers 25:12
58:19 60:9 63:3	36:18 41:17	Northern 25:11	once 38:19,19	page 2:2 74:24
70:25	44:1 47:8,14	notwithstanding	39:7 41:1 42:4	pages 95:11 paid 12:18 34:15
monster 106:23	52:9,12 57:21	86:4	42:10,11 58:11	paid 12:18 34:15 45:18 51:7
moral 30:16 99:5	81:18 89:12	novel 25:3,9,9	67:25 68:23	
morning 3:4 54:8	93:18 94:24	now-conceded	70:5 72:10,19	paradigm 108:20 parallel 109:7
Morrison 84:22	needed 104:8	41:5	76:16 77:18	paranel 109:7 parent 97:24
85:2	108:23	number 18:24	87:22	parent 97:24 part 6:25 9:24
mortgage 47:24	needing 57:6	45:21 46:19,19	ones 57:10,22	23:1,2 31:14,15
47:25 92:1,1,3	needs 12:24,25	70:19 84:17	67:16 75:7	43:3 45:11
92:8	13:1 34:21	numbers 37:1	89:11	43.3 43.11 54:16 102:15
move 40:9 42:24	negative 85:15	104:10	one's 44:1	102:16 105:1
moving 17:6	85:22 91:1	nuts 74:6	open 76:17	participant 32:11
mufflers 16:4	negatively 80:11	0	operated 72:10	92:20
multibillion 4:2	80:12 83:19,22	$\frac{0}{02:13:1}$	operates 64:13	participants 9:3
<u> </u>	84:6 89:25	objective 49:17	operation 48:9	9:16,17 44:5
	never 13:3 31:23		opinion 95:10	J.10,17 TT. J
	•	•	•	•

90:3,16,19 91:1	payer 24:16	38:3 39:8,9,25	97:22,25	35:13 41:12
91:2 94:8 95:2	paying 3:14,16	40:4 43:1,14	perfectly 32:5	44:23 46:5
95:3 105:3,4	8:12 15:19	47:2,7,10 51:12	99:1,7 103:19	48:15,19 53:25
participate 5:18	20:16 38:15	53:9 54:22,24	period 12:15	54:4,20,25,25
6:8 18:22 26:8	57:18 61:25	55:15,18,19	67:11	55:8,14 65:23
31:24 32:18	65:4,4 73:23	56:12,17 57:6	periods 105:10	66:16 67:9,25
39:8 91:10	82:2 83:1,4	57:14,15 60:9	permissible	70:3 76:16 77:5
participates 31:4	86:21 100:25	60:10 61:7,20	80:21	77:6 81:16,19
31:20 40:7 41:7	101:11,12	61:24 62:12	permitted 66:6	83:8,18 85:24
41:10	payment 16:23	63:8 65:10,15	pernicious 98:6	86:3 88:20
participating	17:24 18:3 26:9	66:13,19 67:10	person 13:4,21	101:20 107:21
39:10 64:5	39:17 40:22	67:15,19 68:8	30:13 33:17	108:2
participation	41:4 42:2,6	68:14,16,16	56:2 60:21	pointed 101:25
12:5 13:13 17:9	43:21 58:18	70:10,20 72:11	61:18 103:12	points 54:7 92:11
30:25 31:5	65:6 69:6 101:1	72:18,21 73:1,3	pesticides 93:19	police 6:2,22 7:2
particular 23:14	payments 83:12	73:9 74:14	Petitioners 1:5	76:3 77:20
39:25 41:15	91:22 102:22	75:21 76:17	1:18 2:4,13 3:8	79:15 88:14
64:4 88:8	pays 58:17 73:4	77:1,2,11 78:3	107:12	policed 28:7
particularly 23:9	pediatric 31:10	78:20 82:15	phone 6:10 34:17	policies 31:8
75:9 106:20	31:13,23 32:17	83:2,5,10,11	phones 15:17	policing 30:6
pass 20:25 79:4	penalties 45:21	83:13 84:19,23	16:1	policy 10:2 33:7
79:6 90:5	45:23 47:20	85:5 86:16,24	physician 12:14	33:8,9 58:20
passage 17:13	penalty 24:2	89:9 90:24 91:5	physician's	74:12 80:16
passed 53:12	44:16,18 45:9	91:9,15,16,19	107:24	89:23 104:22
74:1 78:19	47:11,11,15	91:20,25 95:4	picked 70:21	106:7
paternalistic	49:16,23 51:5	95:13 96:11,24	picking 84:13	pollution 87:10
82:15	51:12 98:15	97:6,8,13,22	place 53:11	pool 36:19 47:8
PAUL 1:19 2:6	99:4 101:5	98:8,11,16,25	73:20 74:2 78:4	54:22 56:15
53:1	penalty's 98:19	99:6,8,15 102:4	81:22	89:12 96:11
pause 52:20,22	people 4:6 5:22	102:12,14	plans 55:16	104:11 108:2
pay 7:24 9:6,10	6:17 7:20 8:23	103:20 104:13	plants 94:15	population 11:14
10:13 12:17	10:8,12 11:2,8	105:3,12 107:1	playing 81:22	12:13 21:16
13:18 14:19	11:10 12:10	107:23	please 3:10 53:4	98:1 104:5
19:12,23 20:1	13:8 14:24	people's 12:5	79:25 84:1	pose 54:17
21:12,13,20	18:10,21,23	17:9	85:10,12	posing 32:15,15
34:1 39:25 44:4	19:11,14,22	percent 3:17	102:19	position 5:14
53:21 55:20	20:4,13,17 22:7	12:14,15 14:18	plenary 80:7	38:24 40:19
57:10 58:10,13	22:16 25:25	21:16 28:14	88:11,14,17	43:20 53:19
58:14 62:1 64:9	26:8 28:14 29:4	50:24 61:24,25	104:20,25	58:4 92:9 100:7
65:7 66:15	29:4 31:8,22	75:14 76:15	107:6	100:11
68:17 69:25	32:8,16,19 33:4	81:23 84:16	point 8:19,25	possibility 66:16
70:18,19 73:16	33:10,20,21	87:9,11,12	12:7,10 14:12	75:19,20 107:2
82:20 83:6,7	34:4,5,12,15	102:25 103:1	17:14 18:21,25	possible 54:19
86:25 89:10	36:12,13,16,19	104:5,5,12	23:15,23 24:2	possibly 42:25
98:15	36:22 37:1,7	percentage 82:6	27:17 33:16,19	96:24 97:19
	l	l	Ι	l

	1	1	1	
potential 104:3	predecessor	63:16,19 71:24	problems 4:10	prophylactic
power 8:17 12:9	94:23	73:4,9,11 74:20	23:21 37:21	92:5
12:9 22:24	predicate 45:3	101:13	56:8 63:21 67:2	propose 15:17
23:10 24:15,19	51:21,23	prices 42:9	100:18	proposition
24:20 25:3	109:10	pricing 28:19	proceeded 54:8	48:20
29:24 34:12,14	predicated 30:25	principal 13:19	process 29:17	protect 79:10
35:3,4 38:21,25	predict 6:23	principle 13:23	60:12 66:1	protected 30:5
39:1,4,12 40:10	54:15 70:15	18:13 27:5,18	76:20 94:12	97:9
41:2 42:5,20,21	predictions 68:3	27:22,22 28:1	producers 63:15	protection 47:13
44:25 45:15,25	predominant	42:4,24 50:3,8	produces 37:22	provide 3:18,24
46:4,14,16,20	3:14,15 12:17	50:13 53:17	product 13:17	10:8 54:21
47:4,21 48:1,3	preexisting 96:9	73:7 75:11,12	14:23,25 21:22	68:17 75:22
48:18,23 49:1,3	premise 37:17	75:15 76:4 77:8	43:1,2 71:12	86:21 106:4
49:5,7,14 50:9	69:8 79:12 80:2	82:14 93:13	90:17 92:16,25	provided 7:11
52:15 53:7,9	premium 10:1	principles 44:7	93:3,11 96:3,4	12:21
54:1 58:25	55:20 73:1	50:6 75:3,5,17	104:1 105:24	provider 102:22
59:14,15 62:16	premiums 9:20	75:24 76:22,23	105:25 106:3,5	102:25
62:20,22 65:19	19:1 56:16,20	89:21,22	106:8,8	providers 9:17
68:7 72:2,3,6,7	72:22 74:20	105:17	production 71:23	provides 6:24
72:10,14,17,17	97:14,17 99:16	Printz 27:13	81:4	23:8
76:8,8 77:19,23	99:18 104:12	prior 100:14	products 81:3	providing 52:11
77:24 78:3,6	prescribe 77:24	private 57:16,24	profile 56:20	103:14
79:9,15 80:7,13	prescribed 76:11	57:25 71:19	profit 11:13	provision 4:23
80:15,19,20,20	prescribing 78:2	89:13,14,17	profits 50:25	8:18 11:7 12:6
81:1,3,7,10,10	presenting 91:5	92:3 99:10	profound 86:4	22:11 23:4 24:5
81:12,13 83:19	preserve 78:24	100:9 102:5	programs 3:22	25:9 26:7,18
83:21 84:3,4,19	89:13,17	problem 3:12 4:8	102:15	31:9 38:10 45:3
85:7 86:7,9	President 46:10	4:9 7:10 10:19	prohibiting	45:4 51:20
87:12 88:11,15	46:22,24,25	10:23,24 22:7	103:25	109:4
88:15,17 100:3	pressure 87:6	23:14 26:14	prohibits 104:6	provisions 22:12
104:23,23	presumably	31:18 32:4 33:2	prolonged 82:6	22:13 51:22
106:2,4 107:5,6	56:19 74:4	35:18 36:6 37:3	promote 80:3,9	99:17 108:23
109:5	presume 11:22	37:10,13,15,20	80:19 81:1,10	proximately
powers 14:2 21:1	pretty 42:12	38:2,2,7,11,13	81:11,12	103:12
22:10 27:7,8,23	60:19 101:13	39:25 40:2 50:2	104:23	public 99:10,24
27:24 29:2,21	prevailing 63:19	52:8 54:17 57:6	promotes 84:7	100:8,10
52:7 104:20	prevent 83:6	57:20 64:15	86:11	104:22
practical 48:9	preventive 54:13	69:9,13 70:24	promoting 81:8	punishment
practices 28:19	previous 30:21	70:25 73:18	proper12:9	50:15
precisely 74:15	previously 15:8	82:3,3,19,20	26:20,24,25	punitive 50:15
74:16,17 94:6	15:13,14	91:17,24 97:16	27:4,13 41:14	purchase 5:6,11
98:13 101:20	pre-existing 4:21	97:18 99:21	43:11 63:1,9	20:15 21:4 31:9
107:4,5 109:7	28:18	104:3,16 105:7	68:5 78:13	31:14 32:17,20
preclude 4:5,5	price 19:12,14	105:15,16	property 88:17	33:10 40:4 43:1
4:20,20	25:16 34:22	107:15,20,25	106:22	43:2 53:16

	1	1	1	1
55:16 71:12	17:14 70:22	realizing 59:15	76:8 77:24	regulatory 43:4
77:12 80:3 84:7		really 10:12,18	80:20 81:11,13	67:1 80:21
86:11 90:1	<u> </u>	28:11 52:2 75:2	83:16,19,21	reinvent 82:20
92:21 93:13	R 3:1	76:24 77:3 91:8	84:4 87:24	reject 23:19
106:5	radioactive	104:16 105:13	88:13 90:18,23	related45:23
purchased4:16	51:21	105:23	90:24 91:23,25	relation 11:24
17:15,18,19	Raich 43:16	reason 8:10 30:9	94:12 95:4	30:15
purchases 16:19	72:24 90:3	30:9 31:17	102:23 103:1	Relations 25:14
16:21 42:22	95:23	36:15 41:1,3	104:23 106:19	relationship
purchasing 5:9	rail 93:22	49:22 72:9	regulated 5:5	30:22
18:11	raise 24:15 35:1	78:12 86:19	11:11 25:19	relative 82:8
purely 16:18	47:5,9,16,20	102:23 104:8	42:16 54:17	relatively 56:14
75:9 94:17	47:22 58:13,23	106:24 107:22	80:11 86:6	56:14 65:11,12
purpose 16:20	72:22 95:17	108:9	108:16	relevant 25:22
47:7,22,22	raised 19:2	reasonably	regulates 20:16	67:11 81:24
64:20	raises 48:2 50:4	21:22 26:14,21	23:4,5 42:14,15	82:9
purposes 10:9	raising 52:13	26:23,25	93:12,21	religious 5:18
16:22 56:5 68:9	91:4,7	reasons 5:18	regulating 4:14	rely 25:4 68:3,4
101:18	Ranch 50:14	14:4 51:14 78:7	8:12 14:6 17:7	remain 27:24
put 38:24 57:5	range 31:21	82:15 87:25	17:10 19:8	remaining
63:2,8 87:10	rate 37:6	REBUTTAL	21:19 25:19,23	107:10
93:14 99:17	rates 9:18,19	2:11 107:11	25:23 26:1,5	remedy 107:20
106:23	11:10,14 34:13	received 10:15	28:9.29:10 30:7	repeating 41:25
p.m 109:20	34:15 36:10,20	recognizes	42:6 43:9 54:25	replete 48:21
	56:24 103:13	101:18	64:9 76:13	reply 17:13
$\left \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{Q} \end{array} \right $	rating 4:22 8:17	redeemed 80:15	89:24 90:12,13	represent 68:19
question 16:13	10:25 11:6,13	reduce 80:4	90:16 92:19	79:5
18:18,19 22:20	22:14 36:9 38:9	reducing 80:9	94:8 106:25	represents 53:4
23:20 24:25,25	56:18,19 58:11	refer 48:7	regulation 5:12	Republic 72:14
26:12 29:22	rational 39:15	referred94:25	6:16 7:8,9 12:4	require 4:21 6:9
32:15,25 41:13	rationale 16:11	reflect 9:19	15:3 18:15 26:6	12:20 15:16
42:17,18 45:12	16:12,18 34:10	reforms 4:18,24	26:8 27:15,16	31:14 32:19
45:16 46:8 48:6	70:3 104:22	10:25 11:6 22:4	29:19 31:5	37:5,6 39:8
48:12 55:5 56:9	rationales 76:18	22:6 38:8,10	32:22 33:1	65:20 84:19
62:9,15 65:17	rationalize 15:22	refuse 96:8	37:15,22 42:1	85:5 87:16,21
66:1 68:5,5,12	62:3	regardless 86:7	43:12,12 53:15	90:14 106:22
77:1,4,16 83:15	reaction 62:24	regulate 5:1 21:6	60:2 61:2 63:13	required 33:10
88:4,22,23 89:3	98:5	28:17 38:22,25	68:10 77:9	33:25 57:11
89:8 91:12	read 30:3 49:5	39:1,15,23,24	79:14 80:9,13	86:20,23
105:2,13	51:15,20 78:14	40:3 41:4,5	81:1,2 83:20	106:21
questioning 27:9	95:10,20	42:9,12,14	90:4 91:2 93:4	requirement
questions 45:12 62:7 89:23	real 57:6 67:1	43:21 53:6,8,13	93:9 94:15 96:1	5:17 8:14 24:1
103:9	73:17,24	53:24,25 54:19	96:19 108:15	41:12 43:22,24
	reality 35:2 55:24 56:3	55:4,5,9,14	regulations 4:5	51:1,8,11 65:18
quite 13:10,11	33.24 30:3	64:3 68:1 72:13	95:12 96:20	92:2 96:6
	ļ	l	l	1

				
100:24 107:21	93:25 94:1	41:20,24 49:9	96:2 97:13 99:1	58:1 89:9
109:9	result 14:16 19:1	49:12,21 52:19	99:23 101:4,6	see 8:21 16:5
requires 30:10	20:2 35:4 83:10	52:23 63:25	101:22 104:24	20:22 21:5,8
31:16	86:17,17	77:15 79:19	says 16:25 29:2	24:11 39:5 42:5
requiring 10:12	results 22:7	80:23,25 81:15	40:16 62:1,20	57:20 60:14,18
10:14 12:7 31:8	return 77:15	82:10 92:6	72:6 73:2 77:10	62:11 72:11
31:22 32:16	revenue 24:15	107:7 109:18	78:15 93:4	88:20 89:4
37:3,24 92:21	45:18 47:6,10	Rock 25:16	98:22 100:23	105:9 109:19
94:10 99:2	47:16,21,22	34:24	108:12	seek 13:17
rescue 30:13	48:2 49:18 50:4	role 89:13	scale 71:23	seeking 5:3
reserve 52:17	51:3 58:13	room 23:16	73:11	107:24
reserved 29:3	revenue-raising	54:10,18 56:3	Scalia 4:10,13	seeks 109:11
30:5	47:6	73:15 74:17	5:9,14 12:22	seen 20:23,25
resist 79:12	rid 61:13	97:23 102:2	13:3,5,19 19:10	75:7
resort 3:23	riders 83:11	rooms 74:3 98:9	19:17,18,21	self 5:9
respect 29:14	right 7:18,22	98:11	20:5,11 25:17	self-created
31:25 34:22	10:11,18 15:4	roughly 10:3	26:5,19 27:17	37:13
42:9,10 43:8,16	29:20 34:19	Royal 25:16	27:21 28:4,21	self-insurance
43:17,18,18	40:24,24,25	34:24	28:23 29:1	21:5
45:16 48:17	41:20 46:7	rule 19:9 30:17	34:17 35:20,24	self-insure 14:15
64:10 69:5	48:10 51:18	30:17 40:20	36:4,7 37:2,10	21:7 83:3
70:23 73:7	52:6 53:22 54:2	77:24,25 78:2	37:12,18,21	self-insuring
76:13 77:7 83:9	64:2 65:1,22,24		40:11,21 45:5	94:22
109:13	67:9 68:2,15	<u> </u>	46:10,12,18,23	sell 37:4,6 54:5
respectfully	69:20 72:23	S 2:1 3:1	51:24 52:9,12	101:6
109:16	77:18 81:13	sake 17:16,19,19	52:16 62:6	sellers 86:12
respond 91:12	84:8,9,22 97:19	sale 8:20 12:8,10	76:21 85:24	sells 37:7
Respondents	101:15 102:11	24:2 41:12	scenarios 63:6	Senate 48:19
1:20,22 2:7,10	rights 21:1	53:25 55:1,8,14	scheme 26:4	Senator 48:17
10:4,5,17 12:19	risk 35:25 47:8,8	107:21	43:4,8,9,14,15	sense 24:17 25:8
23:13 41:9 53:2	56:12,20 65:3	Sanchez47:19	43:20 52:1	55:5,9 69:17
79:23	65:11 69:17	sanction 50:18	scienter 50:20	100:21
responding 6:10	70:13 82:16	satisfies 14:8	51:1,7	sensible 24:11
response 6:23	103:20,21,22	satisfying 18:6,7	scientists 68:20	104:1
48:19 95:19	104:11 108:2	save 14:15 60:9	scope 32:3 38:22	separate 45:2,4
responsibility	risks 17:17 43:13	saved 7:25 98:5	second 21:5 23:2	45:12
16:10 58:18	56:1,15	saving 59:7	45:14 50:19	serious 22:7
99:10 100:25	road 15:22 61:8	saw 57:6 108:7	76:5 78:14	39:25
responsible	roadside 6:2	saying 19:17,19 19:22 21:11,18	second-guess	seriously 70:15
100:25	ROBERTS 3:3	25:25 30:18	74:23 106:7	77:22
responsive 41:1	5:25 6:20 17:12	38:24 51:24	Section 78:9	serve 10:10
rest 36:1 38:4	17:25 18:5	57:23 68:19	sector 89:13	16:23
52:4 83:4 91:11	29:18 31:6,19	69:13 72:2	secure 23:9 63:4	service 13:17
91:17,20	32:14 38:14,18	77:23 94:22	Securities 25:12	16:3,23 20:2,16
restrictions	39:18,21 40:24	11.23 /7.22	Security 57:4,19	24:16 43:23
	1	1	1	1

51:3 56:4 73:5	97:3,5,8 98:25	solve 37:2,14	77:16	84:20 87:14
73:14 99:7	side 8:15 15:21	38:10 52:8 69:9	sought 56:22	91:24
services 1:4 3:5	16:2 23:24	69:10,12,12	sounds 61:15	statistically
6:2,11 7:13,14	29:15 33:15	solving 33:1	75:1	83:21 84:5
7:22 8:8 10:7	63:14	somebody 7:23	soup 74:6	94:14
10:13,15 18:12	sign 54:24	8:1,3,6 10:15	south 69:23	statistics 81:23
18:24 21:12,20	signed 108:1	23:16 25:20	sovereigns 27:15	87:19
31:2,10,13,22	significant 9:12	32:7 35:5 37:4	sovereignty 27:1	status 96:8 97:1
31:24 32:17,17	18:1 39:3,13	37:24 56:10	special 78:21	statute 14:8 23:9
33:6,7 39:17	42:16	61:6,11 69:24	speculation	31:3,16 44:18
53:21 55:17,25	simple 98:5	73:22 74:11	56:25	53:12 57:1
71:9	105:24	somebody's	spend 58:19	64:13 69:8 74:1
set 34:14 45:3	simplest 95:8	71:12	sphere 28:8,9,13	74:4 109:14
76:12 86:23	simplest > 3.6	someone's 67:6	30:4,5	stay 35:15 90:24
99:24 100:8	52:3,4 54:20,24	somewhat 15:6	sponsor 48:17	stays 30:4
102:1,2,3,4,6	76:2 77:7,10	son 97:23	spread 58:12	step11:19 18:14
102:15	80:8 88:7 92:2	soon 59:14	stand 98:1	60:7 77:23
setting 51:21	102:12 109:10	sooner 12:24	standard 37:15	stimulating
107:1	single 10:2 24:16	13:6 14:25 83:7	stand-alone 45:3	16:20
severe 30:16	70:8	sorry 18:1 80:24	stare 64:23	stipulate 11:25
share 54:23	sitting 56:2 69:22	83:25 84:12	start 62:15	103:11
shared 58:18	situation 6:17	85:1 93:1,16	started 52:24	Stockyards
100:25	9:12 16:6 17:5	96:4 98:18,19	state 9:6 22:3	25:12
shares 13:12	24:6 36:24	sort 54:20 56:11	28:13 43:7	stop 30:15 76:19
sharing 74:2	44:25 48:25	96:19 105:9	55:22 75:15	stopped7:21
Sherman 25:10	49:20 70:23	sorts 67:10 68:2	78:21,23 79:9	stopped 7.21 store 35:3
shift 8:1 34:3	49.20 70.23 108:21 109:7	74:7 81:4 82:7	108:8	
44:4 74:11	situations 13:20	87:25 93:25		straightforward 58:8
shifted 86:24	13:23 15:18		states 1:1,13 15:12,19 22:15	
shifting 9:3 70:1		94:15,16	23:24 27:1,15	strand 20:24 21:5
0	16:22 17:5,6 44:17 71:11	Sotomayor 20:19 20:22 22:18,23		strands 20:23
74:9,13,14		-	27:25 28:23	
86:19 107:25	small 9:23 82:8	44:11,14 50:2,7	29:3,3,19,20	strange 89:8
short 67:7	smaller 36:20,20	53:18,23 54:2	29:24 30:5 36:8	strawman 98:22
shot 98:5	social 20:3,10	58:16 59:1,4	38:7 51:19 60:4	street 98:16
show 12:1 41:18	57:4,18 58:1	65:14,21,25	61:19 63:4,9	strikes 14:15
41:19,22	89:9	66:11,18 67:4	65:16,17,23	71:2
107:23	society 12:16	76:6 79:3,7,11	66:2,4 71:2	striking 25:2
showed 22:15	solar-powered	92:24 93:2,15	75:14,15 79:4,5	strong 44:9
shows 14:1 70:24	59:5	93:17 94:11,20	79:6,13,15,16	structure 27:2
70:24	sold 95:24	94:21 97:21	84:15 94:1,5,5	45:1,2 99:4
sick 11:3,14	solemn 109:12	98:4,18 99:19	102:7 108:8	structured78:8
36:18 67:21	Solicitor 1:16	99:22 100:2,4,6	109:6	study 38:5
68:16,16 70:14	75:6 77:6 78:15	100:22 101:8	statist 89:22	stupid 35:20
70:15 72:23,23	78:24 80:1 81:9	101:11,17	statistic 81:25	subject 10:13
74:11 83:2 88:6	82:1	Sotomayor's	statistical 83:16	13:21 33:4
	I	I	I	I

51:12 77:20	25:7 29:15	T	45:25 46:4,20	thing 8:14 34:21
108:15	59:13 90:24	T 2:1,1	47:21 48:1,3,18	49:2 54:9,10
subjects 5:11	92:16 95:4,9	take 11:1,8	48:23 50:9	59:17 61:4 62:2
submit 29:14	100:16	18:14 33:19,24	58:25 59:14,15	62:11 64:11
109:16	suggested 46:3	52:20 67:2	78:6 109:5	78:14 89:15
submitted	56:10 91:3	71:20 75:21	taxpayer 100:23	108:17
109:21	suggesting 48:8	76:1 77:5 78:20	101:3	things 12:3 40:4
subset 99:12	54:18	89:15 92:14	taxpayers 70:17	41:5 46:13 51:4
subsidies 4:2	suggestion 108:1	takeover 58:2	teetotalers 90:24	54:14 56:21,21
38:9 58:15	sun 77:14	talk 71:10,13	telephone 34:13	61:5 68:9 72:5
subsidize 10:14	supply 63:14	talked 23:11	34:21	74:7 78:5 81:4
32:6,9 34:13,16	90:2,13,17	talking 8:2 24:6	tell 18:20 21:22	83:19,21,22
56:23 57:21	support 63:16	28:5 29:19 55:3	30:19 40:11	89:24 95:13
81:4 99:13,16	supported 10:5	64:12 68:24,25	62:5 65:15	102:12 105:12
subsidized35:12	supports 25:16	69:2	72:24 79:3	think 6:14,14,15
99:11	34:22 70:4	tangible 14:16	91:14	7:6,12,17 8:9
subsidizers	suppose 7:18	targeted 10:6	telling 49:12	8:14 10:16,17
35:11	35:1 38:20 48:5	tax 24:15 28:16	63:12 74:22	10:18 11:25
subsidizing 35:5	64:11	40:10 44:12,17	tells 96:9 103:6	12:4 16:12 17:3
subsidy 10:9	supposed 27:6,7	44:19,23 45:8,9	temporal 108:14	18:8 21:10 23:8
11:9 28:16 34:9	Supreme 1:1,13	45:11,13,22,25	ten 71:3	23:19,22 24:10
58:9,12,14	sure 6:4 7:2,4 9:5	46:3,5,9,11,16	tend 11:3	25:1 26:11
104:9	22:2 24:13,23	46:19,20,23,23	Tenth -29:1	28:11 29:8
substance 31:10	65:1 96:18 99:8	47:1,4,5,6,19	term 55:17	30:24 31:16
31:12,13 32:19	103:19	48:7,12,24 49:1	terms 34:9 38:22	32:1,5,5,14
substantial 5:8	surely 55:7 80:23	49:3,5,7,10,13	45:11 62:12	34:10,10 35:17
14:7 23:6 24:7	80:25 104:14	49:13,14 50:12	87:24 93:7	35:18,18,24
28:10 29:9,11	surreptitiously	50:15,22,24	terrible 84:15	36:5 37:16,23
30:7 35:25 43:2	86:24	51:11,12 52:2	107:18	38:12 39:2 41:8
60:19,24 70:7	survivor's 57:7	52:13,15 57:8	test 14:5,9 89:19	41:21,25 42:17
substantially	susceptible	58:12,21 59:4,5	89:22 105:5,5	44:9,22 45:7,11
102:9,14	61:20	59:6,12,18,18	105:13,23	45:11,19 46:1,7
substantive	Sutton 95:21	59:21,21,22,23	tests 105:10	46:15,24 47:3
29:17 55:13	Sutton's 95:10	59:24,25 60:5	text 72:12 80:6	48:13,25 49:19
66:1	sweeping 61:19	78:7,8,8,8,9,10	106:17	50:10 51:13,14
substitutes 95:24	84:15 85:6	78:11,12,15,16	Thank 52:19	51:17 54:6
successful 47:9	system 3:13,18	78:19 86:22	79:19,24 107:7	55:12,12 56:7
48:2	3:23 7:11 14:2	99:24 100:3,9	107:13 109:18	58:5,6,23 59:3
succinctly 42:25	15:19,22 35:16	100:15,17,19	thankfully 66:12	59:9,13,14,17
suffer 67:19	36:23 62:3	101:7 109:10	theoretically	60:1,9,10,13
70:13	75:22 79:2	taxation 101:18	35:1	62:24 63:5,7,11
suffered 107:17	86:23 89:9	taxed 50:11 52:6	theory 31:19	63:12 65:1,17
suffering 67:19	99:25 100:8,10	taxes 45:7,22,23	53:16 59:1	66:7,19 67:1,13
sufficient 11:14	101:21	59:16	68:13,14 91:23	69:20 70:4
suggest 23:14		taxing 44:25	thin 64:19	72:14,16 73:7
			l	l

		1		1
73:20 75:4 76:4	55:4,10,12	90:22 92:24	28:21 31:7	unprecedented
76:16 77:3,21	82:22	93:2 103:9,15	35:19 42:2	11:18 25:10,11
77:22 79:4,6	today 20:24	try 22:3 24:24	99:23	25:13,14 53:5
81:16 84:21	21:11 57:15	89:11	understanding	77:23
85:24 88:11	94:22	trying 31:17 34:3	37:17	unpredictable
89:19,22 90:5	told 14:17 45:20	35:14 63:15	understands	13:14
92:7,14,15	tomorrow71:17	69:9,11 74:22	94:8 101:16,21	unrealistic 108:2
93:23 94:20	101:22 109:19	75:20 81:6	106:25	unusual 34:11
95:1 97:21,25	tool 26:13,15,16	89:13	understood 46:8	unwillingness
100:16 101:8,8	torts 30:12	Tuesday 1:10	47:1 72:17	73:8
101:17 103:9	totally 88:4	turn 44:11 76:1	108:6	upfront 65:6
104:19,25	to39 48:19	81:9 85:10	undoubtedly	upheld 25:11,13
105:12,25	tradition 30:12	105:20	95:9	25:15 29:12
106:9 107:19	traditional 25:5	turned 84:14	unexpected	34:23 44:24
108:3,9,20	trait 13:12	97:24	21:17	49:7 109:15
thinks 24:8 109:7	transaction 23:6	turns 68:8 71:16	unexpectedly	uphold 109:3
third 21:8,18	55:4,6	87:9	33:22	up-end 79:2
50:20	transfer 106:22	two 12:3 14:4	unfathomably	urge 78:14 109:3
thought 6:25	transferred9:15	23:8 26:24 43:6	108:5	use 21:12 24:15
14:11,22 15:10	9:16	44:8 45:12	unhappy 105:10	24:20 26:16
15:15 18:20	transfers 34:25	46:13,18,19	unhealthy 32:9	31:10,12,13
19:21,22 49:13	88:17 107:3	54:7 56:8 63:6	32:11 37:1	32:19 38:25
49:15,22 53:13	translates 9:20	64:21 74:8	104:5	39:1 67:8,10,17
59:22,23 60:1	transplant 6:6	75:17 76:22,23	uniform 15:19	74:18 90:9
85:22 88:14	12:25 13:1	78:5 81:21	50:11 52:1	useful 45:11
90:7,7 96:5	transportation	92:11 95:11	uninsured72:21	uses 4:22
101:12 102:10	17:20 71:9	96:10 103:11	72:25 82:7	utmost 76:10
thousand 9:21	travel 42:10	type 25:6	83:14 91:23	utterly 108:2
14:19 73:2	travels 87:11		103:1,2,12	
threatening	Treasury 99:11	U	unique 11:25	V
106:20	treat 33:23 44:18	ultimately 70:4	12:11 14:22	v 1:6 3:5 50:23
three 20:23	treated 44:17	71:15	103:7,8	51:19 77:25
21:25 50:16	109:9	uncertain 15:6	uniquely 70:1	109:6
75:6	treatment 31:11	44:2	103:12	valid 58:24 60:1
throwing 98:11	31:12,13 37:5	uncompensated	United 1:1,13	77:9 79:13
98:16	86:21	9:15,18 14:19	15:12,19 23:24	valuable 34:8
thrown 98:9	tribes 5:19	14:21 73:18,21	51:19 60:4	value 99:7
time 12:14 15:14	tried 38:7 55:13	74:3 80:5,10	61:19 63:4,9	vast 27:24 66:13
21:23 35:16	66:9 69:10,12	82:3,4 83:10	71:2 75:15	Verrilli 1:16 2:3
43:22 52:18	tries 70:1	unconstitutional	84:15 102:7	2:12 3:6,7,9
68:7 91:21	tripled36:11	100:16	109:6	4:12 5:2,13
105:7	true 6:1,5 8:5	undeniably 64:13	universal 17:17	6:13 7:6,14,16
times 23:12	33:13 35:1,6	undercut 43:15	unlawful 78:21	8:4,9 9:1,8,11
timing 23:25	47:17,18,19	understand	unpasteurized	10:16,22 12:3
41:13 43:25	55:23 77:13	11:22 17:21	93:18	13:2,10 14:4,11
L				

15:1,24 16:7,10	31:4 36:14	57:4,5,23 58:14	women 85:14	York 27:14 51:19
16:17 17:3,22	43:24 54:4 67:5	66:25 67:7	86:6	70:10 109:6,12
18:2,8,17 19:6	67:7 77:14	69:12,20 71:21	wonder 71:19	young 7:20 10:5
19:10,16,20,24	visit 12:14 61:24	72:16 77:10	72:1	33:13,14 35:14
20:7,14,20 22:3	visits 54:10,14	83:6 88:18 90:4	words 80:18 82:9	35:21 55:23
22:22,25 23:22	54:19	90:14 92:5	90:22 106:13	56:14 99:15
24:24 26:3	vis-à-vis 95:2	93:23 96:19	106:14	103:12,20
27:12,20 28:2,6	voluntarily 107:1	98:14,23,24	work 3:23 57:4,4	
28:22,25 29:7	voluntary 82:17	99:1 103:14	96:10,24 97:5,5	\$
30:1,24 31:15	voted 48:19	109:16	105:13,14	\$10 101:12
31:25 32:21		ways 23:20 39:2	107:22,22	\$100,000 62:1
33:12 34:5,19	W	42:16 81:21	108:6,7,8,9	\$250 28:16
35:8,10,13,23	Wait 26:19	wealth 107:3	worked 67:15	\$5 101:5,7
36:3,6 37:9,14	walked 7:19	web 67:1	works 4:16 10:21	\$5,800 10:3
37:19 38:1,16	walking 30:14	welfare 69:25	10:23 35:16	\$695 98:15
39:16,19 40:8	want 14:23 29:5	73:22 79:10	47:24 70:7,8	\$854 10:7
40:19 41:8,22	37:8 55:15	went 36:11	world 14:14	1
42:13 43:6	57:19 59:13	we'll 52:20 62:6	34:20 102:5,7	
44:13,22 45:10	60:7 62:2 64:16	70:14 109:19	103:11	1 21:16
45:24 46:12,22	71:2,15 84:17	we're 16:18	worried 39:22	10 50:24 61:20
46:25 47:17	89:10 90:10	35:20 39:24	worse 22:16	63:17 67:20
48:13 49:11,15	92:22 93:6,8,11	40:2,3,20 42:19	worth 59:14	10:00 1:14 3:2
49:24 50:5,9	95:14 99:8,22	66:10 68:24,25	wouldn't 15:23	100 76:15 87:11
51:13 52:7,11	101:6 102:12	100:8 101:11	54:17 55:15	103:1
52:14,17 107:9	104:1,16	104:15	59:2 61:12 63:1	100,000 63:24 1040 45:19
107:11,13	wanted 15:22	we've 20:3 26:24	69:11 97:19	1040 43:19 107 2:13
versus 15:11	55:18	40:6 44:20 81:2	Wrightwood	10 7 2.13 11-398 1:5 3:4
105:11,11,14	wants 58:1 81:9	97:15,17 98:23	25:16 34:23	11-398 1.3 3.4 12:02 109:20
106:8	81:10 89:17	wheat 60:23 61:9	written75:17	12.02 109.20 15 104:12
vested 76:9	Washington 1:9	61:10 63:13,16	wrong 9:25 18:20	15 104.12 15th 45:19 49:19
view 17:1 28:12	1:17,19,21 7:19	63:19 90:9,10	95:21	180,000 36:12
38:13 51:17	wasn't 27:17 46:11 47:1 51:2	90:13,15 92:16	Wyoming 70:11	1930s 105:21
84:8,9	40:11 47:1 51:2 60:1 78:7	92:18 95:23,24	<u> </u>	
viewed 51:11	waste 51:21	95:25	$\frac{1}{x 1:2,8}$	2
viewing 38:6	waste 51.21 way 4:16 8:2	Wickard 43:16	A 1.2,0	20 102:25 104:12
views 44:6	11:25 12:17	63:13 64:3,3	Y	2012 1:10
violate 27:12	14:8 19:5 22:4	72:24 90:3,8,12	yeah 15:10	2016 10:3
violated 27:1	24:13,23 25:9	widowed 57:11	year 10:7 12:14	22 61:25
violates 27:4	25:10,21 26:8	windfall 74:19	28:16 40:1	220 53:23
78:13 violation 102:11	28:6 30:3,23	wipe 94:2 wishes 10:10	66:15 67:11,16	23rd 48:15
violation 102:11 violence 84:23	34:15 35:15	wisnes 10:10 withdrawing	73:2	26 79:5
85:14 86:6	38:7 39:15 46:7	66:22	years 53:23	27 1:10
virtually 5:19	47:25 51:15,18	withheld 47:19	yesterday 45:20	3
12:15 21:15	53:21 55:25	woman 86:3	51:14	$\frac{3}{32:4}$
12,10 21,10				0 2.4

20 104.6	1	
30 104:6		
30s 57:6		
30-year-old		
104:4		
30-year-olds		
104:17		
4		
4 78:10		
40 3:19 22:7 38:3		
61:8,20,22,23		
67:15,19 70:20		
75:21 84:16		
102:4,8,13		
107:16		
43 74:24		
43A 56:25		
45 61:8 72:6		
5		
5 104:5		
50 28:14 84:16		
5000A(a) 109:9		
5000A(b) 109:11		
53 2:7		
57 61:24		
6		
60 48:19 87:12		
7		
7 14:18		
70 104:4		
79 2:10		
19 2.10		
8		
80 3:17		
80,000 36:12		
83 12:14		
9		
9 78:9		
90 87:9		
911 6:11		
95 75:14 81:23		
96 12:14		