

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.,)
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,)
ET AL.,)
Applicants,)
v.) No. 21A240
MISSOURI, ET AL.,)
Respondents.)
and)
XAVIER BECERRA, SECRETARY OF)
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL.,)
Applicants,)
v.) No. 21A241
LOUISIANA, ET AL.,)
Respondents.)

Pages: 1 through 94

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: January 7, 2022

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters

1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 628-4888

www.hrccourtreporters.com

1 APPEARANCES:
2 BRIAN H. FLETCHER, Principal Deputy Solicitor General,
3 Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf
4 of the Applicants.
5 JESUS A. OSETE, Deputy Attorney General, Jefferson
6 City, Missouri; on behalf of the Respondents in
7 No. 21A240.
8 ELIZABETH MURRILL, Solicitor General, Baton Rouge,
9 Louisiana; on behalf of the Respondents in
10 No. 21A241.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	PAGE:
3	BRIAN H. FLETCHER, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Applicants	4
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
6	JESUS A. OSETE, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondents in No. 21A240	45
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
9	ELIZABETH MURRILL, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Respondents in No. 21A241	72
11	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:	
12	BRIAN H. FLETCHER, ESQ.	
13	On behalf of the Applicants	87
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

(12:12 p.m.)

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument next in 21A240, Biden, President of the United States, versus Missouri, and the consolidated case.

Mr. Fletcher.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF BRIAN H. FLETCHER
ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANTS

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the Court:

Hospitals, nursing homes, and other Medicare and Medicaid providers serve patients who are especially vulnerable to COVID-19 in settings that are especially conducive to the spread of the virus.

The Secretary required those providers to make sure that their staff are vaccinated, subject to medical and religious exemptions, because he found that vaccination is the best way to prevent workers from infecting their patients with a potentially deadly disease. He also found that any delay in implementing that requirement would cause preventable deaths and severe illnesses.

1 The preliminary injunctions in these
2 cases are delaying that urgently needed
3 protection for Medicaid and Medicare patients
4 in half the country. This Court should stay
5 those injunctions for two reasons.

6 First, requiring medical staff
7 vaccination during a pandemic falls squarely
8 within the Secretary's statutory authority to
9 protect the health and safety of Medicare and
10 Medicaid patients. Vaccination requirements
11 are a traditional and common way to curb the
12 spread of infectious disease. Many healthcare
13 workers are already required to be vaccinated
14 against diseases like hepatitis, measles, and
15 the flu. And the medical community
16 overwhelmingly supports COVID-19 vaccination
17 requirements, which have been adopted by
18 providers around the country. Those
19 requirements are, in short, the paradigmatic
20 example of a health and safety measure.

21 Second, the Secretary's decision was
22 thoroughly explained and supported by the
23 record. The states do not seriously deny that
24 requiring vaccination will save lives.
25 Instead, they predict that it will cause

1 staffing shortages, especially in some rural
2 areas.

3 But the Secretary carefully considered
4 that concern. He explained that experience
5 from around the country shows that most workers
6 actually will choose to be vaccinated rather
7 than to leave their jobs in response to
8 vaccination requirements. And he concluded
9 that the risk of some temporary staffing
10 shortages is outweighed by the urgent need to
11 protect all Medicare and Medicaid patients
12 during a deadly pandemic.

13 Congress assigned those quintessential
14 predictive and policy judgments to the
15 Secretary, and the states have identified no
16 basis to disturb his conclusions.

17 I welcome the Court's questions.

18 JUSTICE THOMAS: Counsel, are you
19 relying on 1302(a)?

20 MR. FLETCHER: The -- the Secretary
21 invoked -- that's the Secretary's general
22 rulemaking authority under the Social Security
23 Act, and he invoked that general rulemaking
24 authority as he typically does when he makes
25 rules under the Act.

1 But we're not relying primarily or --
2 on that. We're instead relying on specific
3 authorities as to each category of covered
4 providers that allow the Secretary to set
5 standards that set the requirements for their
6 participation in Medicare and Medicaid.

7 JUSTICE THOMAS: I don't understand
8 what you just said.

9 MR. FLETCHER: I'm sorry. The answer
10 is yes, but not only on 1302. We also have
11 specific statutes that speak to each of the
12 covered providers here.

13 JUSTICE THOMAS: So, if I look at the
14 language in 1302, which says that you -- that
15 the Secretary shall make and publish such rules
16 and regulations as may be necessary to the
17 efficient administration of the functions with
18 which each is charged under this chapter, you
19 say there is more than that authorizing the
20 Secretary?

21 MR. FLETCHER: Correct, yes.

22 JUSTICE THOMAS: What is that more?

23 MR. FLETCHER: So the more is set
24 forth -- it's different as to each category of
25 providers. So take hospitals. There, the

1 additional authority is in section 1395x(e)(9),
2 which authorizes the Secretary to set such
3 requirements as he finds necessary in the
4 interest of the health and safety of patients
5 in Medicare and Medicaid.

6 The Secretary cited other similar
7 requirements that authorize him to set
8 conditions of participation for each of the
9 categories of providers, for nursing homes, for
10 ambulatory surgical centers. All of those
11 categories of providers are subject to similar
12 requirements that say the Secretary gets to
13 determine the requirements for their
14 participation in Medicare and Medicaid. The
15 Secretary has long relied on those specific
16 statutory authorities to set forth detailed
17 conditions of participation that are in the
18 Code of Federal Regulations.

19 And what he did here was say, I'm
20 going to add an additional condition of
21 participation pursuant to those specific
22 authorities for each category of provider,
23 requiring vaccination against COVID-19.

24 JUSTICE THOMAS: Has that been used in
25 the past -- the argument for the authority that

1 you just set out, has that been used to require
2 vaccinations in the past?

3 MR. FLETCHER: It has not, no. But
4 the Secretary explained why not. He explained
5 that this is a unique pandemic where we have
6 unique access to effective vaccines. So he
7 explained that, in other settings, healthcare
8 workers are typically vaccinated against
9 communicable diseases because they got them
10 during childhood when all of us did or because
11 state authorities have required vaccinations.

12 But this is a uniquely deadly pandemic
13 that because it is so new, those requirements
14 haven't caught up and ensured the level of
15 staff vaccination that you see in the context
16 of other diseases. And that's why he found it
17 necessary to step in with this requirement.

18 JUSTICE THOMAS: One last -- just a
19 question. Don't you think it's a bit curious
20 that you're placing significant reliance on a
21 provision that speaks about necessary to the
22 efficient administration to administer a
23 vaccine that has -- could have significant
24 health consequences?

25 MR. FLETCHER: Justice Thomas, I

1 don't. So, first of all, I just want to be
2 clear, again, I'm not claiming that that
3 general authority alone would authorize the
4 vaccination requirement. We're resting on the
5 conditions specific to each category of
6 provider, the vast majority of which, the ones
7 covering 97 percent of the workers affected by
8 this rule, specifically reference conditions
9 aimed at health and safety.

10 JUSTICE THOMAS: Thank you.

11 MR. FLETCHER: I think, when you look
12 at it in that context, it's clear that this is
13 a paradigmatic health and safety requirement.

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, in
15 which case is the relationship between the
16 agency closer to the COVID-19 danger, in this
17 CMS case that you're arguing before us now or
18 in the OSHA case that your boss just finished
19 arguing?

20 MR. FLETCHER: I think they're both --
21 they're different cases. I think it's hard to
22 say which one is closer. In the OSHA case, the
23 OSH Act gives the Secretary of Labor
24 responsibility for workplace safety, and you
25 just heard why the COVID-19 pandemic is a grave

1 threat in the workplace.

2 CMS has authority to protect the
3 health and safety of patients in Medicare and
4 Medicaid and explained at length why the
5 COVID-19 pandemic is an acute danger to
6 patients in that setting. So I -- I think
7 they're both very close and directly related to
8 this.

9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, maybe
10 I'll expand it. Which is a more acute danger,
11 OSHA, CMS, or the federal contractor vaccine
12 mandate?

13 MR. FLETCHER: Well, I think all of
14 them. I think this gets to the question you
15 asked my boss earlier, which is, you know, the
16 government is doing a lot of things in response
17 to the pandemic, and I don't think that's a
18 surprise. This is an unprecedented pandemic
19 that touches virtually every aspect of American
20 life, and so it does affect the authorities of
21 lots of different federal agencies.

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Do you think
23 the -- the -- that the government has picked
24 the three most pressing areas to address and
25 that they're doing it in order, or why -- why

1 OSHA, why CMS, why federal contractors? Why
2 not any host of other areas --

3 MR. FLETCHER: Well --

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- that are
5 also -- you know, where COVID-19 is also a
6 serious problem?

7 MR. FLETCHER: Well, because the
8 federal government is, as some of the questions
9 earlier had suggested, a government with
10 limited powers. The federal agencies have the
11 authorities that Congress has given them.

12 Congress has made OSHA responsible for
13 workplace safety. Congress has made CMS
14 responsible for Medicaid and Medicare patient
15 safety, and those agencies have determined and
16 explained their conclusions why those
17 authorities are called upon here by the sort of
18 unique threat that the COVID-19 pandemic poses
19 in both contexts.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I thought you
21 might have said, and it may have been
22 uncomfortable, but I thought you might have
23 said we're dealing here in this case with
24 healthcare, with Medicare and Medicaid.

25 And what could be closer to addressing

1 the COVID-19 problem to health than healthcare?
2 I mean, people already get sick when they go to
3 the hospital. But, if they -- they go and face
4 COVID-19 concerns, well, that's -- that's much
5 worse. On the other hand, OSHA, it's work --
6 it's workplace, yes, COVID is a problem in the
7 workplace, and in some situations, it may be a
8 more serious problem, but it seems to me that
9 if any of the three that I've been talking
10 about anyway present a close connection, it
11 would surely be between a -- be between a health
12 threat like COVID-19 and the government's
13 healthcare.

14 MR. FLETCHER: Mr. Chief Justice, I
15 certainly don't want to disagree with that at
16 all. I think there is an acute threat that
17 COVID-19 poses in healthcare settings. We've
18 seen that throughout the pandemic, especially
19 in nursing homes and other congregate care
20 settings, which are within the scope of this
21 rule.

22 I absolutely agree that Americans
23 shouldn't be forced to choose between getting
24 medical care and exposing themselves
25 unnecessarily to a virus. And as we explained,

1 healthcare workers have long been expected to
2 take extra precautions, including vaccinations,
3 in order to prevent them from infecting their
4 patients.

5 So I don't disagree with any of that,
6 but in making all of those points, I don't want
7 to undersell also everything you heard about in
8 the first case about the grave danger that the
9 pandemic poses for workers as well in a way
10 that implicates OSHA's authority too.

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, there is
12 another significant difference that you haven't
13 talked about. This is a spending clause case
14 and not a general powers case.

15 And I always thought that when you're
16 talking about the spending clause, that the
17 government has more power to define where it
18 wants to spend its money, correct?

19 MR. FLETCHER: Absolutely.

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And to that
21 extent, one of the major arguments raised by
22 the other side here that I want you to address
23 is the -- what they describe as the enormous
24 cost that this will affect on hospitals and the
25 fact that it's affecting so many healthcare

1 providers, et cetera.

2 Could you please tell me whether this
3 is unprecedented in terms of what CMS generally
4 does?

5 MR. FLETCHER: I can. And, first, if
6 I could, I'd like to put it in context with the
7 cost. I think the Secretary's cost estimate
8 was on the order of \$1.3 billion, much of which
9 will be borne by the federal government, which
10 covers the cost of vaccinations.

11 He put that in context by emphasizing
12 that healthcare spending in this country is \$4
13 trillion and that the costs in this case amount
14 to about \$125 per employee. So I don't think
15 the costs of this rule when viewed in context
16 are particularly great.

17 And I think the -- it is not at all
18 unprecedented for the Secretary to exercise the
19 same authorities that I was discussing with
20 Justice Thomas here: the authority to set
21 conditions of participation for hospitals and
22 other providers in Medicare and Medicaid, to
23 impose very detailed, very prescriptive
24 requirements that would have very high
25 compliance costs.

1 This is not a place where it's
2 unfamiliar to have the Secretary involved in
3 the details of the management of healthcare
4 organizations.

5 JUSTICE ALITO: Did the states have
6 clear notice that by accepting Medicaid funds
7 they would be subject to vaccination
8 requirements for staff at their state-run
9 facilities?

10 MR. FLETCHER: So the facilities --
11 and this applies to all facilities in Medicaid
12 and Medicare, not to the states as the
13 administrators of -- of their own Medicaid
14 programs, but I acknowledge states do have
15 state-run facilities.

16 All of them are notice that they're
17 subject to the health and safety requirements
18 that the Secretary may adopt from time to time.
19 Obviously, they didn't have specific notice in
20 the vaccination requirement because it didn't
21 exist until the pandemic came about, but the
22 way that the program operates is that all
23 providers are on notice that they have to
24 comply with the Secretary's regulations which
25 could change.

1 JUSTICE ALITO: So, if they read the
2 statutes that you are now relying on primarily,
3 that would provide them clear notice that they
4 might be subject to something like this
5 vaccination requirement?

6 MR. FLETCHER: It would put them on
7 clear notice that they are subject to such
8 requirements as the Secretary finds necessary
9 in the interest of patient health and safety,
10 which have long included infection control. In
11 the past, that's been general. It's been
12 requiring infection control plans that meet
13 national guidelines, fire preparedness,
14 emergency safety, things of that nature.

15 So they've long been on notice that
16 they are subject to requirements by the
17 Secretary in the interest of patient health and
18 safety, and I think this is a sort of heartland
19 case of a measure to protect patient health and
20 safety in the midst of a pandemic.

21 JUSTICE ALITO: I -- I don't have
22 before me the particular statutory provision
23 that you spoke of earlier, but is it the case
24 that some -- some of many, if not all, of these
25 additional statutory provisions on which you

1 are now placing your principal reliance are
2 definitional provisions rather than provisions
3 that expressly authorize the Secretary to
4 promulgate regulations?

5 Is that correct or incorrect?

6 MR. FLETCHER: They are both. So they
7 are definitions. The provision I quoted
8 earlier, 1395x(e), is the definition of a
9 hospital for purposes of the statute.

10 JUSTICE ALITO: Right. Right.

11 MR. FLETCHER: But, in that
12 definition, it says a hospital, and what that
13 -- it means to be a hospital is to eligible for
14 Medicare reimbursement.

15 What it means to be a hospital is to
16 meet the following specified requirements,
17 including such other requirements as the
18 Secretary finds necessary. So --

19 JUSTICE ALITO: Right. But it
20 isn't -- it doesn't say the Secretary is
21 authorized to promulgate any regulations that
22 protect the health and welfare of people in a
23 hospital or in any of these other facilities.

24 It says that the definition of a
25 hospital and the definitions of these other

1 facilities, by definition, they -- they are
2 facilities that are required to comply with
3 regulations.

4 MR. FLETCHER: As the Secretary finds
5 necessary in the interest of patient health and
6 safety, yes.

7 JUSTICE ALITO: Is there any limit to
8 that power? What could the Secretary -- what,
9 if anything, could the Secretary not do if the
10 Secretary finds that something is necessary to
11 protect the health and safety of people in
12 those facilities?

13 MR. FLETCHER: Well, I think the
14 Secretary -- the major limit is the one in the
15 text of the statute itself. The Secretary has
16 to find that it's a requirement that's in the
17 interest of patient health and safety, as the
18 Secretary did here.

19 I think the other constraints on that
20 authority are the types of health and safety
21 measures that you see in healthcare providers.
22 So the way you know that this provision is
23 within the Secretary's authority is that you
24 see providers adopting it on their own. You
25 see medical societies like the American

1 Hospital Association, the AMA, the American
2 Nurses Association recommending this policy.

3 You see some states adopting this
4 policy. I think all of those things are
5 powerful confirmations that this is a routine,
6 common, effective measure for protecting
7 patient health and safety.

8 JUSTICE ALITO: One of the arguments
9 on the other side is that you were required by
10 statute to consult with the states before you
11 did this. What is your response to that?

12 MR. FLETCHER: There is a provision of
13 the statute that says that when the Secretary
14 sets conditions of participation for some of
15 the providers at issue here, in carrying out
16 that function, he shall consult with the
17 states.

18 The statute doesn't say that that
19 consultation has to happen before a rulemaking.
20 And the way that the Secretary has long
21 understood that to function is to require
22 consultation in conjunction with the notice-and
23 comment-process.

24 JUSTICE ALITO: I mean, isn't that --
25 isn't that an odd understanding of -- of the

1 consultation requirement? We're -- we're going
2 to tell you to do something and then, after
3 we've told you to do it, we're going to consult
4 with you about what we've already said you have
5 to do?

6 MR. FLETCHER: I don't think so,
7 Justice Alito, in the context of the provisions
8 of the statute that also contemplate, as the
9 APA does, that in some circumstances the
10 Secretary will have good cause to act without
11 notice and comment.

12 So, in the ordinary case, there's
13 going to be notice and public comment which has
14 the benefits that Justice Barrett referred to
15 earlier. When that happens, you should also be
16 sure you consult with the states and with
17 accrediting boards. But, when there's good
18 cause to skip that, the agency has long
19 interpreted that to mean that it can defer
20 consultation with the states to the parallel
21 public comment response.

22 JUSTICE ALITO: Is there -- is there a
23 good cause exception in the provision that
24 requires consultation?

25 MR. FLETCHER: There isn't, but

1 there's no temporal requirement at all. So
2 it's actually the other side that's asking you
3 to read into that a requirement that it happen
4 before rulemaking and to make that requirement
5 apply even when the good cause exception is
6 satisfied. And we don't think there's any
7 basis to do that, certainly not in the
8 Secretary's past practice.

9 This has long been the way that the
10 Secretary has interpreted this provision in
11 conjunction with the good cause exception --

12 JUSTICE BARRETT: Mister --

13 MR. FLETCHER: -- to notice and
14 comment.

15 JUSTICE BARRETT: -- Mr. Fletcher, can
16 I follow up on the questions that Justice
17 Thomas and Justice Alito have been asking you
18 about, the facility-specific statutes.

19 MR. FLETCHER: Yes.

20 JUSTICE BARRETT: I think it was wise
21 to shift your focus to those because of their
22 references to health and safety, but I find it
23 difficult because the language of each of those
24 statutes is different, and not all of them
25 reference health or safety.

1 MR. FLETCHER: That's right.

2 JUSTICE BARRETT: So, for example, I
3 think the one on long-term care facilities is
4 your best because that's the one that also
5 refers to or requires skilled nursing
6 facilities to establish and maintain an
7 infection control program.

8 That one, I think, gives you a
9 stronger case than the ones that don't mention
10 health and safety at all, or, for example, for
11 ambulatory surgical centers, you know, the
12 provision on which you rely describes the
13 benefits provided to an individual, and then it
14 lists the kind of services that would be
15 covered, right, and then parenthetically it
16 says "performed at an ambulatory surgical
17 center (that meets health and safety and other
18 standards specified by the Secretary)," it
19 seems to me a heavier lift to say that that
20 kind of aside in a parenthetical is a grant of
21 authority to CMS to impose this kind of
22 vaccination requirement on those who work at
23 the ambulatory surgical centers.

24 So I guess my question is this: One,
25 you know, the government here is seeking the

1 stay of the injunction and has the burden of
2 showing likelihood of success on the merits,
3 and -- and I understand because of space limits
4 and the number of statutes on which you're now
5 relying, it would be hard to make the specific
6 case for each of these provisions, but what if
7 I think some of the provisions might support
8 you and others don't?

9 This was an omnibus rule, and even
10 though the Secretary, in a chart, identified
11 all these, you know, specific provisions, we
12 don't really have before us the structural and
13 textual arguments directed at each of these
14 provisions. So what if I think some do and
15 some don't? In an omnibus rule, what am I
16 supposed to do?

17 MR. FLETCHER: Well, so we agree
18 entirely that the focus ought to be on the
19 statutory text, and one of our complaints with
20 the district court decisions in these cases is
21 that they blew past all of those distinctions
22 and didn't focus on the text at all. So we
23 absolutely agree the text of these provisions
24 should be the Court's focus.

25 In terms of how to think about them, I

1 understand it's unwieldy. There are 15
2 different provisions. I would group them into
3 two categories. There are 11 or so that we
4 cite at pages 5 to 6 of our reply brief that
5 include the health -- that specific health and
6 safety language, in different formulations, but
7 all of them specifically referring to
8 requirements in the interest of patient health
9 and safety.

10 And as we've explained, we think that
11 this is the paradigmatic health and safety
12 regulation, and that's reinforced by the
13 consensus of the medical community, by other
14 regulators, by practices of providers.

15 Now there are a few statutes that we
16 cite at page 9 of our reply brief that don't
17 include that specific language. Those statutes
18 are the ones applicable to providers that
19 employ about 3 percent of all of the workers
20 covered by the rule.

21 Now our view is that those -- all of
22 those statutes still give the Secretary the
23 authority to set standards or requirements for
24 participating providers. And if you look at
25 those provisions, what you find is that

1 Congress was a little bit less detailed. In
2 the hospital provision, the 1395x(e)(9), the
3 preceding eight sections all detail relatively
4 nuanced, very specific requirements for
5 hospitals. And then the (e)(9) adds "and such
6 other requirements as may be necessary to
7 patient health and safety."

8 JUSTICE BARRETT: But what if I
9 disagree? So I understand that your position
10 is that all of these granted the Secretary
11 authority, but what if I disagree? What if I
12 say, for example -- you suggested in a footnote
13 in your reply brief that because such a small
14 percentage of employees are covered by the
15 statutes that don't reference health and
16 safety, that we should just allow the
17 injunction to remain in place only as to those.

18 And let's say that I disagree with you
19 that every single one of the statutes that
20 references health and safety could be
21 interpreted as a grant of rulemaking authority
22 for the reason I suggested with ambulatory
23 surgical centers.

24 The rule is an omnibus rule. You
25 know, it wasn't adopted on a

1 facility-by-facility basis. So, if I assume
2 the premise that I disagree with you that every
3 single statute grants this authority, why
4 shouldn't then we just leave the Fifth
5 Circuit's injunction in place?

6 MR. FLETCHER: Well, because I think,
7 to the extent you're looking at likelihood of
8 success, that's the factor that this would be
9 relevant to, I think that does depend, as you
10 say, on the authorities as to each category of
11 providers, and the Secretary included -- in
12 some sense, it's an omnibus regulation, he did
13 it all at once, but he included specific
14 severability language that we cite in that
15 footnote at page 61,608, and said if any of
16 these provisions are no good, then the rest
17 ought to stand.

18 And so I think, if you disagree with
19 us on either the provisions that lack health
20 and safety language or if you disagree with us
21 on the ones that have it, although I want to
22 talk about both of those things to hopefully
23 persuade you otherwise, I think the result
24 would be we don't have a likelihood of success
25 at obtaining -- prevailing on those provisions.

1 But that wouldn't justify allowing the
2 injunctions to remain in place as to all of the
3 other provisions, you know, especially those
4 that cover the vast majority of workers. So I
5 think that's the approach we'd suggest if
6 that's where you find yourself.

7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Fletcher, I --
8 I -- I'm not -- I do understand that we could
9 go provision by provision, but I thought in
10 reading your brief that the general authority
11 to pass regulations to -- with respect to the
12 Secretary's functions, that all that you were
13 saying is that generalized authority is well
14 documented by the fact that in the vast
15 majority of these at least 11, if not 12, of
16 these specific rules, they referenced health
17 and safety directly.

18 Isn't that your point?

19 MR. FLETCHER: That's our point. And,
20 in addition, that even as to the ones that
21 don't reference health and safety, so the
22 end-stage renal disease providers or the
23 psychiatric residential treatment facilities,
24 those categories, Justice Barrett and Justice
25 Sotomayor, they still give the Secretary even

1 broader authority to set conditions for
2 participation.

3 And our view is that when the
4 Secretary is authorized to set conditions for
5 participation in Medicare and Medicaid, that
6 has to include the authority to set patient
7 health and safety requirements. And, in fact,
8 that's the way the Secretary has long
9 interpreted them.

10 If you look at the regulations that
11 are being amended by the provisions addressing
12 those categories of providers, there are
13 existing bodies of patient health and safety
14 measures, in many cases addressing infection
15 control already, in other cases, addressing
16 other matters directed at patient health and
17 safety.

18 So the Secretary has long interpreted
19 those more general grants of authority to
20 include the authority to impose patient health
21 and safety conditions, and we think that's the
22 right way to read them in the context of the
23 statute.

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I dare say that I
25 looked at some of the regulations at issue

1 here, not the ones you passed with respect to
2 COVID but other regulations. Is it fair to say
3 that the vast majority of the regulations
4 across all facilities relate to health and
5 safety?

6 MR. FLETCHER: I think that's fair,
7 yes. That's certainly consistent with my
8 reading of the regulations applicable to the
9 facility providers at issue here.

10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It does seem that
11 since it's a program to serve ill people,
12 people with conditions like renal failure,
13 psychiatric conditions, other conditions, that
14 that would be the primary focus of contracting
15 with places that are safe for those people,
16 correct?

17 MR. FLETCHER: Absolutely. And that's
18 the way the Secretary has always understood
19 those more general authorities.

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Thank you.

21 MR. FLETCHER: If I -- I could say
22 just a word about the other argument that the
23 other side has pressed heavily in this case,
24 and that's the concern about staffing
25 shortages, that is a concern that the Secretary

1 acknowledged and considered in the regulation,
2 and he explained nonetheless that he was
3 adopting a vaccination requirement for several
4 reasons.

5 First, he explained that experience
6 from around the country has shown that even
7 workers who express hesitancy or even strong
8 objections to becoming vaccinated don't
9 actually end up leaving their jobs in those
10 large numbers when vaccination requirements are
11 imposed when their employers can help
12 facilitate vaccination, can counsel them, that
13 across the economy, including in the healthcare
14 sector, including in rural areas, including
15 healthcare systems in North Carolina and
16 Indiana, the Secretary found that vaccination
17 requirements achieved very high levels of
18 compliance.

19 He sought comment on the issue, and he
20 welcomed input from stakeholders about the
21 particular challenges faced by rural hospitals,
22 but he also explained that any temporary
23 staffing shortages are likely to be relatively
24 minor in the context of this industry, which
25 already faces enormous staff turnover every

1 year. He said the rate of staff turnover in
2 the healthcare industry generally is about
3 25 percent in normal conditions and that in
4 those circumstances, any marginal additional
5 turnover attributable to the vaccination
6 requirement does not outweigh the need to
7 impose this health and safety measure that,
8 again, is supported by the medical community
9 and has already been adopted by providers
10 around the country.

11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
12 counsel.

13 Justice Thomas?

14 Justice Breyer, anything further?

15 Justice Alito?

16 Justice Kagan?

17 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Fletcher, the
18 states talk quite a bit about the time that it
19 took the administration to get out the good
20 cause rule and suggest that, in that amount of
21 time, it could have done a full
22 notice-and-comment proceeding.

23 I guess I would like you to comment on
24 that. Is that true?

25 MR. FLETCHER: It's not for a number

1 of reasons. I think the clearest is the
2 provision governing notice-and-comment
3 regulations that applies when good cause isn't
4 found for the Secretary. 1395hh says that the
5 Secretary has to allow a 60-day comment period.
6 So that right there is more than two months.

7 In addition to that, the Secretary has
8 to write the rule, which involves not just
9 developing the regulation and fitting it into
10 the existing conditions of participation for 15
11 different categories of providers but also
12 writing a sort of detailed cost benefit
13 analysis and Paperwork Reduction Act analysis
14 that are required by statutes and executive
15 orders and that occupy dozens of pages at the
16 back end of the rule.

17 So I think the suggestion that in two
18 months the agency could have completed
19 notice-and-comment rulemaking is inconsistent
20 with both the applicable legal requirements and
21 just experience with regulatory process more
22 generally.

23 JUSTICE KAGAN: Yeah. I guess, sort
24 of for an ordinary person, an ordinary person
25 might say, well, if it's really important, why

1 don't you just work faster?

2 MR. FLETCHER: I -- I understand that.
3 I mean, that doesn't get you around the 60-day
4 time limit. And what I can tell you is that
5 the Secretary did work extremely fast and
6 produced a 73-page rule in two months and
7 explained why the rule was necessary, satisfied
8 all of the legal requirements. And I think --
9 you know, I don't want to fault my friends on
10 the other side, but I think, if the Secretary
11 had rushed something out with a less thorough
12 explanation, I think we'd be hearing legal
13 challenges that he hadn't adequately explained
14 things or considered things or calculated out
15 the cost benefits.

16 I think agencies that are trying to
17 make policies that will stick have to make sure
18 that they engage in the kind of robust analysis
19 and document that analysis in the way that the
20 Secretary did here.

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
22 Sotomayor, anything further?

23 Justice Gorsuch.

24 JUSTICE GORSUCH: This statute, unlike
25 the -- the OSHA statute, actually contains an

1 express limitation on the Secretary's authority
2 that we haven't yet discussed and that I know
3 you're familiar with. Among other things, it
4 says, you know, the Secretary shall not control
5 the tenure of -- of employees at covered
6 healthcare facilities or their compensation or
7 their selection.

8 And -- and this regulation, arguably,
9 the other side will say -- I'm sure we're going
10 to hear it, so I didn't want you to not have a
11 chance -- is going to say this effectively
12 controls the employment of individuals at these
13 healthcare facilities in a way that Congress
14 specifically prohibited.

15 As I understand your response, it is
16 we're just providing money or not providing
17 money, and by withholding money, we're not
18 controlling who you hire.

19 And I might understand that in some
20 circumstances, but in a statute where
21 everything is about spending, it's a spending
22 clause statute, I would have thought that
23 Congress would have understood and we should
24 interpret this language in that light, that you
25 cannot use the money as a weapon to control

1 these things.

2 And, in fact, of course, as you know,
3 the Court has some anti-commandeering law.
4 That's doctrinal speak for you can't always use
5 money without -- and claim you're not
6 controlling what's going on.

7 And I wonder whether we should take
8 particular cognizance of that here given that
9 these statutes sometimes constitute, we're
10 told, 10 percent of all the funding that state
11 governments receive. This regulation affects,
12 we're told, 10 million healthcare workers and
13 will cost over a billion dollars for employers
14 to comply with.

15 So what's your reaction to that? Why
16 isn't this a regulation that effectively
17 controls the employment and tenure of -- of --
18 of healthcare workers at hospitals, an issue
19 Congress said the agency didn't have the
20 authority, that should be left to states to
21 regulate?

22 MR. FLETCHER: So, Justice Gorsuch,
23 you're talking about Section 1395, and that
24 says that nothing in the Medicaid Act shall
25 be -- or Medicare Act shall be interpreted to

1 authorize any federal official to control, as
2 you say, tenure, staffing, the practice of
3 medicine, or the administration of entities.

4 We read, as the Secretary has long
5 read, that to mean that he can't dictate
6 particular decisions, hire this person, don't
7 hire that person, you know, treat this patient
8 this way, not that way, that that's what
9 control and supervision means and that the --

10 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Can it mean, though,
11 could it mean, should it mean, have we in other
12 cases interpreted similar language to mean you
13 can't use money in a way that commandeers a
14 state or private entity?

15 MR. FLETCHER: So I -- I think the
16 most direct answer is that that's not -- it
17 can't mean that in this context because you
18 have to read --

19 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Could -- could it
20 mean it and do you agree that it means that in
21 other contexts?

22 MR. FLETCHER: I -- I -- control and
23 supervision can mean different things in
24 different contexts, but I just -- I do want to
25 get out that they have to mean something that's

1 within --

2 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Fine. I'll let you
3 do it, I promise. But you'd agree that in some
4 contexts, in some circumstances, that's a
5 possible meaning?

6 MR. FLETCHER: I think it may be a
7 possible meaning. I don't think it's the most
8 natural reading.

9 JUSTICE GORSUCH: All right. And now
10 you get to go ahead. Got it.

11 MR. FLETCHER: Thank you. I
12 appreciate it. So the reason why it can't mean
13 that here is that succeeding provisions of the
14 Medicare statute authorize the Secretary to do
15 or actually do directly by Congress exactly
16 that sort of standard-setting that the
17 Secretary is engaged in here.

18 So just take the hospital statute that
19 we've talked about a bunch, 1396x(e), there's a
20 provision before we talked about, (e)(9), which
21 was health and safety. The preceding
22 provisions say things like you have to be
23 staffed by doctors and the doctors have to have
24 particular licenses. You have to have a
25 certified nurse on duty 24 hours a day. You

1 have to have a budget plan that meets the
2 requirements of another subsection that I gave.

3 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. So that
4 doesn't control. But somewhere along the line
5 you move from general regulations that outline
6 things you -- you, the hospital, have to do to
7 somewhere more directly where you are
8 controlling or supervising. We agree?

9 MR. FLETCHER: Yes.

10 JUSTICE GORSUCH: There's a sliding
11 scale in there.

12 MR. FLETCHER: I -- I'm not sure about
13 sliding scale. I would say standard-setting,
14 we can tell from that context.

15 JUSTICE GORSUCH: There's a range.
16 Can we agree on that?

17 MR. FLETCHER: Sure.

18 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. Where is the
19 line?

20 MR. FLETCHER: I think that as is
21 often the case with ranges, the line may be
22 hard to draw when you get out towards the more
23 granular controls.

24 I think what I can be confident about
25 is that this standard is on the right side of

1 the line because it's consistent with standards
2 in the statute itself that say you have to hire
3 physicians and nurses that meet these
4 qualifications or with other provisions that
5 say you have to train -- your staff must be
6 trained in this way.

7 JUSTICE GORSUCH: I understand -- I
8 understand that. What do we do about the fact
9 that Congress has never before -- sorry, that
10 CMS, not Congress, we don't have Congress here,
11 CMS has never before said among its standards a
12 vaccination requirement or any other health
13 standard with respect to employees and actions
14 they must take outside the work environment?

15 So, for example, could Congress --
16 sorry, CMS, also implement regulations about
17 exercise regimes, sleep habits, medicines and
18 supplements that must be ingested by hospital
19 employees in the name of health and safety and
20 would -- would the government argue that does
21 not control the tenure of those employees?

22 MR. FLETCHER: You know, I'm not sure
23 that there would be a problem with those
24 requirements. I don't think it would be the
25 Section 1395 control. I think it would be that

1 it's very hard to characterize those as
2 requirements for the health and safety of
3 patients.

4 JUSTICE GORSUCH: But, in your
5 argument -- in your view, that would not
6 control the tenure of employees?

7 MR. FLETCHER: I think that does
8 not -- setting standards, even if they're
9 outlandish standards that we think couldn't be
10 set for other reasons wouldn't be controlling
11 in the standard.

12 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Still doesn't
13 control, doesn't control, even though they have
14 to take these medications, they have to get
15 this much sleep, they have to do this much
16 exercise every day?

17 MR. FLETCHER: In any more -- again, I
18 want to be clear, I'm not suggesting the
19 Secretary can do any of those things. I'm just
20 suggesting that the reason he can't is not
21 1395.

22 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Is that because it
23 doesn't constitute control of an employee's
24 tenure or compensation?

25 MR. FLETCHER: Correct.

1 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Thank you.

2 MR. FLETCHER: Because setting
3 standards for employees does not exercise
4 control.

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
6 Kavanaugh.

7 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: You -- you
8 mentioned at the beginning that over a billion
9 dollar in costs would be borne mostly by the
10 federal government, I think you said.

11 Can you explain that?

12 MR. FLETCHER: Sure. I think in large
13 part by the federal government. So the
14 Secretary, in estimating the costs, said a big
15 driver of the cost was going to be the cost of
16 the vaccinations themselves, the shots, and the
17 cost of administering the shots.

18 The Secretary explained that he was
19 including that in the cost/benefit analysis to
20 be comprehensive about the effects of the rule,
21 even though the federal government covers the
22 costs of vaccines for most employees and would
23 cover them here.

24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. And then,
25 on the question to follow up on Justice

1 Gorsuch's question, what is the story as you
2 understand it for why CMS has not previously
3 required flu shots for healthcare workers or
4 some of the other vaccines that, as you pointed
5 out, the states still insist upon for
6 healthcare workers? Is there a story there or
7 explanation there for why CMS has not
8 previously done that?

9 MR. FLETCHER: I think the Secretary
10 laid this out and sort of identified different
11 reasons as to different categories of vaccines.

12 So, as to some, where state
13 vaccination requirements mean that everyone is
14 basically vaccinated against those diseases
15 already, there was no need for the Secretary to
16 do that.

17 The Secretary also hasn't acted with
18 respect to flu vaccines. Some states have done
19 that. Not every state has done that. But the
20 Secretary explained that this is a pandemic
21 that is a much graver threat than the seasonal
22 flu is and also that these are uniquely
23 effective vaccines and explained that it's that
24 combination, the sort of unique pandemic
25 situation that we haven't seen before and the

1 uniquely effective vaccines, that led him to
2 choose to adopt that here.

3 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
5 Barrett?

6 JUSTICE BARRETT: Are you arguing with
7 respect to the facility-specific grants -- and
8 this goes to the questions that Justice
9 Sotomayor asked you after we last talked -- are
10 you arguing that those facility-specific grants
11 informed the general grants in 1302(a) and
12 1395hh such that we should interpret the
13 general grants as encompassing the authority to
14 impose health and safety measures, or are you
15 arguing that even if we pretend that these two
16 general grants don't exist, that the
17 facility-specific grants would nonetheless
18 equip the Secretary with this authority?

19 MR. FLETCHER: I think the latter. I
20 think I'd be making the same argument even if
21 we didn't have the general grant. I think the
22 general grant, you know, reinforces the idea
23 that when the Secretary sets standards, he has
24 the power to do that through regulations. But
25 we're relying primarily on the specific grants,

1 and I think those would be sufficient even if
2 you set aside 1302.

3 JUSTICE BARRETT: Thank you.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
5 counsel.

6 Mr. Osete.

7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF JESUS A. OSETE
8 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS IN NO. 21A240

9 MR. OSETE: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
10 it please the Court:

11 In early 2020, while millions stayed
12 at home, millions of healthcare workers
13 heroically stayed at work. These same workers
14 are now forced to choose between losing their
15 jobs and complying with the government's
16 vaccine mandate.

17 The Secretary claim -- the Secretary's
18 claim of authority to impose this mandate is
19 expansive, unprecedented, and unlawful for two
20 principal reasons.

21 First, the Secretary believes a series
22 of vague catch-all provisions scattered
23 throughout the Social Security Act authorize
24 this sweeping mandate, but the relevant text,
25 structure, and context say otherwise.

1 For example, the Secretary ignores
2 eight provisions that precede the catch-all
3 provision he primarily invokes, all of which
4 are materially unlike a permanent medical
5 procedure that cannot be undone after a shift
6 is over. Exceedingly clear language is
7 required here because the mandate regulates
8 matters that have traditionally been within the
9 province of the states.

10 Second, the rule is arbitrary and
11 capricious under the APA.

12 The Secretary impermissibly
13 extrapolated evidence for one category of
14 facilities to justify regulating all 15 and
15 failed to adequately explain his sudden shift
16 from encouraging vaccination to mandating it.

17 But, more fundamentally, the Secretary
18 overlooked the critical perspective of rural
19 healthcare facilities in the states and the
20 devastating consequences the mandate will have
21 on rural Americans' access to healthcare.
22 Categorically excluding an entire class from
23 employment will mean that patients in rural
24 Nebraska will have to seek primary and
25 emergency care two to three hours away and

1 cannot undergo surgery.

2 This represents vast stretches of this
3 country where healthcare is not provided by
4 massive institutional providers with tens of
5 thousands of employees but by smaller
6 healthcare facilities run by local communities.
7 While a 1 percent loss of staff may be
8 insignificant to the former, it is fatal to the
9 latter.

10 Without the injunction, rural America
11 will face an imminent crisis. The government's
12 stay application should be denied. And I
13 welcome the Court's questions.

14 JUSTICE THOMAS: Counsel, would you
15 discuss the preemption issue just briefly?

16 MR. OSETE: Yes, Your Honor. This
17 regulation -- the Secretary says in this
18 regulation that it is intended to preempt
19 arguably any inconsistent state laws with
20 respect to vaccination requirements.

21 And, for example, in this case, the
22 most direct example I can point to, Your Honor,
23 is at 20-7-134 of the Arkansas Code, that
24 prohibits as a condition of employment any sort
25 of vaccination requirement.

1 JUSTICE THOMAS: But that's somewhat
2 ironic since he -- the government relies on --
3 on those other vaccinations to argue for this
4 vaccination. But are all of the party states
5 in the same position with respect to
6 preemption?

7 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, certainly, the
8 district court in this case at the very least
9 cited that Arkansas, Wyoming, and Missouri are
10 similarly situated with that respect, and,
11 certainly, there are other states in our -- in
12 the Missouri-led coalition that also have laws
13 that are going to be preempted by this
14 regulation.

15 The key point here, Your Honor, just
16 like in *Mass v. EPA*, is so long as one of us
17 has one of these laws that would affect our
18 duly enacted legislation through an unlawful
19 mandate, we are -- it is -- it does present an
20 issue on preemption.

21 Now that's independent, obviously,
22 from other interests that the states have in
23 this case, which is the states are the
24 administrator. It's our providers with respect
25 to Medicaid, with Medicare. We're being asked

1 to facilitate this program for the federal
2 government. We have compliance costs. We have
3 surveyors that have to go out and enforce this
4 rule. All of that are -- are the states'
5 interests, Your Honor.

6 JUSTICE THOMAS: Well, the one final
7 point has to go to standing. You seem to rely
8 on *parens patriae* a bit. And would you discuss
9 that standing and why we should apply that?

10 MR. OSETE: Well, sure, Your Honor.
11 And just to be clear, we -- we do have various
12 capacities here. We mention sovereign
13 interests, we mention proprietary -- a whole
14 plethora of them, and, certainly, we did invoke
15 also a quasi-sovereign interest in the health
16 and well-being of our citizens. For example,
17 this mandate will close the doors of many of
18 these rural facilities. That will effectively
19 deprive our citizens of healthcare. And we
20 also are asserting rights under federal law
21 with respect to the APA on many of these
22 claims.

23 That -- that is -- but that is not the
24 only basis that we're seeking standing in this
25 case. We have various other capacities that

1 we're suing under, just like the ones I
2 mentioned, Your Honor.

3 JUSTICE THOMAS: Is that true of all
4 of the parties?

5 MR. OSETE: I -- I -- I believe so,
6 Your Honor, yes.

7 JUSTICE THOMAS: Thank you.

8 MR. OSETE: There was a -- there was a
9 question -- sorry, Chief.

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, I was just
11 going to ask you about the -- the spending
12 clause context. In other words, we're not just
13 dealing with federal law in the abstract; we're
14 dealing with a provision that says Congress
15 authorized it -- well, the Secretary to ensure
16 compliance with requirements that the Secretary
17 finds necessary in the interest of the health
18 and safety of patients.

19 That's very broad, and I think --
20 well, you agree that you -- they have broader
21 authority because it's in a spending clause
22 provision? I mean, you signed -- you signed
23 the contract.

24 MR. OSETE: Well, sure. And even in
25 the spending clause context -- I would say two

1 responses to that, Your Honor. First, even in
2 the spending clause context, as Justice Alito
3 mentioned earlier, the states are entitled to
4 clear notice. So there is -- whatever
5 conditions the Secretary does state, they have
6 to derive from unambiguous grants of statutory
7 authority.

8 In this case, Your Honor, we -- we
9 respectfully disagree with my friend, Mr.
10 Fletcher, because he only cites certain parts
11 of these provisions. For example, with respect
12 to the hospital in this application, he ignores
13 the "such other requirements" language that
14 precedes the Secretary's authority to regulate
15 health and safety.

16 And many of those provisions, for
17 example, (e)(1) through (8), none of those talk
18 about immunization. They talk about
19 recordkeeping. They talk about discharge
20 procedures. They talk about many --

21 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Osete, really? Do
22 you think that the CMS head and that the
23 Secretary of HHS are bookkeepers with respect
24 to this statute? Do you think that they don't
25 have responsibility to protect the safety of

1 these two incredibly vulnerable patient
2 populations? Isn't that their principal
3 responsibility in these laws? Isn't that the
4 most important thing that both of them do?

5 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, certainly, the
6 Secretary does have authority to set
7 requirements in the interest of health and
8 safety. All I'm saying is you have to look at
9 the statute in context. I'm not saying that
10 HHS is somehow just this recordkeeping
11 function. I mean, certainly, it is important
12 for these facilities to have adequate
13 recordkeeping. You're dealing with vital
14 records, health records, other things. The
15 context here --

16 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, I wasn't saying
17 that they don't have to concern -- be concerned
18 about records either. I'm just saying, in
19 addition to being concerned about records, this
20 statute clearly gives them, by reference to the
21 health and safety delegations, by reference
22 even to the idea of administering efficiently
23 programs like this, their principal job is to
24 look after the health and safety of Medicare
25 and Medicaid recipients.

1 And -- and with the understanding that
2 those two groups of patients are pretty much
3 the most vulnerable patients there are, either
4 elderly patients or the -- in the -- in the
5 case of Medicaid, unfortunately, poverty has a
6 great deal to do with medical outcomes.

7 So, you know, with respect to these
8 two vulnerable populations and especially
9 vulnerable when it comes to COVID, how can it
10 not be the principal, prime responsibility of
11 the CMS head and the Secretary of HHS to look
12 out for their health and safety?

13 MR. OSETE: Because that
14 responsibility that falls in (e)(9) with
15 respect to the hospitals, which is what the
16 Secretary has before it in this application,
17 that authority is informed -- the grant of
18 authority in that section is informed by the
19 other provisions in that statute.

20 Doubly so here, Your Honor, where you
21 have a situation where this Court has said that
22 ordinarily compulsory vaccination is not
23 something that ordinarily concerns the federal
24 government. That was in Jacobson at page 38.

25 Doubly so here, Your Honor, because,

1 when you're going to alter, significantly
2 alter, the balance between state and federal
3 powers, something that has traditionally been
4 in the province of the states, you have to do
5 so with exceedingly clear language. The Court
6 said that in Alabama Realtors recently. The
7 Court said that also in U.S. Forest in 2020.
8 That is the kind of language we're asking here.
9 It's not that the Secretary --

10 JUSTICE KAGAN: Do you think that the
11 Secretary can require the adoption of various
12 infection prevention and control measures? You
13 know, can they say to hospitals, you have to
14 sterilize your instruments, you have to wash
15 your hands in a certain way? One of the things
16 we understand about settings like this one is
17 the way that infections spread.

18 MR. OSETE: Sure.

19 JUSTICE KAGAN: And you have to do a
20 variety of things to make sure that you prevent
21 the spread of infection. Can they do that?

22 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, absolutely,
23 because --

24 JUSTICE KAGAN: Because that's their
25 job, right?

1 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, certainly,
2 with respect to 1395i-3(d)(3), which goes to
3 skilled nursing facilities, there's express
4 language that the Secretary can adopt infection
5 control measures to prevent the spread of
6 diseases and --

7 JUSTICE KAGAN: Yeah. Well, whether
8 there's express language of that kind or not,
9 the responsibility to look after the health and
10 safety of vulnerable populations includes
11 requiring infection prevention measures, isn't
12 that right?

13 MR. OSETE: Well, certainly, Your
14 Honor. If -- if Congress -- Congress decided
15 to write statutes in very express terms with
16 respect to skilled nursing facilities, and I
17 will submit --

18 JUSTICE KAGAN: I think you're
19 ignoring the question. Put that aside.
20 Suppose there was -- it didn't say infection at
21 all, but it says you have to look after the
22 health and safety of your patients. Does that
23 include infection prevention?

24 MR. OSETE: It -- it may very well
25 include infection prevention. I guess all I'm

1 saying is that, in this case, Your Honor, where
2 there is express language that talks about
3 that, Congress knows how to do that and chose
4 not to regulate with such specificity.

5 JUSTICE KAGAN: I -- I --

6 JUSTICE BREYER: Your view is that --
7 what you're saying is they don't have authority
8 under this? Is that what -- in response to
9 Justice Kagan?

10 MR. OSETE: Your Honor --

11 JUSTICE BREYER: They can't say wash
12 your hands. Can they say, if there's a
13 diphtheria -- we don't want anybody with
14 diphtheria walking into the hospital because
15 everybody will get it. You're saying they
16 can't say that, is that right?

17 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, there are
18 various -- there are various measures that --

19 JUSTICE BREYER: Are you saying that
20 or not? Take the example --

21 MR. OSETE: I'm saying they can --

22 JUSTICE BREYER: -- that Justice Kagan
23 gave of the washing hands or -- or sterilizing
24 instruments or the one I just gave you of
25 diphtheria. Can they say it or not?

1 MR. OSETE: Yes, they can regulate all
2 kinds of --

3 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. If they
4 can say that, then why can't they say in the
5 same breath, and, by the way, we don't want you
6 walking in here in crowds that will spread
7 COVID and this is how you stop it?

8 MR. OSETE: Because --

9 JUSTICE BREYER: Why can they say the
10 one and not the other?

11 MR. OSETE: Because gloves -- taking
12 off gloves and masks, a vaccine cannot --

13 JUSTICE BREYER: I didn't say that. I
14 said diphtheria.

15 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, the Secretary
16 certainly has authority to implement all kinds
17 of infection control measures at these
18 facilities. I -- I'm not disputing that, Your
19 Honor. All we're saying --

20 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, all the
21 Secretary is doing here is to say to providers,
22 you know what, like basically the one thing you
23 can't do is to kill your patients. So you have
24 to get -- you have to get vaccinated so that
25 you're not transmitting the disease that can

1 kill elderly Medicare patients, that can kill
2 sick Medicaid patients.

3 I mean, that seems like a pretty basic
4 infection prevention measure. You can't be the
5 carrier of disease.

6 MR. OSETE: But, Your Honor, here
7 you're -- we're dealing specifically with a
8 vaccine requirement that, again, has
9 historically been in the state's province. And
10 if Congress wants to give that authority to
11 CMS, the federal agency here, it has to do so
12 in exceedingly clear language.

13 JUSTICE BREYER: But what do I do with
14 this? Perhaps you can tell me I am way off
15 base, and I don't mind if you do, but, I mean,
16 here we are, ask for a stay, okay?

17 And in the one case, either this will
18 go ahead or it won't. In the case earlier, it
19 will go ahead or it won't. And to what extent
20 can we take account of what I think would be
21 relevant with stays or not stays or how we act
22 in the interim and dah-dah, dah-dah, dah, okay,
23 but there are 750,000 people got this
24 yesterday, but the hospitals are full to
25 overflowing, that -- there is a problem, worse

1 than diphtheria.

2 People all over the world are getting
3 this, and they are here, too, and they are
4 dying, that's what we're trying to ask you, or
5 they're filling up hospital beds and others are
6 dying because they can't get in. Okay. Now,
7 public interest call it. Call it something
8 else. Call it what you might.

9 But it seems to me, it's hard for me
10 to believe, it seems to me that every minute
11 that these things are not in effect, thousands
12 of more people are getting this disease. Okay?

13 And we have some discretionary power.
14 And, therefore, well, you tell me I can't take
15 that into account. To me that's fairly
16 unbelievable, but I want to hear it.

17 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, the public
18 interest is flexible. And you can take all
19 that into account. All I'm saying is the two
20 statutes, the provisions that the Secretary has
21 put forward in this case, we do not believe
22 that they have met their burden of showing a
23 likelihood of success that on the merits those
24 were lawful exercises of authority.

25 Even in situations where the Secretary

1 desires to prevent the spread of COVID, it
2 cannot act unlawfully. Doubly so here, again,
3 because this is exactly the kind of requirement
4 that historically has been in the province of
5 the states.

6 And if Congress wants to take that
7 away and give it to CMS or give it to a federal
8 agency, it has to do so in exceeding clarity.
9 And I will point out, too, in the public
10 interest, Your Honor, keeping -- doing away
11 with the injunction as we said so is going to
12 be devastating to vulnerable patients in rural
13 America, in rural Nebraska.

14 No surgeries. The only
15 anesthesiologist in a rural Nebraska hospital,
16 he is not going to be able to go to work. That
17 means no surgeries. Emergency C-sections.

18 JUSTICE BREYER: On that one I have a
19 question, too. I take what you say is correct.
20 All right. I don't know if it is correct, but
21 I'll assume it.

22 Well, if these states, if we act in
23 such a way that over the next two weeks or the
24 next week these rules go ahead as planned and
25 people do get inoculated because they have to,

1 or -- now, if the bad thing that you are
2 talking about then occurs, we'll know it,
3 because what they are saying at the moment on
4 the other side is there is another bad thing,
5 which is the bad thing that I mentioned at the
6 beginning, that hundreds of thousands of people
7 more get this disease.

8 And we know what happens from
9 Massachusetts and in New York in the old
10 people's homes. Okay? So they're saying there
11 are two bad things. You are saying the one and
12 the agency, the other, is the more predominant.

13 So suppose you are faced with that
14 division. We let it go ahead. Then if you are
15 right, everybody will know it, and we can draw
16 back. That's not perfect for you, but that's
17 at least something, and it helps protect the
18 people who might otherwise get very sick.

19 MR. OSETE: And -- and unfortunately,
20 Your Honor, it's going to introduce --

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Please.

22 MR. OSETE: Unfortunately, Your Honor,
23 in this case it's going to devastate local
24 economies. It's going to decimate these local
25 towns that don't draw their pool of applicants

1 from the coast, Your Honor. These are local
2 communities. They run these hospitals.

3 And that is the problem, Your Honor,
4 is those kind of interests, that perspective
5 was not heard in this context. And that is
6 going to be devastating, Your Honor.

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
8 Thomas, anything further? No?

9 Justice Alito?

10 Justice Kagan?

11 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Osete, this rural
12 hospital question, you have presented some
13 declarations that suggest that there would be
14 labor disruptions, the Secretary took that into
15 account specifically, basically has a different
16 view of the size of the disruptions, based on
17 the data that he had. And then, in addition to
18 that, said that there are countervailing
19 things, there are countervailing things with
20 respect to the labor force, and the -- and the
21 Secretary said some people might come back
22 because they won't have to deal with
23 unvaccinated colleagues.

24 Some people -- you know, that there
25 will -- there will be savings in terms of fewer

1 people out sick and so forth. And then the
2 Secretary has an important job to do. And
3 that's to balance, whatever disruptions there
4 are, the Secretary says they're much less than
5 you say they are, but then to balance those
6 disruptions against the safety of the Medicare
7 and Medicaid recipients, whom he is statutorily
8 obligated to protect.

9 And -- and, you know, it just seems
10 pretty basic to me, as I said, that the first
11 thing that that means in the context of this
12 pandemic is that providers can't be carriers of
13 the disease itself. And then, in addition,
14 there are other health benefits, you know,
15 people are not showing up to hospitals because
16 they're afraid of getting COVID from staff.

17 And so they're not coming for their
18 mammograms and they're not coming for their
19 colonoscopies and so forth. So he has to
20 balance all those health benefits against what
21 you say are these labor disruptions.

22 And the question is, I mean, you might
23 have a point, I don't know, I don't know very
24 much about the rural market, the -- you know,
25 but the Secretary, that's his job.

1 Should it be that we decide, you know,
2 as against what the Secretary has decided, in
3 performing his important function of evaluating
4 these potential disruptions and weighing those
5 disruptions against the health benefits that he
6 sees in that rule? Should we say we think that
7 the -- that the disruptions are more, greater
8 than the Secretary thought and we further would
9 weigh them differently against the health
10 benefits of the rural? Is that for courts to
11 decide?

12 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, there is a lot
13 there. And I -- I think the -- the -- the
14 simplest way I can answer that directly is in
15 this case it's this critical perspective of
16 these tiny communities that, again, he did cite
17 to one example in North Carolina with 35,000, I
18 think it was Novant Health, 35,000 employees as
19 this is going to be insignificant to them.

20 But I think that critical perspective
21 of these tiny hospitals and, again, are 100 or
22 less, these numerous facilities that are going
23 to be devastated by this, that sort of relevant
24 factor, that important aspect of the problem,
25 we don't see how the Secretary could have

1 properly weighed everything properly when that
2 sort of critical perspective was ignored, and
3 these folks did not have a chance to be heard.

4 And in this case it's almost as if the
5 Secretary put a rock on one side of the scale
6 and a feather on the other. What -- what may
7 work in Detroit and Houston may actually be
8 counterproductive in Memphis, Missouri, or, for
9 that matter, in El Dorado, Arkansas.

10 All of those places have different
11 considerations, which is why this historically
12 has been a local and state matter and the
13 states, again, are free to require it or not
14 require it --

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, why is this --

16 MR. OSETE: According to the local
17 government.

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- an issue for
19 the states to require or not require? I mean,
20 this is the federal government paying for
21 services. And why doesn't it have a right as
22 the payer for services to specify what services
23 it wants to pay for?

24 I mean, that's -- now, in terms of
25 clear rules, I'm -- I'm having a very hard

1 time understanding how you can say, yes, they
2 could pass a rule that requires people to wear
3 gloves or they can pass a rule that requires
4 them to isolate individuals who are -- are
5 infected by something, but they can't pass this
6 rule. And you say because it wasn't clear?

7 If it's clear enough that they can
8 consider safety and health regulations, why is
9 this particular rule subject to us saying no?

10 MR. OSETE: Because, Your Honor, this
11 Court in Jacobson and various cases has drawn
12 the line at compulsory vaccination being
13 something that the states do. And when
14 Congress --

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But wait a minute.
16 That's what they do with respect to other
17 issues, but this is with respect to if you want
18 my money, your facility has to do this.

19 MR. OSETE: Sure.

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It has to have --
21 it has to serve certain food. It has to serve
22 certain meals a day. It has to give snacks.

23 These are all state issues usually,
24 but under the Spending Clause, we're the buyer.
25 The federal government says what it wants to

1 spend its money on. This is not a -- an issue
2 of power between the states and federal
3 government. This is an issue of what do --
4 what does the federal -- what right has the
5 federal government to dictate what it wants to
6 buy.

7 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, it is a
8 vaccine requirement -- requirement masquerading
9 as a condition of participation. And if
10 Congress intended that, this Court has made it
11 very clear that something like compulsory
12 vaccination, even in the Spending Clause
13 context, which itself demands Congress speak
14 with a clear voice, it requires --

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How much clearer
16 do you need for Congress to say than pass
17 regulations that protect the health and welfare
18 of ill people?

19 MR. OSETE: Perhaps the -- the one
20 example I can think of right away, Your Honor,
21 is in (e)(7) of 1395x(e), where Congress
22 acknowledged or spoke with a very clear voice
23 that when it comes to licensing at the state
24 level, that is something that the states do.
25 And that's exactly -- I mean, Congress knows

1 how to directly speak to issues that invade
2 into the state -- into state areas --

3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And it hasn't --

4 MR. OSETE: -- like --

5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- done it with
6 health and safety. It has given that right to
7 the Commission. Thank you, counsel.

8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
9 Gorsuch?

10 Justice Kavanaugh?

11 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Couple questions.
12 First, this is an unusual administrative law
13 situation, from my experience, because the
14 people who are regulated are not here
15 complaining about the regulation, the -- the
16 hospitals and healthcare organizations. A very
17 unusual situation.

18 They, in fact, overwhelmingly appear
19 to support the Secretary's -- the CMS
20 regulation. So I want -- and the government
21 makes something of that. What -- what are we
22 to make of that?

23 MR. OSETE: Your Honor, certainly
24 there are large institutional providers that
25 may have no problem with this. Obviously,

1 there are smaller ones, very small community
2 hospitals, that do have a problem with that.

3 But -- but here the states have their
4 facilities. They --

5 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: The states have a
6 very small percentage of the facilities. Most
7 of the facilities are private-run facilities,
8 right? This picks up on Justice Thomas's
9 question. Like where -- where are the
10 regulated parties complaining about the
11 regulation? That's how we usually have -- the
12 last case is a good example.

13 MR. OSETE: Sure.

14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Obviously, there's
15 a -- there's a missing element here.

16 MR. OSETE: Well, they're not --
17 they're not -- certainly they -- these sort of
18 entities that would be subject to this rule,
19 like small private facilities that receive
20 Medicaid funding, certainly are not plaintiffs
21 per se, but the states do represent the
22 citizens of our -- our constituencies, like
23 these places that run these facilities, small
24 community hospitals. We speak on their
25 behalfes.

1 And all I would say here is we have --
2 we have made a value judgment through our
3 policies to not require vaccination because a
4 one-size-fits-all requirement does not help.
5 And that kind of policy judgment, as expressed
6 through our laws, our duly enacted laws, that
7 would be applicable both to state-run
8 facilities and private facilities, that is what
9 is being preempted here, Your Honor, by this
10 unlawful mandate.

11 And that's how we're -- we're speaking
12 in that capacity, Your Honor, is the folks
13 whose voices were ignored throughout this
14 entire process and shouldn't have been ignored,
15 especially with these devastating consequences.

16 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And then, second,
17 just -- I think you've alluded to this, but how
18 is a vaccine different in kind, from your
19 perspective, from, say, the requirement to wear
20 gloves or the requirement to wash your hands or
21 the other kinds of requirements? Because I
22 think if you acknowledge that the -- there's
23 authority to require the latter, then you need
24 to explain why the -- the vaccine is different.

25 MR. OSETE: I don't think I could say

1 it any better than Chief Justice Sutton did at
2 page 12 of the dissent in the OSHA case, which
3 is masks can come off, gloves can come off, the
4 vaccine requirement, taking a vaccine is a
5 permanent medical procedure that cannot come
6 off after work is over. That is, there are --
7 there are materially different conditions,
8 materially different procedures at stake.

9 And when you look at the context, for
10 example, in the hospital requirement, 1395x(e),
11 nothing in that statute comes close to
12 authorizing this precise mandate in this case,
13 which is going to have devastating consequences
14 for vast swaths of this country, Your Honor.

15 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you very
16 much.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
18 Barrett.

19 JUSTICE BARRETT: No questions.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
21 counsel.

22 General Murrill, are you still on the
23 line?

24 MS. MURRILL: I am, Mr. Chief Justice.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You may

1 proceed.

2 ORAL ARGUMENT OF ELIZABETH MURRILL
3 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS IN NO. 21A241

4 MS. MURRILL: Thank you, Mr. Chief
5 Justice, and may it please the Court:

6 This case is not about whether
7 vaccines are effective, useful, or a good idea.
8 It's about whether this federal executive
9 branch agency has the power to force millions
10 of people working for or with a Medicare or
11 Medicaid provider to undergo an invasive,
12 irrevocable, forced medical treatment, a COVID
13 shot. It's a bureaucratic power move that is
14 unprecedented.

15 If it can do that, the question still
16 remains as to whether it properly exercised
17 that power here. The district court answered
18 no to both questions at the preliminary
19 injunction stage, and the court below supported
20 its ruling with a number of well-reasoned
21 conclusions.

22 Now, without even addressing all the
23 underlying bases for the ruling, the government
24 asks this Court to jump ahead of the Fifth
25 Circuit and dissolve the injunction,

1 irrevocably changing the status quo in a way
2 that will effectively give the federal
3 government all the relief it seeks. This will
4 create chaos in state provider networks, limit
5 access to care for the poor and needy, and
6 eviscerate informed consent for millions of
7 people.

8 The Court should reject the
9 government's request and maintain the status
10 quo because the district Court's holdings were
11 correct on all counts.

12 I'm happy to take questions or speak
13 to some of the questions that have already been
14 asked all -- by the Court.

15 JUSTICE THOMAS: Just briefly,
16 counsel.

17 The -- I'd like you to address whether
18 or not or at least to what extent this rule
19 preempts rules of your state.

20 MS. MURRILL: Justice Thomas, it does
21 preempt rules of some of the states in our
22 coalition. I don't know that it preempts rules
23 in every state, but it affects Alabama,
24 Louisiana, and Montana in different ways,
25 different laws.

1 JUSTICE THOMAS: Could you address as
2 I asked earlier the *parens patriae* standing. I
3 think that is going to be an important matter,
4 and I'd like you to address it.

5 MS. MURRILL: So I think we have
6 *parens patriae* standing to protect the
7 interests of our citizens, but that is not the
8 sole basis on which we appear in these cases.
9 And there has been, you know, some questions
10 about Medicare and Medicaid. I think the
11 government has conflated those two programs in
12 -- in an enormous way because just in Louisiana
13 alone, I can tell you that 41 percent of our
14 budget is Medicaid funding.

15 So we have -- we have enormous,
16 enormous interests in the way these programs
17 operate, and that's one of the reasons why
18 there are express consultation requirements
19 built into the statute.

20 JUSTICE THOMAS: Thank you.

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: General, do
22 you agree with the district court's statement
23 that COVID -- this is a quote -- "COVID no
24 longer poses the dire emergency it once did"?

25 MS. MURRILL: Your Honor, I -- I think

1 that that is a shifting -- those are shifting
2 sands. Obviously, COVID conditions can change
3 at any given time. And they have.

4 JUSTICE BREYER: What is your other
5 basis for standing?

6 MS. MURRILL: Our basis for standing
7 is that we are being regulated directly by this
8 rule. We have to implement it, and it affects
9 our provider networks. It directly affects
10 Medicaid funding, and that is a program that is
11 implemented entirely by the state.

12 I don't think I could underestimate
13 enough the impact on the states and their
14 provider networks. That's precisely what the
15 -- the -- the declarations that we submitted
16 and I think many that were submitted in the
17 Missouri case also go to, is the effect on our
18 ability to actually provide access to care,
19 which is the actual primary goal of this
20 program.

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'd like to
22 touch on the Spending Clause issue just a bit.
23 It was a broad provision that you agreed to,
24 which authorized the Secretary to impose
25 requirements that are -- that the Secretary

1 finds are necessary in the interest of the
2 health and safety of -- of patients.

3 Why did that not give you adequate
4 notice that something like this could be
5 enacted?

6 MS. MURRILL: I don't think that gave
7 us any more notice that that could be enacted
8 than -- I mean, no one even expected COVID, so
9 how could we possibly have expected to have the
10 federal government, through a spending
11 condition imposed upon us years after this
12 program was created, co-opt a quintessential
13 police -- state police power for deciding
14 whether the -- its citizens should be
15 vaccinated or not?

16 That's just not something that we
17 could have reasonably anticipated given the
18 general broad language that is put into the
19 statute. And -- and, again, I don't think that
20 the primary role is to -- is to actually
21 provide directly for the health and safety of
22 the people. It is to provide funding to the
23 state to implement these programs, or through
24 Medicare to reimburse for healthcare to
25 individuals.

1 I -- I could -- I mean, I would also
2 point just to the secondary aspect of any
3 spending clause argument, also turns on the
4 voluntarily and knowingly accepting the terms.
5 And so I think that goes straight to your
6 question, that that -- respecting that
7 limitation is absolutely critical to respecting
8 the balance of the state's sovereignty in this
9 program.

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it's --

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How does that --

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Determination
13 is what the Secretary finds and it's what the
14 Secretary finds necessary. So I'm not saying
15 there's not some limit there, but I don't know
16 why a provision addressing a -- an infectious
17 disease of this scope is beyond the Secretary's
18 determination that mandated issue here is -- is
19 necessary.

20 MS. MURRILL: Well, we've never taken
21 the position that the Secretary has no
22 authority to address it in any given -- in any
23 -- at all. We're saying that the -- that they
24 can't do this. And they've never, ever, ever
25 done anything like this, which they

1 acknowledge.

2 And -- and the solicitor general in
3 the argument that preceded this one also
4 pointed and conceded that where there are other
5 textual and structural cues in a statute, that
6 may be inconsistent with the -- with the
7 agency's jurisdiction, that you should be
8 looking at that in terms of the discretion
9 that -- that you give and whether -- when you
10 evaluate, whether this is a question or an
11 issue that falls within the general discretion
12 and scope that was granted earlier by Congress.

13 And -- and here there are multiple
14 cues that conflict directly with the broad,
15 broad scope and grant of authority that they're
16 claiming here.

17 JUSTICE ALITO: Do you think we need
18 to find that you have *parens patriae* standing
19 in order to take into account the interests of
20 employees within your state who do not want to
21 be vaccinated? Is that a standing question or
22 is it a question that can be taken into account
23 in the context of determining what the statute
24 means and whether it satisfies whatever
25 requirements there may be under the spending

1 clause?

2 MS. MURRILL: I -- I think it's both.
3 I mean, I -- I certainly believe that you can
4 take it into account as part of our standing.
5 We have independent grounds for standing. When
6 you get past that question, I think it also
7 relates to the -- the -- the question
8 of whether it's actually controlling the tenure
9 of -- of employees.

10 I think it directly conflicts with
11 that. I mean, Justice Alito, there's --
12 there's really no question I think in our mind
13 that this was a -- a pretext that the entire --
14 as the Chief Justice alluded to, that this was
15 a work-around.

16 This was an intent -- that the
17 government intended to tether all of these
18 restrictions together, all of these -- these
19 mandates together to vaccinate as many -- as
20 much of the American public as they could
21 touch.

22 And in this particular rule, at the --
23 the Federal Register 61607, the government even
24 acknowledged that the most important inducement
25 here was the fear of job loss.

1 This is targeted at people. It's not
2 targeted at facilities. And they've never done
3 anything like this before, precisely because
4 there are structural prohibitions against it in
5 the statute. And where we are in this
6 procedure is -- is extraordinary.

7 They want a -- to -- you to dissolve
8 an injunction, parts of which have not even
9 been contested, so that they can up-end the
10 status quo which will disturb enormously our
11 provider network.

12 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, all that's
13 true, but I'd like to get your response -- I
14 mean, there's some truth to what you say, but
15 there -- I'd like to get your response to what
16 I asked previously twice already.

17 We sit in both these cases something,
18 as the inheritor of a court of equity and we do
19 that particularly in respect to stays, whether
20 you call them administrative or not. And it
21 may be, both sides, and in the other case, you
22 know, as -- that's why I say there's a side in
23 each case, that is predicting harm if the
24 agency rule goes into effect.

25 And the other side predicts serious

1 harm, if the agency rule does not go into
2 effect. And as you heard the OSHA case at the
3 last minute, on the one hand, if they have to
4 start complying with this, they have to get
5 plans and the employers are hurt.

6 On the other hand, if they don't start
7 to get those plans ready, people might -- well,
8 it looks like a lot of people will get sick and
9 take up hospital beds or worse.

10 So in weighing those equities, why
11 don't we have to take and put quite a lot of
12 weight on avoiding even by a minute or a
13 second, because if you divide 750,000 by the
14 number of seconds in a day, you get a lot of
15 people.

16 And why do we not have to take those
17 things into account, see how the government
18 would balance them, see if that is reasonable,
19 and be very weary at the least of interfering
20 with rules that will, in fact, save people's
21 lives or hospital beds or from getting the
22 disease?

23 Do you see what I'm --

24 MS. MURRILL: Justice --

25 JUSTICE BREYER: -- saying? I'm

1 asking -- I'm putting a burden on you to say,
2 yeah, that's what I mean.

3 MS. MURRILL: I -- I do.

4 JUSTICE BREYER: And I want to
5 know.

6 MS. MURRILL: I understand the
7 question.

8 JUSTICE BREYER: Yeah.

9 MS. MURRILL: I think -- I -- I think,
10 first of all, these aren't just plans. But
11 here this rule is different. There -- there's
12 no test-and-mask exception. There's this is a
13 vaccinate, and it's a short, short shot clock.

14 And -- and so they do not have a
15 choice. They have to be fired or they cannot
16 be hired and so it handcuffs our providers in a
17 way that is -- that is extraordinary and
18 immediate. And that, the status quo right now
19 is that they still comply with all the other
20 rules of Medicaid and Medicare, which means
21 they have infectious disease control measures
22 in place, they are doing the very best job that
23 they can, they need all the boots on the ground
24 that they can get, and this rule will actually
25 change that.

1 That will -- it will immediately
2 change that. So I think it is extraordinarily
3 different and it also comes up in a different
4 context. It comes up in the context of a
5 preliminary injunction, multiple injunctions,
6 but specifically in ours where they did not
7 even contest certain aspects of it, so they --
8 they present to you a request for a stay that
9 does not even contest certain aspects of an
10 injunction that they want you to overturn.

11 JUSTICE BREYER: Thank you.

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, I -- I'm
13 having a very hard time trying to do the state
14 power argument with respect to a spending
15 clause program that doesn't affect the states
16 directly, except this proprietors because, as
17 proprietors of state-run facilities, those are
18 the ones affected by this rule. The private
19 facilities are, and, as one of my colleagues
20 noted, Justice Kavanaugh, we don't have many
21 amici of them complaining.

22 But putting that aside, I am having a
23 hard time understanding how and why a rule like
24 this is so substantially different than
25 the volumes of rules that CMS has with respect

1 to so many issues involving health and welfare.
2 They tell you how high the bed has to be. They
3 tell you how close hand sanitizers have to be.
4 This is before COVID.

5 They have so many different rules that
6 one could arguably say belonged within the
7 state's rights that -- that give me a working
8 principle that says to the federal agency
9 charged with the health and safety of -- of
10 patients who believes that the only way to
11 protect these vulnerable patients is by this
12 one tactic, by this one step, why that should
13 tie their hands.

14 You may argue otherwise, that the
15 other ways of doing it are effective, but
16 they've decided in this particular context,
17 with the vulnerability of this -- of these
18 particular populations, that the other steps
19 are inadequate.

20 MS. MURRILL: Your Honor, there --
21 there's two aspects to your question, and I'd
22 like to speak to both of them.

23 One is the issue of whether we're just
24 proprietors. We are not just proprietors. And
25 I think the Court effectively discussed that in

1 NFIB versus Sebelius. Medicaid is an enormous
2 program where states are contracted with the
3 federal government, not providers. The
4 providers are contracted with the states. So
5 it is -- it is important, I think, to keep that
6 distinction between these two programs.

7 But, to -- to your question about the
8 -- the dividing line, the dividing line here is
9 -- is precisely why we are in a question of --
10 major questions doctrine land, because they
11 have never done this for at least since the
12 Jacobson case.

13 And -- and -- and, before that,
14 predominantly, this has been a question --
15 protecting the health and safety of individuals
16 and exercising this kind of -- of -- of power
17 to force the individual to submit to a medical
18 treatment has never ever been something that
19 has been authorized by Congress or done by an
20 agency on an emergency basis without
21 consulting --

22 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, I don't
23 mean to interrupt you, but we've never had a
24 situation like this one before.

25 MS. MURRILL: We haven't.

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It's
2 unprecedented.

3 MS. MURRILL: But I don't think in
4 this case that justifies them co-opting a
5 quintessential state police power. In fact,
6 the opposite is true. It only points up the
7 need to evaluate this in the larger context of
8 whether Congress -- I mean, Congress didn't do
9 this, by the way.

10 I mean, the Congress just as recently
11 as last summer changed some of the discrete
12 statutes specifically related to skilled
13 nursing and nursing homes and authorized
14 certain measures for strike teams to augment
15 staff in those facilities due to COVID
16 outbreaks, but they didn't authorize vaccines,
17 so -- for staff.

18 I think there are cues. There are
19 cues in the statute. There are cues in the --
20 in the -- the -- the history and structure and
21 the precedents of this Court that -- that
22 support waiting and maintaining the status quo,
23 as the district court below did and the Fifth
24 Circuit did.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice

1 Thomas, anything further?

2 JUSTICE THOMAS: Nothing further,
3 Chief.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
5 Breyer?

6 Justice Alito?

7 Anything further, Justice Sotomayor?

8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I just want to say
9 the Sixth Circuit didn't, correct?

10 MS. MURRILL: The Sixth Circuit in the
11 OSHA case --

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry, I
13 confused --

14 MS. MURRILL: -- operated differently.

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Yes.

16 MS. MURRILL: Yes.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Kagan?

18 Justice Gorsuch?

19 Justice Barrett?

20 Thank you, counsel.

21 Rebuttal, Mr. Fletcher.

22 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF BRIAN H. FLETCHER

23 ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANTS

24 MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chief

25 Justice. Just three quick points.

1 I'd like to start with the
2 interpretation of the statutes before you that
3 the other side is offering because I don't hear
4 them to contest that the Secretary's authority
5 to set conditions for participating in the
6 federal Medicare and Medicaid programs includes
7 the authority to protect patient health and
8 safety, even in the statutes that don't include
9 that language.

10 I don't hear them to be disputing that
11 the Secretary can adopt infection control
12 mechanisms or require people to wear gloves or
13 do other things of that nature. Instead, their
14 submission seems to be that vaccines are
15 different. And I think the problem with that
16 is that they haven't really given you a basis
17 to ground that in the statute.

18 The first thing that they've said is
19 vaccination is typically a prerogative of the
20 states. And, of course, that's true in some
21 sense, but we're talking here about a federal
22 spending program.

23 And the regulation of medicine is
24 typically the prerogative of the states.
25 Usually it's the states who require hospitals

1 to make sure their employees wear gloves or
2 they follow the Fire Code or they have
3 sprinklers, things like that.

4 But no one disputes that Congress has
5 given the Secretary the authority to make sure
6 that providers who are providing care under the
7 aegis of the federal Medicare and Medicaid
8 program live up to standards set by the
9 Secretary. That's what the Secretary has done
10 here.

11 The other thing that I've heard them
12 say about why vaccines are different is that
13 you can't take them off, that vaccines are
14 somehow different than gloves or other safety
15 measures and so some special specific
16 authorization ought to be required. And I just
17 don't think that can be squared with the
18 context of the healthcare industry.

19 Vaccination requirements are common
20 throughout our society. They're particularly
21 common for healthcare workers. They've been
22 adopted voluntarily by providers around the
23 country. You have virtually the uniform view
24 of the medical community telling you that this
25 is the best way to protect patient health and

1 safety.

2 If anything, I think it would be
3 bizarre to say that the Secretary's authority
4 to protect the health and safety of Medicare
5 and Medicaid patients does not include the
6 authority to adopt a measure that you see other
7 regulators adopting, the medical community
8 urging, and other providers adopting
9 voluntarily.

10 The whole point of the statute is to
11 let the Secretary make sure that the standards
12 of care for Medicare and Medicaid patients meet
13 best practices, and that's what he has done
14 here.

15 The second point I want to make,
16 Justice Barrett, goes back to the colloquy that
17 you and I had earlier about some of the
18 different statutes. I hope we've persuaded you
19 that we're right about all of them, but in case
20 we have not, I just want to make the case that
21 it actually is worth the candle in the stay
22 posture to go provision by provision.

23 So, as we explained, 97 percent of the
24 employees affected by this regulation are
25 covered by statutes that include the express

1 health and safety language.

2 Even if you just narrow it down beyond
3 that, three categories, the largest three
4 categories of providers, hospitals, home health
5 agencies, and long-term care facilities,
6 account for more than 90 percent of the covered
7 workers. This is shown at the table at page
8 61603.

9 All of those provisions have express
10 health and safety language of the sort that
11 we've been discussing, and two of them,
12 long-term care facilities or nursing homes and
13 home health providers, actually include the
14 extra provisions that we cite at page 6 of our
15 reply that says the Secretary has not just the
16 authority to ensure health and safety but also
17 the duty to do so. And I think, at an absolute
18 minimum, it's worth letting the rule go into
19 effect as to them.

20 And, finally, Justice Breyer, I want
21 to come back to a point that you have raised a
22 few times about the equities because we are
23 here on a stay. And I think a couple of
24 observations to make about the equities.

25 The first is a point that Justice

1 Kavanaugh raised. You don't have providers
2 before you here. You don't have workers before
3 you here. Instead, providers and workers
4 overwhelmingly support the vaccination
5 requirement.

6 Instead, you have before you states
7 who do operate some facilities covered by the
8 rule but only a tiny fraction of them.

9 The second thing I'd say is that even
10 as to the providers and the workers who are
11 covered by the regulation, some of my friend's
12 presentation has suggested that if the stays
13 are lifted or if the preliminary injunctions
14 are stayed and the rule goes into effect, that
15 means that tomorrow people are going to be out
16 of a job, and that is not true.

17 The Secretary has put out guidance
18 after the Fifth Circuit narrowed the previously
19 nationwide injunction to cover only the
20 plaintiff states here, put out guidance giving
21 regulated entities 30 days to come into
22 compliance as to the first shot, 60 days to
23 come into compliance as to the second shot, and
24 making clear that even if a regulated entity
25 has not met full compliance by that 60-day

1 deadline, if the entity is at 90 percent
2 compliance and has a plan to come into full
3 compliance within 30 days, the Secretary won't
4 take enforcement action.

5 Even if that isn't met, even if at the
6 end of 90 days there is still not full
7 compliance, the Secretary has always exercised
8 enforcement discretion before terminating a
9 provider from the program, and one of the
10 things the Secretary has considered is access
11 to care issues of the sort that the other side
12 has raised. So there are ways to address some
13 of the problems that my friends have relied on
14 even if the rule goes into effect.

15 On the other side of the ledger, and
16 this is where I'll close, if the preliminary
17 injunctions remain stayed, then we know what
18 the consequence is. We know that this urgently
19 needed measure is not going to be in effect to
20 protect Medicare and Medicaid patients in half
21 of the country during a pandemic.

22 And I think the Secretary found, and I
23 don't think anyone seriously disputes, that any
24 delay in the operation of the rule will cost
25 lives and cause unnecessary serious illnesses.

1 We'd ask that the preliminary
2 injunctions be stayed.

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
4 counsel. The applications are submitted.

5 (Whereupon, at 1:38 p.m., the
6 applications were submitted.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Official - Subject to Final Review

\$	9	adopted ^[4] 5:17 26:25 32:9 89:22	answer ^[3] 7:9 37:16 64:14	6 53:17,18 56:7 57:16 58:10 59:24 70:23 77:22 78:15 88:4,7 89:5 90:3,6 91:16
\$1.3 ^[1] 15:8	9 ^[1] 25:16	adopting ^[5] 19:24 20:3 31:3 90:7,8	answered ^[1] 72:17	authorization ^[1] 89:16
\$125 ^[1] 15:14	90 ^[3] 91:6 93:1,6	adoption ^[1] 54:11	anti-commandeering ^[1] 36:3	authorize ^[7] 8:7 10:3 18:3 37:1 38:14 45:23 86:16
\$4 ^[1] 15:12	97 ^[2] 10:7 90:23	aegis ^[1] 89:7	anticipated ^[1] 76:17	authorized ^[6] 18:21 29:4 50:15 75:24 85:19 86:13
1	A	affect ^[4] 11:20 14:24 48:17 83:15	anybody ^[1] 56:13	authorizes ^[1] 8:2
1 ^[1] 47:7	ability ^[1] 75:18	affected ^[3] 10:7 83:18 90:24	anyway ^[1] 13:10	authorizing ^[2] 7:19 71:12
1:38 ^[1] 94:5	able ^[1] 60:16	affects ^[4] 36:11 73:23 75:8,9	APA ^[3] 21:9 46:11 49:21	avoiding ^[1] 81:12
10 ^[2] 36:10,12	above-entitled ^[1] 1:22	afraid ^[1] 63:16	appear ^[2] 68:18 74:8	away ^[4] 46:25 60:7,10 67:20
100 ^[1] 64:21	absolute ^[1] 91:17	agencies ^[5] 11:21 12:10,15 34:16 91:5	APPEARANCES ^[1] 2:1	B
11 ^[2] 25:3 28:15	absolutely ^[6] 13:22 14:19 24:23 30:17 54:22 77:7	agency ^[12] 10:16 21:18 33:18 36:19 58:11 60:8 61:12 72:9 80:24 81:1 84:8 85:20	applicable ^[4] 25:18 30:8 33:20 70:7	back ^[5] 33:16 61:16 62:21 90:16 91:21
12 ^[2] 28:15 71:2	abstract ^[1] 50:13	agency's ^[1] 78:7	Applicants ^[8] 1:6,13 2:4 3:4,13 4:9 61:25 87:23	bad ^[4] 61:1,4,5,11
12:12 ^[2] 1:24 4:2	accepting ^[2] 16:6 77:4	agree ^[9] 13:22 24:17,23 37:20 38:3 39:8,16 50:20 74:22	application ^[3] 47:12 51:12 53:16	balance ^[6] 54:2 63:3,5,20 77:8 81:18
1302 ^[3] 7:10,14 45:2	access ^[5] 9:6 46:21 73:5 75:18 93:10	agreed ^[1] 75:23	applications ^[2] 94:4,6	Barrett ^[14] 21:14 22:12,15,20 23:2 26:8 28:24 44:5,6 45:3 71:18,19 87:19 90:16
1302(a) ^[2] 6:19 44:11	According ^[1] 65:16	ahead ^[6] 38:10 58:18,19 60:24 61:14 72:24	applies ^[2] 16:11 33:3	base ^[1] 58:15
1395 ^[3] 36:23 40:25 41:21	account ^[9] 58:20 59:15,19 62:15 78:19,22 79:4 81:17 91:6	aimed ^[1] 10:9	apply ^[2] 22:5 49:9	based ^[1] 62:16
1395hh ^[2] 33:4 44:12	According ^[1] 65:16	AL ^[4] 1:5,8,12,15	appreciate ^[1] 38:12	bases ^[1] 72:23
1395i-3(d) ^[3] 1:55:2	account ^[9] 58:20 59:15,19 62:15 78:19,22 79:4 81:17 91:6	Alabama ^[2] 54:6 73:23	approach ^[1] 28:5	basic ^[2] 58:3 63:10
1395x(e) ^[3] 18:8 67:21 71:10	accrediting ^[1] 21:17	ALITO ^[17] 16:5 17:1,21 18:10,19 19:7 20:8,24 21:7,22 22:17 32:15 51:2 62:9 78:17 79:11 87:6	arbitrary ^[1] 46:10	basically ^[3] 43:14 57:22 62:15
1395x(e)(9) ^[2] 8:1 26:2	achieved ^[1] 31:17	allow ^[3] 7:4 26:16 33:5	areas ^[5] 6:2 11:24 12:2 31:14 68:2	basis ^[9] 6:16 22:7 27:1 49:24 74:8 75:5,6 85:20 88:16
1396x(e) ^[1] 38:19	acknowledge ^[3] 16:14 70:22 78:1	allowing ^[1] 28:1	aren't ^[1] 82:10	Baton ^[1] 2:8
15 ^[3] 25:1 33:10 46:14	acknowledged ^[3] 31:1 67:22 79:24	alluded ^[2] 70:17 79:14	arguably ^[3] 35:8 47:19 84:6	BECERRA ^[1] 1:11
2	across ^[2] 30:4 31:13	almost ^[1] 65:4	argue ^[3] 40:20 48:3 84:14	becoming ^[1] 31:8
20-7-134 ^[1] 47:23	Act ^[11] 6:23,25 10:23 21:10 33:13 36:24,25 45:23 58:21 60:2,22	alone ^[2] 10:3 74:13	arguing ^[5] 10:17,19 44:6,10,15	bed ^[1] 84:2
2020 ^[2] 45:11 54:7	acted ^[1] 43:17	already ^[9] 5:13 13:2 21:4 29:15 31:25 32:9 43:15 73:13 80:16	Arkansas ^[3] 47:23 48:9 65:9	beds ^[3] 59:5 81:9,21
2022 ^[1] 1:20	action ^[1] 93:4	alter ^[2] 54:1,2	around ^[6] 5:18 6:5 31:6 32:10 34:3 89:22	beginning ^[2] 42:8 61:6
21A240 ^[4] 2:7 3:7 4:4 45:8	actions ^[1] 40:13	although ^[1] 27:21	aside ^[4] 23:20 45:2 55:19 83:22	behalf ^[11] 2:3,6,9 3:4,7,10,13 4:9 45:8 72:3 87:23
21A241 ^[3] 2:10 3:10 72:3	actual ^[1] 75:19	AMA ^[1] 20:1	asks ^[1] 72:24	behaves ^[1] 69:25
24 ^[1] 38:25	actually ^[12] 6:6 22:2 31:9 34:25 38:15 65:7 75:18 76:20 79:8 82:24 90:21 91:13	ambulatory ^[5] 8:10 23:11,16,23 26:22	aspect ^[3] 11:19 64:24 77:2	believe ^[4] 50:5 59:10,21 79:3
25 ^[1] 32:3	acute ^[3] 11:5,10 13:16	amended ^[1] 29:11	arguments ^[3] 14:21 20:8 24:13	believes ^[2] 45:21 84:10
3	add ^[1] 8:20	America ^[2] 47:10 60:13	Arkansas ^[3] 47:23 48:9 65:9	belonged ^[1] 84:6
3 ^[1] 25:19	addition ^[5] 28:20 33:7 52:19 62:17 63:13	American ^[4] 11:19 19:25 20:1 79:20	around ^[6] 5:18 6:5 31:6 32:10 34:3 89:22	below ^[2] 72:19 86:23
30 ^[2] 92:21 93:3	additional ^[4] 8:1,20 17:25 32:4	Americans ^[1] 13:22	aspect ^[3] 11:19 64:24 77:2	benefit ^[1] 33:12
35,000 ^[2] 64:17,18	address ^[7] 11:24 14:22 73:17 74:1,4 77:22 93:12	Americans' ^[1] 46:21	aspects ^[3] 83:7,9 84:21	benefits ^[7] 21:14 23:13 34:15 63:14,20 64:5,10
38 ^[1] 53:24	addressing ^[6] 12:25 29:11,14,15 72:22 77:16	amici ^[1] 83:21	asserting ^[1] 49:20	best ^[5] 4:20 23:4 82:22 89:25 90:13
4	adds ^[1] 26:5	Among ^[2] 35:3 40:11	assigned ^[1] 6:13	better ^[1] 71:1
4 ^[1] 3:4	adequate ^[2] 52:12 76:3	amount ^[2] 15:13 32:20	Association ^[2] 20:1,2	between ^[8] 10:15 13:11,11,23 45:14 54:2 67:2 85:6
41 ^[1] 74:13	adequately ^[2] 34:13 46:15	analysis ^[5] 33:13,13 34:18,19 42:19	assume ^[2] 27:1 60:21	beyond ^[2] 77:17 91:2
45 ^[1] 3:7	administer ^[1] 9:22	anesthesiologist ^[1] 60:15	Attorney ^[1] 2:5	BIDEN ^[2] 1:3 4:4
5	administering ^[2] 42:17 52:22	another ^[3] 14:12 39:2 61:4	attributable ^[1] 32:5	big ^[1] 42:14
5 ^[1] 25:4	administration ^[4] 7:17 9:22 32:19 37:3		augment ^[1] 86:14	billion ^[3] 15:8 36:13 42:8
6	administrative ^[2] 68:12 80:20		authorities ^[10] 7:3 8:16,22 9:11 11:20 12:11,17 15:19 27:10 30:19	bit ^[5] 9:19 26:1 32:18 49:8 75:22
6 ^[2] 25:4 91:14	administrator ^[1] 48:24		authority ^[46] 5:8 6:22,24 8:1,25 10:3 11:2 14:10 15:20 19:20,23 23:21 25:23 26:11,21 27:3 28:10,13 29:1,6,19,20 35:1 36:20 44:13,18 45:18 50:21 51:7,14 52:4	bizarre ^[1] 90:3
60 ^[1] 92:22	administrators ^[1] 16:13			
60-day ^[3] 33:5 34:3 92:25	adopt ^[5] 16:18 44:2 55:4 88:11 90:6			
61,608 ^[1] 27:15				
61603 ^[1] 91:8				
61607 ^[1] 79:23				
7				
7 ^[1] 1:20				
72 ^[1] 3:10				
73-page ^[1] 34:6				
750,000 ^[2] 58:23 81:13				
8				
8 ^[1] 51:17				
87 ^[1] 3:13				

Official - Subject to Final Review

<p>blew ^[1] 24:21 boards ^[1] 21:17 bodies ^[1] 29:13 bookkeepers ^[1] 51:23 boots ^[1] 82:23 borne ^[2] 15:9 42:9 boss ^[2] 10:18 11:15 both ^[13] 10:20 11:7 12:19 18:6 27:22 33:20 52:4 70: 7 72:18 79:2 80:17,21 84: 22 branch ^[1] 72:9 breath ^[1] 57:5 Breyer ^[18] 32:14 56:6,11, 19,22 57:3,9,13 58:13 60: 18 75:4 80:12 81:25 82:4, 8 83:11 87:5 91:20 BRIAN ^[5] 2:2 3:3,12 4:8 87:22 brief ^[4] 25:4,16 26:13 28: 10 briefly ^[2] 47:15 73:15 broad ^[5] 50:19 75:23 76: 18 78:14,15 broader ^[2] 29:1 50:20 budget ^[2] 39:1 74:14 built ^[1] 74:19 bunch ^[1] 38:19 burden ^[3] 24:1 59:22 82:1 bureaucratic ^[1] 72:13 buy ^[1] 67:6 buyer ^[1] 66:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>C-sections ^[1] 60:17 calculated ^[1] 34:14 call ^[4] 59:7,7,8 80:20 called ^[1] 12:17 came ^[2] 1:22 16:21 candle ^[1] 90:21 cannot ^[7] 35:25 46:5 47:1 57:12 60:2 71:5 82:15 capacities ^[2] 49:12,25 capacity ^[1] 70:12 capricious ^[1] 46:11 care ^[11] 13:19,24 23:3 46: 25 73:5 75:18 89:6 90:12 91:5,12 93:11 carefully ^[1] 6:3 Carolina ^[2] 31:15 64:17 carrier ^[1] 58:5 carriers ^[1] 63:12 carrying ^[1] 20:15 case ^[43] 4:6 10:15,17,18, 22 12:23 14:8,13,14 15:13 17:19,23 21:12 23:9 24:6 30:23 39:21 47:21 48:8,23 49:25 51:8 53:5 56:1 58: 17,18 59:21 61:23 64:15 65:4 69:12 71:2,12 72:6 75:17 80:21,23 81:2 85:12 86:4 87:11 90:19,20 cases ^[9] 5:2 10:21 24:20</p>	<p>29:14,15 37:12 66:11 74:8 80:17 catch-all ^[2] 45:22 46:2 Categorically ^[1] 46:22 categories ^[9] 8:9,11 25:3 28:24 29:12 33:11 43:11 91:3,4 category ^[6] 7:3,24 8:22 10:5 27:10 46:13 caught ^[1] 9:14 cause ^[10] 4:24 5:25 21:10, 18,23 22:5,11 32:20 33:3 93:25 center ^[1] 23:17 centers ^[4] 8:10 23:11,23 26:23 certain ^[7] 51:10 54:15 66: 21,22 83:7,9 86:14 certainly ^[15] 13:15 22:7 30:7 48:7,11 49:14 52:5, 11 55:1,13 57:16 68:23 69: 17,20 79:3 certified ^[1] 38:25 cetera ^[1] 15:1 challenges ^[2] 31:21 34: 13 chance ^[2] 35:11 65:3 change ^[4] 16:25 75:2 82: 25 83:2 changed ^[1] 86:11 changing ^[1] 73:1 chaos ^[1] 73:4 chapter ^[1] 7:18 characterize ^[1] 41:1 charged ^[2] 7:18 84:9 chart ^[1] 24:10 CHIEF ^[36] 4:3,10 10:14 11: 9,22 12:4,20 13:14 32:11 34:21 42:5 44:4 45:4,9 50: 9,10 61:21 62:7 68:8 71:1, 17,20,24,25 72:4 74:21 75: 21 77:10,12 79:14 86:25 87:3,4,17,24 94:3 childhood ^[1] 9:10 choice ^[1] 82:15 choose ^[4] 6:6 13:23 44:2 45:14 chose ^[1] 56:3 Circuit ^[5] 72:25 86:24 87: 9,10 92:18 Circuit's ^[1] 27:5 circumstances ^[4] 21:9 32:4 35:20 38:4 cite ^[5] 25:4,16 27:14 64:16 91:14 cited ^[2] 8:6 48:9 cites ^[1] 51:10 citizens ^[5] 49:16,19 69:22 74:7 76:14 City ^[1] 2:6 claim ^[3] 36:5 45:17,18 claiming ^[2] 10:2 78:16</p>	<p>claims ^[1] 49:22 clarity ^[1] 60:8 class ^[1] 46:22 clause ^[13] 14:13,16 35:22 50:12,21,25 51:2 66:24 67: 12 75:22 77:3 79:1 83:15 clear ^[18] 10:2,12 16:6 17:3, 7 41:18 46:6 49:11 51:4 54:5 58:12 65:25 66:6,7 67:11,14,22 92:24 clearer ^[1] 67:15 clearest ^[1] 33:1 clearly ^[1] 52:20 clock ^[1] 82:13 close ^[6] 11:7 13:10 49:17 71:11 84:3 93:16 closer ^[3] 10:16,22 12:25 CMS ^[18] 10:17 11:2,11 12: 1,13 15:3 23:21 40:10,11, 16 43:2,7 51:22 53:11 58: 11 60:7 68:19 83:25 co-opt ^[1] 76:12 co-opting ^[1] 86:4 coalition ^[2] 48:12 73:22 coat ^[1] 62:1 Code ^[3] 8:18 47:23 89:2 cognizance ^[1] 36:8 colleagues ^[2] 62:23 83: 19 colloquy ^[1] 90:16 colonoscopies ^[1] 63:19 combination ^[1] 43:24 come ^[8] 62:21 71:3,3,5 91: 21 92:21,23 93:2 comes ^[5] 53:9 67:23 71: 11 83:3,4 coming ^[2] 63:17,18 commandeers ^[1] 37:13 comment ^[7] 21:11,13,21 22:14 31:19 32:23 33:5 comment-process ^[1] 20: 23 Commission ^[1] 68:7 common ^[4] 5:11 20:6 89: 19,21 communicable ^[1] 9:9 communities ^[3] 47:6 62: 2 64:16 community ^[7] 5:15 25:13 32:8 69:1,24 89:24 90:7 compensation ^[2] 35:6 41: 24 complaining ^[3] 68:15 69: 10 83:21 complaints ^[1] 24:19 completed ^[1] 33:18 compliance ^[10] 15:25 31: 18 49:2 50:16 92:22,23,25 93:2,3,7 comply ^[4] 16:24 19:2 36: 14 82:19 complying ^[2] 45:15 81:4</p>	<p>comprehensive ^[1] 42:20 compulsory ^[3] 53:22 66: 12 67:11 conceded ^[1] 78:4 concern ^[4] 6:4 30:24,25 52:17 concerned ^[2] 52:17,19 concerns ^[2] 13:4 53:23 concluded ^[1] 6:8 conclusions ^[3] 6:16 12: 16 72:21 condition ^[4] 8:20 47:24 67:9 76:11 conditions ^[18] 8:8,17 10: 5,8 15:21 20:14 29:1,4,21 30:12,13,13 32:3 33:10 51: 5 71:7 75:2 88:5 conductive ^[1] 4:15 confident ^[1] 39:24 confirmations ^[1] 20:5 conflated ^[1] 74:11 conflict ^[1] 78:14 conflicts ^[1] 79:10 confused ^[1] 87:13 congregate ^[1] 13:19 Congress ^[31] 6:13 12:11, 12,13 26:1 35:13,23 36:19 38:15 40:9,10,10,15 50:14 55:14,14 56:3 58:10 60:6 66:14 67:10,13,16,21,25 78:12 85:19 86:8,8,10 89: 4 conjunction ^[2] 20:22 22: 11 connection ^[1] 13:10 consensus ^[1] 25:13 consent ^[1] 73:6 consequence ^[1] 93:18 consequences ^[4] 9:24 46:20 70:15 71:13 consider ^[1] 66:8 considerations ^[1] 65:11 considered ^[4] 6:3 31:1 34:14 93:10 consistent ^[2] 30:7 40:1 consolidated ^[1] 4:6 constituencies ^[1] 69:22 constitute ^[2] 36:9 41:23 constraints ^[1] 19:19 consult ^[4] 20:10,16 21:3, 16 consultation ^[6] 20:19,22 21:1,20,24 74:18 consulting ^[1] 85:21 contains ^[1] 34:25 contemplate ^[1] 21:8 contest ^[3] 83:7,9 88:4 contested ^[1] 80:9 context ^[26] 9:15 10:12 15: 6,11,15 21:7 29:22 31:24 37:17 39:14 45:25 50:12, 25 51:2 52:9,15 62:5 63:</p>	<p>11 67:13 71:9 78:23 83:4, 4 84:16 86:7 89:18 contexts ^[4] 12:19 37:21, 24 38:4 contract ^[1] 50:23 contracted ^[2] 85:2,4 contracting ^[1] 30:14 contractor ^[1] 11:11 contractors ^[1] 12:1 control ^[22] 17:10,12 23:7 29:15 35:4,25 37:1,9,22 39:4 40:21,25 41:6,13,13, 23 42:4 54:12 55:5 57:17 82:21 88:11 controlling ^[5] 35:18 36:6 39:8 41:10 79:8 controls ^[3] 35:12 36:17 39:23 Correct ^[9] 7:21 14:18 18:5 30:16 41:25 60:19,20 73: 11 87:9 cost ^[11] 14:24 15:7,7,10 33:12 34:15 36:13 42:15, 15,17 93:24 cost/benefit ^[1] 42:19 costs ^[7] 15:13,15,25 42:9, 14,22 49:2 couldn't ^[1] 41:9 Counsel ^[14] 6:18 10:14 14:11 31:12 32:12 45:5 47: 14 68:7 71:21 73:16 83:12 85:22 87:20 94:4 counterproductive ^[1] 65: 8 countervailing ^[2] 62:18, 19 country ^[10] 5:4,18 6:5 15: 12 31:6 32:10 47:3 71:14 89:23 93:21 counts ^[1] 73:11 Couple ^[2] 68:11 91:23 course ^[2] 36:2 88:20 COURT ^[23] 1:1,23 4:11 5: 4 24:20 36:3 45:10 48:8 53:21 54:5,7 66:11 67:10 72:5,17,19,24 73:8,14 80: 18 84:25 86:21,23 Court's ^[5] 6:17 24:24 47: 13 73:10 74:22 courts ^[1] 64:10 cover ^[3] 28:4 42:23 92:19 covered ^[10] 7:3,12 23:15 25:20 26:14 35:5 90:25 91: 6 92:7,11 covering ^[1] 10:7 covers ^[2] 15:10 42:21 COVID ^[13] 13:6 30:2 53:9 57:7 60:1 63:16 72:12 74: 23,23 75:2 76:8 84:4 86: 15 COVID-19 ^[12] 4:14 5:16 8: 23 10:16,25 11:5 12:5,18</p>
---	--	---	--	--

Official - Subject to Final Review

<p>13:1,4,12,17 create [1] 73:4 created [1] 76:12 crisis [1] 47:11 critical [5] 46:18 64:15,20 65:2 77:7 crowds [1] 57:6 cues [5] 78:5,14 86:18,19, 19 curb [1] 5:11 curious [1] 9:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <p>D.C [2] 1:19 2:3 dah [1] 58:22 dah-dah [2] 58:22,22 danger [4] 10:16 11:5,10 14:8 dare [1] 29:24 data [1] 62:17 day [4] 38:25 41:16 66:22 81:14 days [4] 92:21,22 93:3,6 deadline [1] 93:1 deadly [3] 4:22 6:12 9:12 deal [2] 53:6 62:22 dealing [5] 12:23 50:13,14 52:13 58:7 deaths [1] 4:24 decide [2] 64:1,11 decided [3] 55:14 64:2 84: 16 deciding [1] 76:13 decimate [1] 61:24 decision [1] 5:21 decisions [2] 24:20 37:6 declarations [2] 62:13 75: 15 defer [1] 21:19 define [1] 14:17 definition [4] 18:8,12,24 19:1 definitional [1] 18:2 definitions [2] 18:7,25 delay [2] 4:23 93:24 delaying [1] 5:2 delegations [1] 52:21 demands [1] 67:13 denied [1] 47:12 deny [1] 5:23 Department [1] 2:3 depend [1] 27:9 deprive [1] 49:19 Deputy [2] 2:2,5 derive [1] 51:6 describe [1] 14:23 describes [1] 23:12 desires [1] 60:1 detail [1] 26:3 detailed [4] 8:16 15:23 26: 1 33:12 details [1] 16:3 Determination [2] 77:12,</p>	<p>18 determine [1] 8:13 determined [1] 12:15 determining [1] 78:23 Detroit [1] 65:7 devastate [1] 61:23 devastated [1] 64:23 devastating [5] 46:20 60: 12 62:6 70:15 71:13 developing [1] 33:9 dictate [2] 37:5 67:5 difference [1] 14:12 different [28] 7:24 10:21 11:21 22:24 25:2,6 33:11 37:23,24 43:10,11 62:15 65:10 70:18,24 71:7,8 73: 24,25 82:11 83:3,3,24 84:5 88:15 89:12,14 90:18 differently [2] 64:9 87:14 difficult [1] 22:23 diphtheria [5] 56:13,14,25 57:14 59:1 dire [1] 74:24 direct [2] 37:16 47:22 directed [2] 24:13 29:16 directly [12] 11:7 28:17 38: 15 39:7 64:14 68:1 75:7,9 76:21 78:14 79:10 83:16 disagree [9] 13:15 14:5 26: 9,11,18 27:2,18,20 51:9 discharge [1] 51:19 discrete [1] 86:11 discretion [3] 78:8,11 93:8 discretionary [1] 59:13 discuss [2] 47:15 49:8 discussed [2] 35:2 84:25 discussing [2] 15:19 91: 11 disease [11] 4:22 5:12 28: 22 57:25 58:5 59:12 61:7 63:13 77:17 81:22 82:21 diseases [5] 5:14 9:9,16 43:14 55:6 disputes [2] 89:4 93:23 disputing [2] 57:18 88:10 disruptions [8] 62:14,16 63:3,6,21 64:4,5,7 dissent [1] 71:2 dissolve [2] 72:25 80:7 distinction [1] 85:6 distinctions [1] 24:21 district [6] 24:20 48:8 72: 17 73:10 74:22 86:23 disturb [2] 6:16 80:10 divide [1] 81:13 dividing [2] 85:8,8 division [1] 61:14 doctors [2] 38:23,23 doctrinal [1] 36:4 doctrine [1] 85:10 document [1] 34:19 documented [1] 28:14</p>	<p>doing [6] 11:16,25 57:21 60:10 82:22 84:15 dollar [1] 42:9 dollars [1] 36:13 done [11] 32:21 43:8,18,19 68:5 77:25 80:2 85:11,19 89:9 90:13 doors [1] 49:17 Dorado [1] 65:9 Doubly [3] 53:20,25 60:2 down [1] 91:2 dozens [1] 33:15 draw [3] 39:22 61:15,25 drawn [1] 66:11 driver [1] 42:15 due [1] 86:15 duly [2] 48:18 70:6 during [4] 5:7 6:12 9:10 93: 21 duty [2] 38:25 91:17 dying [2] 59:4,6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <p>e)(1 [1] 51:17 e)(7 [1] 67:21 e)(9 [3] 26:5 38:20 53:14 each [12] 7:3,11,18,24 8:8, 22 10:5 22:23 24:6,13 27: 10 80:23 earlier [10] 11:15 12:9 17: 23 18:8 21:15 51:3 58:18 74:2 78:12 90:17 early [1] 45:11 economies [1] 61:24 economy [1] 31:13 effect [8] 59:11 75:17 80: 24 81:2 91:19 92:14 93:14, 19 effective [6] 9:6 20:6 43:23 44:1 72:7 84:15 effectively [5] 35:11 36:16 49:18 73:2 84:25 effects [1] 42:20 efficient [2] 7:17 9:22 efficiently [1] 52:22 eight [2] 26:3 46:2 either [4] 27:19 52:18 53:3 58:17 EI [1] 65:9 elderly [2] 53:4 58:1 element [1] 69:15 eligible [1] 18:13 ELIZABETH [3] 2:8 3:9 72: 2 emergency [5] 17:14 46: 25 60:17 74:24 85:20 emphasizing [1] 15:11 employ [1] 25:19 employee [1] 15:14 employee's [1] 41:23 employees [14] 26:14 35:5 40:13,19,21 41:6 42:3,22 47:5 64:18 78:20 79:9 89:</p>	<p>1 90:24 employers [3] 31:11 36:13 81:5 employment [4] 35:12 36: 17 46:23 47:24 enacted [4] 48:18 70:6 76: 5,7 encompassing [1] 44:13 encouraging [1] 46:16 end [3] 31:9 33:16 93:6 end-stage [1] 28:22 enforce [1] 49:3 enforcement [2] 93:4,8 engage [1] 34:18 engaged [1] 38:17 enormous [6] 14:23 31:25 74:12,15,16 85:1 enormously [1] 80:10 enough [2] 66:7 75:13 ensure [2] 50:15 91:16 ensured [1] 9:14 entire [3] 46:22 70:14 79: 13 entirely [2] 24:18 75:11 entities [3] 37:3 69:18 92: 21 entitled [1] 51:3 entity [3] 37:14 92:24 93:1 environment [1] 40:14 EPA [1] 48:16 equip [1] 44:18 equities [3] 81:10 91:22,24 equity [1] 80:18 especially [7] 4:14,15 6:1 13:18 28:3 53:8 70:15 ESQ [4] 3:3,6,9,12 establish [1] 23:6 estimate [1] 15:7 estimating [1] 42:14 ET [5] 1:5,8,12,15 15:1 evaluate [2] 78:10 86:7 evaluating [1] 64:3 even [31] 22:5 24:9 28:20, 25 31:6,7 41:8,13 42:21 44:15,20 45:1 50:24 51:1 52:22 59:25 67:12 72:22 76:8 79:23 80:8 81:12 83: 7,9 88:8 91:2 92:9,24 93:5, 5,14 everybody [2] 56:15 61:15 everyone [1] 43:13 everything [3] 14:7 35:21 65:1 evidence [1] 46:13 eviscerate [1] 73:6 exactly [3] 38:15 60:3 67: 25 example [16] 5:20 23:2,10 26:12 40:15 46:1 47:21,22 49:16 51:11,17 56:20 64: 17 67:20 69:12 71:10 exceeding [1] 60:8</p>	<p>Exceedingly [3] 46:6 54:5 58:12 except [1] 83:16 exception [4] 21:23 22:5, 11 82:12 excluding [1] 46:22 executive [2] 33:14 72:8 exemptions [1] 4:19 exercise [4] 15:18 40:17 41:16 42:3 exercised [2] 72:16 93:7 exercises [1] 59:24 exercising [1] 85:16 exist [2] 16:21 44:16 existing [2] 29:13 33:10 expand [1] 11:10 expansive [1] 45:19 expected [3] 14:1 76:8,9 experience [4] 6:4 31:5 33: 21 68:13 explain [3] 42:11 46:15 70: 24 explained [18] 5:22 6:4 9:4, 4,7 11:4 12:16 13:25 25: 10 31:2,5,22 34:7,13 42:18 43:20,23 90:23 explanation [2] 34:12 43:7 exposing [1] 13:24 express [9] 31:7 35:1 55:3, 8,15 56:2 74:18 90:25 91: 9 expressed [1] 70:5 expressly [1] 18:3 extent [4] 14:21 27:7 58:19 73:18 extra [2] 14:2 91:14 extraordinarily [1] 83:2 extraordinary [2] 80:6 82: 17 extrapolated [1] 46:13 extremely [1] 34:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <p>face [2] 13:3 47:11 faced [2] 31:21 61:13 faces [1] 31:25 facilitate [2] 31:12 49:1 facilities [38] 16:9,10,11,15 18:23 19:1,2,12 23:3,6 28: 23 30:4 35:6,13 46:14,19 47:6 49:18 52:12 55:3,16 57:18 64:22 69:4,6,7,19, 23 70:8,8 80:2 83:17,19 86:15 91:5,12 92:7 facility [2] 30:9 66:18 facility-by-facility [1] 27:1 facility-specific [4] 22:18 44:7,10,17 fact [8] 14:25 28:14 29:7 36: 2 40:8 68:18 81:20 86:5 factor [2] 27:8 64:24 failed [1] 46:15 failure [1] 30:12</p>
--	---	---	---	--

Official - Subject to Final Review

<p>fair [2] 30:2,6 fairly [1] 59:15 falls [3] 5:7 53:14 78:11 familiar [1] 35:3 fast [1] 34:5 faster [1] 34:1 fatal [1] 47:8 fault [1] 34:9 fear [1] 79:25 feather [1] 65:6 Federal [32] 8:18 11:11,21 12:1,8,10 15:9 37:1 42:10, 13,21 49:1,20 50:13 53:23 54:2 58:11 60:7 65:20 66:25 67:2,4,5 72:8 73:2 76:10 79:23 84:8 85:3 88:6, 21 89:7 few [2] 25:15 91:22 fewer [1] 62:25 Fifth [4] 27:4 72:24 86:23 92:18 filling [1] 59:5 final [1] 49:6 finally [1] 91:20 find [5] 19:16 22:22 25:25 28:6 78:18 finds [9] 8:3 17:8 18:18 19:4,10 50:17 76:1 77:13,14 Fine [1] 38:2 finished [1] 10:18 fire [2] 17:13 89:2 fired [1] 82:15 First [13] 5:6 10:1 14:8 15:5 31:5 45:21 51:1 63:10 68:12 82:10 88:18 91:25 92:22 fitting [1] 33:9 FLETCHER [64] 2:2 3:3,12 4:7,8,10 6:20 7:9,21,23 9:3,25 10:11,20 11:13 12:3,7 13:14 14:19 15:5 16:10 17:6 18:6,11 19:4,13 20:12 21:6,25 22:13,15,19 23:1 24:17 27:6 28:7,19 30:6, 17,21 32:17,25 34:2 36:22 37:15,22 38:6,11 39:9,12, 17,20 40:22 41:7,17,25 42:2,12 43:9 44:19 51:10 87:21,22,24 flexible [1] 59:18 flu [4] 5:15 43:3,18,22 focus [5] 22:21 24:18,22, 24 30:14 folks [2] 65:3 70:12 follow [3] 22:16 42:25 89:2 following [1] 18:16 food [1] 66:21 footnote [2] 26:12 27:15 force [3] 62:20 72:9 85:17 forced [3] 13:23 45:14 72:12 Forest [1] 54:7</p>	<p>former [1] 47:8 formulations [1] 25:6 forth [4] 7:24 8:16 63:1,19 forward [1] 59:21 found [6] 4:20,23 9:16 31:16 33:4 93:22 fraction [1] 92:8 free [1] 65:13 Friday [1] 1:20 friend [1] 51:9 friend's [1] 92:11 friends [2] 34:9 93:13 full [5] 32:21 58:24 92:25 93:2,6 function [4] 20:16,21 52:11 64:3 functions [2] 7:17 28:12 fundamentally [1] 46:17 funding [5] 36:10 69:20 74:14 75:10 76:22 funds [1] 16:6 further [7] 32:14 34:22 62:8 64:8 87:1,2,7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>gave [4] 39:2 56:23,24 76:6 General [22] 2:2,5,8 6:21, 23 10:3 14:14 17:11 28:10 29:19 30:19 39:5 44:11,13, 16,21,22 71:22 74:21 76:18 78:2,11 generalized [1] 28:13 generally [3] 15:3 32:2 33:22 gets [2] 8:12 11:14 getting [5] 13:23 59:2,12 63:16 81:21 give [10] 25:22 28:25 58:10 60:7,7 66:22 73:2 76:3 78:9 84:7 given [8] 12:11 36:8 68:6 75:3 76:17 77:22 88:16 89:5 gives [3] 10:23 23:8 52:20 giving [1] 92:20 gloves [8] 57:11,12 66:3 70:20 71:3 88:12 89:1,14 goal [1] 75:19 Gorsuch [18] 34:23,24 36:22 37:10,19 38:2,9 39:3,10, 15,18 40:7 41:4,12,22 42:1 68:9 87:18 Gorsuch's [1] 43:1 got [3] 9:9 38:10 58:23 governing [1] 33:2 government [28] 11:16,23 12:8,9 14:17 15:9 23:25 40:20 42:10,13,21 48:2 49:2 53:24 65:17,20 66:25 67:3,5 68:20 72:23 73:3 74:11 76:10 79:17,23 81:17 85:3 government's [4] 13:12</p>	<p>45:15 47:11 73:9 governments [1] 36:11 grant [6] 23:20 26:21 44:21, 22 53:17 78:15 granted [2] 26:10 78:12 grants [10] 27:3 29:19 44:7, 10,11,13,16,17,25 51:6 granular [1] 39:23 grave [2] 10:25 14:8 graver [1] 43:21 great [2] 15:16 53:6 greater [1] 64:7 ground [2] 82:23 88:17 grounds [1] 79:5 group [1] 25:2 groups [1] 53:2 guess [4] 23:24 32:23 33:23 55:25 guidance [2] 92:17,20 guidelines [1] 17:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>habits [1] 40:17 half [2] 5:4 93:20 hand [4] 13:5 81:3,6 84:3 handcuffs [1] 82:16 hands [5] 54:15 56:12,23 70:20 84:13 happen [2] 20:19 22:3 happens [2] 21:15 61:8 happy [1] 73:12 hard [8] 10:21 24:5 39:22 41:1 59:9 65:25 83:13,23 harm [2] 80:23 81:1 head [2] 51:22 53:11 HEALTH [76] 1:12 5:9,20 8:4 9:24 10:9,13 11:3 13:1, 11 16:17 17:9,17,19 18:22 19:5,11,17,20 20:7 22:22, 25 23:10,17 25:5,5,8,11 26:7,15,20 27:19 28:16,21 29:7,13,16,20 30:4 32:7 38:21 40:12,19 41:2 44:14 49:15 50:17 51:15 52:7,14,21,24 53:12 55:9,22 63:14,20 64:5,9,18 66:8 67:17 68:6 76:2,21 84:1,9 85:15 88:7 89:25 90:4 91:1,4,10,13,16 healthcare [30] 5:12 9:7 12:24 13:1,13,17 14:1,25 15:12 16:3 19:21 31:13,15 32:2 35:6,13 36:12,18 43:3,6 45:12 46:19,21 47:3,6 49:19 68:16 76:24 89:18, 21 hear [5] 4:3 35:10 59:16 88:3,10 heard [6] 10:25 14:7 62:5 65:3 81:2 89:11 hearing [1] 34:12 heartland [1] 17:18 heavier [1] 23:19 heavily [1] 30:23</p>	<p>help [2] 31:11 70:4 helps [1] 61:17 hepatitis [1] 5:14 heroically [1] 45:13 hesitancy [1] 31:7 HHS [3] 51:23 52:10 53:11 high [3] 15:24 31:17 84:2 hire [4] 35:18 37:6,7 40:2 hired [1] 82:16 historically [3] 58:9 60:4 65:11 history [1] 86:20 holdings [1] 73:10 home [3] 45:12 91:4,13 homes [6] 4:12 8:9 13:19 61:10 86:13 91:12 Honor [39] 47:16,22 48:7, 15 49:5,10 50:2,6 51:1,8 52:5 53:20,25 54:22 55:1, 14 56:1,10,17 57:15,19 58:6 59:17 60:10 61:20,22 62:1,3,6 64:12 66:10 67:7,20 68:23 70:9,12 71:14 74:25 84:20 hope [1] 90:18 hopefully [1] 27:22 hospital [20] 13:3 18:9,12, 13,15,23,25 20:1 26:2 38:18 39:6 40:18 51:12 56:14 59:5 60:15 62:12 71:10 81:9,21 Hospitals [18] 4:12 7:25 14:24 15:21 26:5 31:21 36:18 53:15 54:13 58:24 62:2 63:15 64:21 68:16 69:2,24 88:25 91:4 host [1] 12:2 hours [2] 38:25 46:25 Houston [1] 65:7 HUMAN [1] 1:12 hundreds [1] 61:6 hurt [1] 81:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>idea [3] 44:22 52:22 72:7 identified [3] 6:15 24:10 43:10 ignored [3] 65:2 70:13,14 ignores [2] 46:1 51:12 ignoring [1] 55:19 ill [2] 30:11 67:18 illnesses [2] 4:25 93:25 immediate [1] 82:18 immediately [1] 83:1 imminent [1] 47:11 immunization [1] 51:18 impact [1] 75:13 impermissibly [1] 46:12 implement [4] 40:16 57:16 75:8 76:23 implemented [1] 75:11 implementing [1] 4:23 implicates [1] 14:10</p>	<p>important [9] 33:25 52:4, 11 63:2 64:3,24 74:3 79:24 85:5 impose [7] 15:23 23:21 29:20 32:7 44:14 45:18 75:24 imposed [2] 31:11 76:11 inadequate [1] 84:19 include [10] 25:5,17 29:6, 20 55:23,25 88:8 90:5,25 91:13 included [3] 17:10 27:11, 13 includes [2] 55:10 88:6 including [6] 14:2 18:17 31:13,14,14 42:19 inconsistent [3] 33:19 47:19 78:6 incorrect [1] 18:5 incredibly [1] 52:1 independent [2] 48:21 79:5 Indiana [1] 31:16 individual [2] 23:13 85:17 individuals [4] 35:12 66:4 76:25 85:15 inducement [1] 79:24 industry [3] 31:24 32:2 89:18 infected [1] 66:5 infecting [2] 4:21 14:3 infection [14] 17:10,12 23:7 29:14 54:12,21 55:4,11, 20,23,25 57:17 58:4 88:11 infections [1] 54:17 infectious [3] 5:12 77:16 82:21 informed [4] 44:11 53:17, 18 73:6 ingested [1] 40:18 inherit [1] 80:18 injunction [1] 24:1 26:17 27:5 47:10 60:11 72:19,25 80:8 83:5,10 92:19 injunctions [7] 5:1,5 28:2 83:5 92:13 93:17 94:2 inoculated [1] 60:25 input [1] 31:20 insignificant [2] 47:8 64:19 insist [1] 43:5 Instead [5] 5:25 7:2 88:13 92:3,6 institutional [2] 47:4 68:24 instruments [2] 54:14 56:24 intended [3] 47:18 67:10 79:17 intent [1] 79:16 interest [13] 8:4 17:9,17 19:5,17 25:8 49:15 50:17 52:7 59:7,18 60:10 76:1</p>
--	---	--	--	--

Official - Subject to Final Review

<p>interests [7] 48:22 49:5,13 62:4 74:7,16 78:19</p> <p>interfering [1] 81:19</p> <p>interim [1] 58:22</p> <p>interpret [2] 35:24 44:12</p> <p>interpretation [1] 88:2</p> <p>interpreted [7] 21:19 22:10 26:21 29:9,18 36:25 37:12</p> <p>interrupt [1] 85:23</p> <p>introduce [1] 61:20</p> <p>invade [1] 68:1</p> <p>invasive [1] 72:11</p> <p>invoke [1] 49:14</p> <p>invoked [2] 6:21,23</p> <p>invokes [1] 46:3</p> <p>involved [1] 16:2</p> <p>involves [1] 33:8</p> <p>involving [1] 84:1</p> <p>ironic [1] 48:2</p> <p>irrevocable [1] 72:12</p> <p>irrevocably [1] 73:1</p> <p>isn't [11] 18:20 20:24,25 21:25 28:18 33:3 36:16 52:2,3 55:11 93:5</p> <p>isolate [1] 66:4</p> <p>issue [14] 20:15 29:25 30:9 31:19 36:18 47:15 48:20 65:18 67:1,3 75:22 77:18 78:11 84:23</p> <p>issues [5] 66:17,23 68:1 84:1 93:11</p> <p>itself [4] 19:15 40:2 63:13 67:13</p>	<p>47:14 48:1 49:6 50:3,7,10 51:2,21 52:16 54:10,19,24 55:7,18 56:5,6,9,11,19,22,22 57:3,9,13,20 58:13 60:18 61:21 62:7,7,9,10,11 65:15,18 66:15,20 67:15 68:3,5,8,8,10,11 69:5,8,14 70:16 71:1,15,17,17,19,20,24,25 72:5 73:15,20 74:1,20,21 75:4,21 77:10,11,12 78:17 79:11,14 80:12 81:24,25 82:4,8 83:11,12,20 85:22 86:1,25,25 87:2,4,4,6,7,8,12,15,17,17,18,19,25 90:16 91:20,25 94:3</p> <p>justifies [1] 86:4</p> <p>justify [2] 28:1 46:14</p>	<p>led [1] 44:1</p> <p>ledger [1] 93:15</p> <p>left [1] 36:20</p> <p>legal [3] 33:20 34:8,12</p> <p>legislation [1] 48:18</p> <p>length [1] 11:4</p> <p>less [4] 26:1 34:11 63:4 64:22</p> <p>letting [1] 91:18</p> <p>level [2] 9:14 67:24</p> <p>levels [1] 31:17</p> <p>licenses [1] 38:24</p> <p>licensing [1] 67:23</p> <p>life [1] 11:20</p> <p>lift [1] 23:19</p> <p>lifted [1] 92:13</p> <p>light [1] 35:24</p> <p>likelihood [4] 24:2 27:7,24 59:23</p> <p>likely [1] 31:23</p> <p>limit [5] 19:7,14 34:4 73:4 77:15</p> <p>limitation [2] 35:1 77:7</p> <p>limited [1] 12:10</p> <p>limits [1] 24:3</p> <p>line [8] 39:4,19,21 40:1 66:12 71:23 85:8,8</p> <p>lists [1] 23:14</p> <p>little [1] 26:1</p> <p>live [1] 89:8</p> <p>lives [3] 5:24 81:21 93:25</p> <p>local [6] 47:6 61:23,24 62:1 65:12,16</p> <p>long [11] 8:15 14:1 17:10,15 20:20 21:18 22:9 29:8,18 37:4 48:16</p> <p>long-term [3] 23:3 91:5,12</p> <p>longer [1] 74:24</p> <p>look [10] 7:13 10:11 25:24 29:10 52:8,24 53:11 55:9,21 71:9</p> <p>looked [1] 29:25</p> <p>looking [2] 27:7 78:8</p> <p>looks [1] 81:8</p> <p>losing [1] 45:14</p> <p>loss [2] 47:7 79:25</p> <p>lot [5] 11:16 64:12 81:8,11,14</p> <p>lots [1] 11:21</p> <p>LOUISIANA [4] 1:15 2:9 73:24 74:12</p>	<p>mandate [10] 11:12 45:16,18,24 46:7,20 48:19 49:17 70:10 71:12</p> <p>mandated [1] 77:18</p> <p>mandates [1] 79:19</p> <p>mandating [1] 46:16</p> <p>Many [13] 5:12 14:25 17:24 29:14 49:17,21 51:16,20 75:16 79:19 83:20 84:1,5</p> <p>marginal [1] 32:4</p> <p>market [1] 63:24</p> <p>masks [2] 57:12 71:3</p> <p>masquerading [1] 67:8</p> <p>Mass [1] 48:16</p> <p>Massachusetts [1] 61:9</p> <p>massive [1] 47:4</p> <p>materially [3] 46:4 71:7,8</p> <p>matter [4] 1:22 65:9,12 74:3</p> <p>matters [2] 29:16 46:8</p> <p>meals [1] 66:22</p> <p>mean [33] 13:2 20:24 21:19 34:3 37:5,10,11,11,12,17,20,23,25 38:12 43:13 46:23 50:22 52:11 58:3,15 63:22 65:19,24 67:25 76:8 77:1 79:3,11 80:14 82:2 85:23 86:8,10</p> <p>meaning [2] 38:5,7</p> <p>means [9] 18:13,15 37:9,20 60:17 63:11 78:24 82:20 92:15</p> <p>measles [1] 5:14</p> <p>measure [7] 5:20 17:19 20:6 32:7 58:4 90:6 93:19</p> <p>measures [11] 19:21 29:14 44:14 54:12 55:5,11 56:18 57:17 82:21 86:14 89:15</p> <p>mechanisms [1] 88:12</p> <p>Medicaid [33] 4:13 5:3,10 6:11 7:6 8:5,14 11:4 12:14,24 15:22 16:6,11,13 29:5 36:24 48:25 52:25 53:5 58:2 63:7 69:20 72:11 74:10,14 75:10 82:20 85:1 88:6 89:7 90:5,12 93:20</p> <p>medical [14] 4:19 5:6,15 13:24 19:25 25:13 32:8 46:4 53:6 71:5 72:12 85:17 89:24 90:7</p> <p>Medicare [29] 4:13 5:3,9 6:11 7:6 8:5,14 11:3 12:14,24 15:22 16:12 18:14 29:5 36:25 38:14 48:25 52:24 58:1 63:6 72:10 74:10 76:24 82:20 88:6 89:7 90:4,12 93:20</p> <p>medications [1] 41:14</p> <p>medicine [2] 37:3 88:23</p> <p>medicines [1] 40:17</p> <p>meet [4] 17:12 18:16 40:3 90:12</p>	<p>meets [2] 23:17 39:1</p> <p>Memphis [1] 65:8</p> <p>mention [3] 23:9 49:12,13</p> <p>mentioned [4] 42:8 50:2 51:3 61:5</p> <p>merits [2] 24:2 59:23</p> <p>met [3] 59:22 92:25 93:5</p> <p>midst [1] 17:20</p> <p>might [11] 12:21,22 17:4 24:7 33:25 35:19 59:8 61:18 62:21 63:22 81:7</p> <p>million [1] 36:12</p> <p>millions [4] 45:11,12 72:9 73:6</p> <p>mind [2] 58:15 79:12</p> <p>minimum [1] 91:18</p> <p>minor [1] 31:24</p> <p>minute [4] 59:10 66:15 81:3,12</p> <p>missing [1] 69:15</p> <p>MISSOURI [6] 1:8 2:6 4:5 48:9 65:8 75:17</p> <p>Missouri-led [1] 48:12</p> <p>Mister [1] 22:12</p> <p>moment [1] 61:3</p> <p>money [9] 14:18 35:16,17,17,25 36:5 37:13 66:18 67:1</p> <p>Montana [1] 73:24</p> <p>months [3] 33:6,18 34:6</p> <p>most [10] 6:5 11:24 37:16 38:7 42:22 47:22 52:4 53:3 69:6 79:24</p> <p>mostly [1] 42:9</p> <p>move [2] 39:5 72:13</p> <p>MS [19] 71:24 72:4 73:20 74:5,25 75:6 76:6 77:20 79:2 81:24 82:3,6,9 84:20 85:25 86:3 87:10,14,16</p> <p>much [11] 13:4 15:8 41:15,15 43:21 53:2 63:4,24 67:15 71:16 79:20</p> <p>multiple [2] 78:13 83:5</p> <p>MURRILL [23] 2:8 3:9 71:22,24 72:2,4 73:20 74:5,25 75:6 76:6 77:20 79:2 81:24 82:3,6,9 84:20 85:25 86:3 87:10,14,16</p> <p>must [3] 40:5,14,18</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <p>Jacobson [3] 53:24 66:11 85:12</p> <p>January [1] 1:20</p> <p>Jefferson [1] 2:5</p> <p>JESUS [3] 2:5 3:6 45:7</p> <p>job [7] 52:23 54:25 63:2,25 79:25 82:22 92:16</p> <p>jobs [3] 6:7 31:9 45:15</p> <p>JOSEPH [1] 1:3</p> <p>JR [1] 1:3</p> <p>judgment [2] 70:2,5</p> <p>judgments [1] 6:14</p> <p>jump [1] 72:24</p> <p>jurisdiction [1] 78:7</p> <p>Justice [181] 2:3 4:3,11 6:18 7:7,13,22 8:24 9:18,25 10:10,14 11:9,22 12:4,20 13:14 14:11,20 15:20 16:5 17:1,21 18:10,19 19:7 20:8,24 21:7,14,22 22:12,15,16,17,20 23:2 26:8 28:7,24,24 29:24 30:10,20 32:11,13,14,15,16,17 33:23 34:21,21,23,24 36:22 37:10,19 38:2,9 39:3,10,15,18 40:7 41:4,12,22 42:1,5,5,7,24,25 44:3,4,4,6,8 45:3,4,9</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <p>Kagan [17] 32:16,17 33:23 51:21 52:16 54:10,19,24 55:7,18 56:5,9,22 57:20 62:10,11 87:17</p> <p>Kavanaugh [12] 42:6,7,24 44:3 68:10,11 69:5,14 70:16 71:15 83:20 92:1</p> <p>keep [1] 85:5</p> <p>keeping [1] 60:10</p> <p>key [1] 48:15</p> <p>kill [3] 57:23 58:1,1</p> <p>kind [11] 23:14,20,21 34:18 54:8 55:8 60:3 62:4 70:5,18 85:16</p> <p>kinds [3] 57:2,16 70:21</p> <p>knowingly [1] 77:4</p> <p>knows [2] 56:3 67:25</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p>Labor [4] 10:23 62:14,20 63:21</p> <p>lack [1] 27:19</p> <p>laid [1] 43:10</p> <p>land [1] 85:10</p> <p>language [20] 7:14 22:23 25:6,17 27:14,20 35:24 37:12 46:6 51:13 54:5,8 55:4,8 56:2 58:12 76:18 88:9 91:1,10</p> <p>large [3] 31:10 42:12 68:24</p> <p>larger [1] 86:7</p> <p>largest [1] 91:3</p> <p>last [5] 9:18 44:9 69:12 81:3 86:11</p> <p>latter [3] 44:19 47:9 70:23</p> <p>law [4] 36:3 49:20 50:13 68:12</p> <p>lawful [1] 59:24</p> <p>laws [7] 47:19 48:12,17 52:3 70:6,6 73:25</p> <p>least [6] 28:15 48:8 61:17 73:18 81:19 85:11</p> <p>leave [2] 6:7 27:4</p> <p>leaving [1] 31:9</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>made [4] 12:12,13 67:10 70:2</p> <p>maintain [2] 23:6 73:9</p> <p>maintaining [1] 86:22</p> <p>major [3] 14:21 19:14 85:10</p> <p>majority [4] 10:6 28:4,15 30:3</p> <p>mammograms [1] 63:18</p> <p>management [1] 16:3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <p>name [1] 40:19</p> <p>narrow [1] 91:2</p> <p>narrowed [1] 92:18</p> <p>national [1] 17:13</p> <p>nationwide [1] 92:19</p> <p>natural [1] 38:8</p> <p>nature [2] 17:14 88:13</p> <p>Nebraska [3] 46:24 60:13,15</p> <p>necessary [14] 7:16 8:3 9:17,21 17:8 18:18 19:5,10 26:6 34:7 50:17 76:1 77:</p>

Official - Subject to Final Review

<p>14,19 need [8] 6:10 32:6 43:15 67:16 70:23 78:17 82:23 86:7 needed [2] 5:2 93:19 needy [1] 73:5 network [1] 80:11 networks [3] 73:4 75:9,14 never [8] 40:9,11 77:20,24 80:2 85:11,18,23 new [2] 9:13 61:9 next [3] 4:4 60:23,24 NFIB [1] 85:1 none [1] 51:17 nonetheless [2] 31:2 44: 17 normal [1] 32:3 North [2] 31:15 64:17 noted [1] 83:20 nothing [3] 36:24 71:11 87: 2 notice [13] 16:6,16,19,23 17:3,7,15 21:11,13 22:13 51:4 76:4,7 notice-and [1] 20:22 notice-and-comment [3] 32:22 33:2,19 Novant [1] 64:18 nuanced [1] 26:4 number [4] 24:4 32:25 72: 20 81:14 numbers [1] 31:10 numerous [1] 64:22 nurse [1] 38:25 Nurses [2] 20:2 40:3 nursing [9] 4:12 8:9 13:19 23:5 55:3,16 86:13,13 91: 12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <p>objections [1] 31:8 obligated [1] 63:8 observations [1] 91:24 obtaining [1] 27:25 Obviously [5] 16:19 48:21 68:25 69:14 75:2 occupy [1] 33:15 occurs [1] 61:2 odd [1] 20:25 offering [1] 88:3 official [1] 37:1 often [1] 39:21 Okay [8] 39:3,18 42:24 58: 16,22 59:6,12 61:10 old [1] 61:9 omnibus [4] 24:9,15 26:24 27:12 once [2] 27:13 74:24 One [38] 9:18 10:22 14:21 19:14 20:8 23:3,4,8,24 24: 19 26:19 46:13 48:16,17 49:6 54:15,16 56:24 57:10, 22 58:17 60:18 61:11 64:</p>	<p>17 65:5 67:19 74:17 76:8 78:3 81:3 83:19 84:6,12, 12,23 85:24 89:4 93:9 one-size-fits-all [1] 70:4 ones [9] 10:6 23:9 25:18 27:21 28:20 30:1 50:1 69: 1 83:18 only [9] 7:10 26:17 49:24 51:10 60:14 84:10 86:6 92: 8,19 operate [2] 74:17 92:7 operated [1] 87:14 operates [1] 16:22 operation [1] 93:24 opposite [1] 86:6 oral [7] 1:22 3:2,5,8 4:8 45: 7 72:2 order [4] 11:25 14:3 15:8 78:19 orders [1] 33:15 ordinarily [2] 53:22,23 ordinary [3] 21:12 33:24, 24 organizations [2] 16:4 68: 16 OSETE [42] 2:5 3:6 45:6,7, 9 47:16 48:7 49:10 50:5,8, 24 51:21 52:5 53:13 54:18, 22 55:1,13,24 56:10,17,21 57:1,8,11,15 58:6 59:17 61:19,22 62:11 64:12 65: 16 66:10,19 67:7,19 68:4, 23 69:13,16 70:25 OSH [1] 10:23 OSHA [10] 10:18,22 11:11 12:1,12 13:5 34:25 71:2 81:2 87:11 OSHA's [1] 14:10 other [65] 4:12 8:6 9:7,16 12:2 13:5,19 14:22 15:22 18:17,23,25 19:19 20:9 22: 2 23:17 25:13 26:6 28:3 29:15,16 30:2,13,22,23 34: 10 35:3,9 37:11,21 40:4,12 41:10 43:4 48:3,11,22 49: 25 50:12 51:13 52:14 53: 19 57:10 61:4,12 63:14 65: 6 66:16 70:21 75:4 78:4 80:21,25 81:6 82:19 84:15, 18 88:3,13 89:11,14 90:6,8 93:11,15 others [2] 24:8 59:5 otherwise [4] 27:23 45:25 61:18 84:14 ought [3] 24:18 27:17 89: 16 out [16] 9:1 20:15 32:19 34: 11,14 37:25 39:22 43:5,10 49:3 53:12 60:9 63:1 92: 15,17,20 outbreaks [1] 86:16 outcomes [1] 53:6</p>	<p>outlandish [1] 41:9 outline [1] 39:5 outside [1] 40:14 outweigh [1] 32:6 outweighed [1] 6:10 over [6] 36:13 42:8 46:6 59: 2 60:23 71:6 overflying [1] 58:25 overlooked [1] 46:18 overturn [1] 83:10 overwhelmingly [3] 5:16 68:18 92:4 own [2] 16:13 19:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>p.m [3] 1:24 4:2 94:5 PAGE [7] 3:2 25:16 27:15 53:24 71:2 91:7,14 pages [2] 25:4 33:15 pandemic [17] 5:7 6:12 9: 5,12 10:25 11:5,17,18 12: 18 13:18 14:9 16:21 17:20 43:20,24 63:12 93:21 Paperwork [1] 33:13 paradigmatic [3] 5:19 10: 13 25:11 parallel [1] 21:20 parens [4] 49:8 74:2,6 78: 18 parenthetical [1] 23:20 parenthetically [1] 23:15 part [2] 42:13 79:4 participating [2] 25:24 88: 5 participation [11] 7:6 8:8, 14,17,21 15:21 20:14 29:2, 5 33:10 67:9 particular [9] 17:22 31:21 36:8 37:6 38:24 66:9 79: 22 84:16,18 particularly [3] 15:16 80: 19 89:20 parties [2] 50:4 69:10 parts [2] 51:10 80:8 party [1] 48:4 pass [5] 28:11 66:2,3,5 67: 16 passed [1] 30:1 past [6] 8:25 9:2 17:11 22: 8 24:21 79:6 patient [17] 12:14 17:9,17, 19 19:5,17 20:7 25:8 26:7 29:6,13,16,20 37:7 52:1 88:7 89:25 patients [26] 4:13,22 5:3, 10 6:11 8:4 11:3,6 14:4 41: 3 46:23 50:18 53:2,3,4 55: 22 57:23 58:1,2 60:12 76: 2 84:10,11 90:5,12 93:20 patriae [4] 49:8 74:2,6 78: 18 pay [1] 65:23 payer [1] 65:22</p>	<p>paying [1] 65:20 people [28] 13:2 18:22 19: 11 30:11,12,15 58:23 59:2, 12 60:25 61:6,18 62:21,24 63:1,15 66:2 67:18 68:14 72:10 73:7 76:22 80:1 81: 7,8,15 88:12 92:15 people's [2] 61:10 81:20 per [2] 15:14 69:21 percent [9] 10:7 25:19 32: 3 36:10 47:7 74:13 90:23 91:6 93:1 percentage [2] 26:14 69:6 perfect [1] 61:16 performed [1] 23:16 performing [1] 64:3 Perhaps [2] 58:14 67:19 period [1] 33:5 permanent [2] 46:4 71:5 person [4] 33:24,24 37:6,7 perspective [6] 46:18 62:4 64:15,20 65:2 70:19 persuade [1] 27:23 persuaded [1] 90:18 physicians [1] 40:3 picked [1] 11:23 picks [1] 69:8 place [5] 16:1 26:17 27:5 28:2 82:22 places [3] 30:15 65:10 69: 23 placing [2] 9:20 18:1 plaintiff [1] 92:20 plaintiffs [1] 69:20 plan [2] 39:1 93:2 planned [1] 60:24 plans [4] 17:12 81:5,7 82: 10 please [5] 4:11 15:2 45:10 61:21 72:5 plethora [1] 49:14 point [12] 28:18,19 47:22 48:15 49:7 60:9 63:23 77: 2 90:10,15 91:21,25 pointed [2] 43:4 78:4 points [3] 14:6 86:6 87:25 police [3] 76:13,13 86:5 policies [2] 34:17 70:3 policy [4] 6:14 20:2,4 70:5 pool [1] 61:25 poor [1] 73:5 populations [4] 52:2 53:8 55:10 84:18 poses [4] 12:18 13:17 14:9 74:24 position [3] 26:9 48:5 77: 21 possible [2] 38:5,7 possibly [1] 76:9 posture [1] 90:22 potential [1] 64:4 potentially [1] 4:22</p>	<p>poverty [1] 53:5 power [12] 14:17 19:8 44: 24 59:13 67:2 72:9,13,17 76:13 83:14 85:16 86:5 powerful [1] 20:5 powers [3] 12:10 14:14 54: 3 practice [2] 22:8 37:2 practices [2] 25:14 90:13 precautions [1] 14:2 precede [1] 46:2 preceded [1] 78:3 precedents [1] 86:21 precedes [1] 51:14 preceding [2] 26:3 38:21 precise [1] 71:12 precisely [3] 75:14 80:3 85: 9 predict [1] 5:25 predicting [1] 80:23 predictive [1] 6:14 predicts [1] 80:25 predominant [1] 61:12 predominantly [1] 85:14 preempt [2] 47:18 73:21 preempted [2] 48:13 70:9 preemption [3] 47:15 48:6, 20 preempts [2] 73:19,22 preliminary [6] 5:1 72:18 83:5 92:13 93:16 94:1 premise [1] 27:2 preparedness [1] 17:13 prerogative [2] 88:19,24 prescriptive [1] 15:23 present [3] 13:10 48:19 83: 8 presentation [1] 92:12 presented [1] 62:12 PRESIDENT [2] 1:4 4:4 pressed [1] 30:23 pressing [1] 11:24 pretend [1] 44:15 pretext [1] 79:13 pretty [3] 53:2 58:3 63:10 prevailing [1] 27:25 prevent [5] 4:21 14:3 54: 20 55:5 60:1 preventable [1] 4:24 prevention [5] 54:12 55:11, 23,25 58:4 previously [4] 43:2,8 80: 16 92:18 primarily [4] 7:1 17:2 44: 25 46:3 primary [4] 30:14 46:24 75: 19 76:20 prime [1] 53:10 Principal [6] 2:2 18:1 45: 20 52:2,23 53:10 principle [1] 84:8 private [4] 37:14 69:19 70:</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Official - Subject to Final Review

<p>8 83:18 private-run [1] 69:7 problem [11] 12:6 13:1,6,8 40:23 58:25 62:3 64:24 68: 25 69:2 88:15 problems [1] 93:13 procedure [3] 46:5 71:5 80:6 procedures [2] 51:20 71:8 proceed [1] 72:1 proceeding [1] 32:22 process [2] 33:21 70:14 produced [1] 34:6 program [13] 16:22 23:7 30:11 49:1 75:10,20 76:12 77:9 83:15 85:2 88:22 89: 8 93:9 programs [7] 16:14 52:23 74:11,16 76:23 85:6 88:6 prohibited [1] 35:14 prohibitions [1] 80:4 prohibits [1] 47:24 promise [1] 38:3 promulgate [2] 18:4,21 properly [3] 65:1,1 72:16 proprietary [1] 49:13 proprietors [4] 83:16,17 84:24,24 protect [16] 5:9 6:11 11:2 17:19 18:22 19:11 51:25 61:17 63:8 67:17 74:6 84: 11 88:7 89:25 90:4 93:20 protecting [2] 20:6 85:15 protection [1] 5:3 provide [4] 17:3 75:18 76: 21,22 provided [2] 23:13 47:3 provider [8] 8:22 10:6 72: 11 73:4 75:9,14 80:11 93: 9 providers [39] 4:13,17 5: 18 7:4,12,25 8:9,11 15:1, 22 16:23 19:21,24 20:15 25:14,18,24 27:11 28:22 29:12 30:9 32:9 33:11 47: 4 48:24 57:21 63:12 68:24 82:16 85:3,4 89:6,22 90:8 91:4,13 92:1,3,10 providing [3] 35:16,16 89: 6 province [4] 46:9 54:4 58: 9 60:4 provision [20] 9:21 17:22 18:7 19:22 20:12 21:23 22: 10 23:12 26:2 28:9,9 33:2 38:20 46:3 50:14,22 75:23 77:16 90:22,22 provisions [27] 17:25 18:2, 2 21:7 24:6,7,11,14,23 25: 2,25 27:16,19,25 28:3 29: 11 38:13,22 40:4 45:22 46: 2 51:11,16 53:19 59:20 91:</p>	<p>9,14 psychiatric [2] 28:23 30: 13 public [6] 21:13,21 59:7,17 60:9 79:20 publish [1] 7:15 purposes [1] 18:9 pursuant [1] 8:21 put [10] 15:6,11 17:6 55:19 59:21 65:5 76:18 81:11 92: 17,20 putting [2] 82:1 83:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <p>qualifications [1] 40:4 quasi-sovereign [1] 49: 15 question [24] 9:19 11:14 23:24 42:25 43:1 50:9 55: 19 60:19 62:12 63:22 69:9 72:15 77:6 78:10,21,22 79: 6,7,12 82:7 84:21 85:7,9, 14 questions [12] 6:17 12:8 22:16 44:8 47:13 68:11 71: 19 72:18 73:12,13 74:9 85: 10 quick [1] 87:25 quintessential [3] 6:13 76: 12 86:5 quite [2] 32:18 81:11 quo [5] 73:1,10 80:10 82:18 86:22 quote [1] 74:23 quoted [1] 18:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>raised [4] 14:21 91:21 92:1 93:12 range [1] 39:15 ranges [1] 39:21 rate [1] 32:1 rather [2] 6:6 18:2 reaction [1] 36:15 read [6] 17:1 22:3 29:22 37: 4,5,18 reading [3] 28:10 30:8 38: 8 ready [1] 81:7 really [5] 24:12 33:25 51:21 79:12 88:16 Realtors [1] 54:6 reason [3] 26:22 38:12 41: 20 reasonable [1] 81:18 reasonably [1] 76:17 reasons [7] 5:5 31:4 33:1 41:10 43:11 45:20 74:17 REBUTTAL [3] 3:11 87:21, 22 receive [2] 36:11 69:19 recently [2] 54:6 86:10 recipients [2] 52:25 63:7</p>	<p>recommending [1] 20:2 record [1] 5:23 recordkeeping [3] 51:19 52:10,13 records [4] 52:14,14,18,19 Reduction [1] 33:13 reference [6] 10:8 22:25 26:15 28:21 52:20,21 referenced [1] 28:16 references [2] 22:22 26:20 referred [1] 21:14 referring [1] 25:7 refers [1] 23:5 regimes [1] 40:17 Register [1] 79:23 regulate [4] 36:21 51:14 56:4 57:1 regulated [5] 68:14 69:10 75:7 92:21,24 regulates [1] 46:7 regulating [1] 46:14 regulation [16] 25:12 27: 12 31:1 33:9 35:8 36:11, 16 47:17,18 48:14 68:15, 20 69:11 88:23 90:24 92: 11 regulations [18] 7:16 8:18 16:24 18:4,21 19:3 28:11 29:10,25 30:2,3,8 33:3 39: 5 40:16 44:24 66:8 67:17 regulators [2] 25:14 90:7 regulatory [1] 33:21 reimburse [1] 76:24 reimbursement [1] 18:14 reinforced [1] 25:12 reinforces [1] 44:22 reject [1] 73:8 relate [1] 30:4 related [2] 11:7 86:12 relates [1] 79:7 relationship [1] 10:15 relatively [2] 26:3 31:23 relevant [4] 27:9 45:24 58: 21 64:23 reliance [2] 9:20 18:1 relied [2] 8:15 93:13 relief [1] 73:3 relies [1] 48:2 religious [1] 4:19 rely [2] 23:12 49:7 relying [6] 6:19 7:1,2 17:2 24:5 44:25 remain [3] 26:17 28:2 93: 17 remains [1] 72:16 renal [2] 28:22 30:12 reply [4] 25:4,16 26:13 91: 15 represent [1] 69:21 represents [1] 47:2 request [2] 73:9 83:8 require [11] 9:1 20:21 54:</p>	<p>11 65:13,14,19,19 70:3,23 88:12,25 required [9] 4:17 5:13 9:11 19:2 20:9 33:14 43:3 46:7 89:16 requirement [26] 4:24 9: 17 10:4,13 16:20 17:5 19: 3 32:6 40:12 47:25 58:8 60:3 67:8,8 70:4,19,20 71: 4,10 92:5 requirements [39] 5:10,17, 19 6:8 7:5 8:3,7,12,13 9: 13 15:24 16:8,17 17:8,16 18:16,17 25:8,23 26:4,6 29:7 31:10,17 33:20 34:8 39:2 40:24 41:2 43:13 47: 20 50:16 51:13 52:7 70:21 74:18 75:25 78:25 89:19 requires [5] 21:24 23:5 66: 2,3 67:14 requiring [5] 5:6,24 8:23 17:12 55:11 residential [1] 28:23 respect [22] 28:11 30:1 40: 13 43:18 44:7 47:20 48:5, 10,24 49:21 51:11,23 53:7, 15 55:2,16 62:20 66:16,17 80:19 83:14,25 respectfully [1] 51:9 respecting [2] 77:6,7 Respondents [8] 1:9,16 2: 6,9 3:7,10 45:8 72:3 response [8] 6:7 11:16 20: 11 21:21 35:15 56:8 80:13, 15 responses [1] 51:1 responsibility [6] 10:24 51:25 52:3 53:10,14 55:9 responsible [2] 12:12,14 rest [1] 27:16 resting [1] 10:4 restrictions [1] 79:18 result [1] 27:23 rights [2] 49:20 84:7 risk [1] 6:9 ROBERTS [26] 4:3 10:14 11:9,22 12:4,20 32:11 34: 21 42:5 44:4 45:4 50:10 61:21 62:7 68:8 71:17,20, 25 74:21 75:21 77:10,12 86:25 87:4,17 94:3 robust [1] 34:18 rock [1] 65:5 role [1] 76:20 Rouge [1] 2:8 routine [1] 20:5 rule [36] 10:8 13:21 15:15 24:9,15 25:20 26:24,24 32: 20 33:8,16 34:6,7 42:20 46:10 49:4 64:6 66:2,3,6,9 69:18 73:18 75:8 79:22 80:</p>	<p>24 81:1 82:11,24 83:18,23 91:18 92:8,14 93:14,24 rulemaking [6] 6:22,23 20: 19 22:4 26:21 33:19 rules [12] 6:25 7:15 28:16 60:24 65:25 73:19,21,22 81:20 82:20 83:25 84:5 ruling [2] 72:20,23 run [3] 47:6 62:2 69:23 rural [14] 6:1 31:14,21 46: 18,21,23 47:10 49:18 60: 12,13,15 62:11 63:24 64: 10 rushed [1] 34:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <p>safe [1] 30:15 safety [65] 5:9,20 8:4 10:9, 13,24 11:3 12:13,15 16:17 17:9,14,18,20 19:6,11,17, 20 20:7 22:22,25 23:10,17 25:6,9,11 26:7,16,20 27:20 28:17,21 29:7,13,17,21 30: 5 32:7 38:21 40:19 41:2 44:14 50:18 51:15,25 52:8, 21,24 53:12 55:10,22 63:6 66:8 68:6 76:2,21 84:9 85: 15 88:8 89:14 90:1,4 91:1, 10,16 same [5] 15:19 44:20 45:13 48:5 57:5 sands [1] 75:2 sanitizers [1] 84:3 satisfied [2] 22:6 34:7 satisfies [1] 78:24 save [2] 5:24 81:20 savings [1] 62:25 saying [19] 28:13 52:8,9,16, 18 56:1,7,15,19,21 57:19 59:19 61:3,10,11 66:9 77: 14,23 81:25 says [15] 7:14 18:12,24 20: 13 23:16 33:4 35:4 36:24 47:17 50:14 55:21 63:4 66: 25 84:8 91:15 scale [3] 39:11,13 65:5 scattered [1] 45:22 scope [4] 13:20 77:17 78: 12,15 se [1] 69:21 seasonal [1] 43:21 Sebelius [1] 85:1 Second [7] 5:21 46:10 70: 16 81:13 90:15 92:9,23 secondary [1] 77:2 seconds [1] 81:14 SECRETARY [109] 1:11 4: 17 6:3,15,20 7:4,15,20 8:2, 6,12,15 9:4 10:23 15:18 16:2,18 17:8,17 18:3,18,20 19:4,8,9,10,14,15,18 20:13, 20 21:10 22:10 23:18 24: 10 25:22 26:10 27:11 28:</p>
---	---	---	---	---

Official - Subject to Final Review

25 29:4,8,18 30:18,25 31:16 33:4,5,7 34:5,10,20 35:4 37:4 38:14,17 41:19 42:14,18 43:9,15,17,20 44:18,23 45:17,21 46:1,12,17 47:17 50:15,16 51:5,23 52:6 53:11,16 54:9,11 55:4 57:15,21 59:20,25 62:14,21 63:2,4,25 64:2,8,25 65:5 75:24,25 77:13,14,21 88:11 89:5,9,9 90:11 91:15 92:17 93:3,7,10,22 Secretary's [15] 5:8,21 6:21 15:7 16:24 19:23 22:8 28:12 35:1 45:17 51:14 68:19 77:17 88:4 90:3 section [4] 8:1 36:23 40:25 53:18 sections [1] 26:3 sector [1] 31:14 Security [2] 6:22 45:23 see [10] 9:15 19:21,24,25 20:3 64:25 81:17,18,23 90:6 seek [1] 46:24 seeking [2] 23:25 49:24 seeks [1] 73:3 seem [2] 30:10 49:7 seems [7] 13:8 23:19 58:3 59:9,10 63:9 88:14 seen [2] 13:18 43:25 sees [1] 64:6 selection [1] 35:7 sense [2] 27:12 88:21 series [1] 45:21 serious [4] 12:6 13:8 80:25 93:25 seriously [2] 5:23 93:23 serve [4] 4:13 30:11 66:21,21 SERVICES [5] 1:12 23:14 65:21,22,22 set [17] 7:4,5,23 8:2,7,16 9:1 15:20 25:23 29:1,4,6 41:10 45:2 52:6 88:5 89:8 sets [2] 20:14 44:23 setting [3] 11:6 41:8 42:2 settings [5] 4:15 9:7 13:17,20 54:16 severability [1] 27:14 several [1] 31:3 severe [1] 4:25 shall [5] 7:15 20:16 35:4 36:24,25 shift [3] 22:21 46:5,15 shifting [2] 75:1,1 short [3] 5:19 82:13,13 shortages [4] 6:1,10 30:25 31:23 shot [4] 72:13 82:13 92:22,23 shots [3] 42:16,17 43:3	shouldn't [3] 13:23 27:4 70:14 showing [3] 24:2 59:22 63:15 shown [2] 31:6 91:7 shows [1] 6:5 sick [5] 13:2 58:2 61:18 63:1 81:8 side [14] 14:22 20:9 22:2 30:23 34:10 35:9 39:25 61:4 65:5 80:22,25 88:3 93:11,15 sides [1] 80:21 signed [2] 50:22,22 significant [3] 9:20,23 14:12 significantly [1] 54:1 similar [3] 8:6,11 37:12 similarly [1] 48:10 simplest [1] 64:14 since [3] 30:11 48:2 85:11 single [2] 26:19 27:3 sit [1] 80:17 situated [1] 48:10 situation [5] 43:25 53:21 68:13,17 85:24 situations [2] 13:7 59:25 Sixth [2] 87:9,10 size [1] 62:16 skilled [4] 23:5 55:3,16 86:12 skip [1] 21:18 sleep [2] 40:17 41:15 sliding [2] 39:10,13 small [5] 26:13 69:1,6,19,23 smaller [2] 47:5 69:1 snacks [1] 66:22 Social [2] 6:22 45:23 societies [1] 19:25 society [1] 89:20 sole [1] 74:8 Solicitor [3] 2:2,8 78:2 somehow [2] 52:10 89:14 sometimes [1] 36:9 somewhat [1] 48:1 somewhere [2] 39:4,7 sorry [5] 7:9 40:9,16 50:9 87:12 sort [13] 12:17 17:18 33:12,23 38:16 43:10,24 47:24 64:23 65:2 69:17 91:10 93:11 SOTOMAYOR [24] 14:11,20 28:7,25 29:24 30:10,20 34:22 44:9 65:15,18 66:15,20 67:15 68:3,5 77:11 83:12 85:22 86:1 87:7,8,12,15 sought [1] 31:19 sovereign [1] 49:12 sovereignty [1] 77:8 space [1] 24:3	speaking [1] 70:11 speaks [1] 9:21 special [1] 89:15 specific [15] 7:2,11 8:15,21 10:5 16:19 24:5,11 25:5,17 26:4 27:13 28:16 44:25 89:15 specifically [7] 10:8 25:7 35:14 58:7 62:15 83:6 86:12 specificity [1] 56:4 specified [2] 18:16 23:18 specify [1] 65:22 spend [2] 14:18 67:1 spending [17] 14:13,16 15:12 35:21,21 50:11,21,25 51:2 66:24 67:12 75:22 76:10 77:3 78:25 83:14 88:22 spoke [2] 17:23 67:22 spread [7] 4:16 5:12 54:17,21 55:5 57:6 60:1 sprinklers [1] 89:3 squared [1] 89:17 squarely [1] 5:7 staff [11] 4:18 5:6 9:15 16:8 31:25 32:1 40:5 47:7 63:16 86:15,17 staffed [1] 38:23 staffing [5] 6:1,9 30:24 31:23 37:2 stage [1] 72:19 stake [1] 71:8 stakeholders [1] 31:20 stand [1] 27:17 standard [3] 39:25 40:13 41:11 standard-setting [2] 38:16 39:13 standards [11] 7:5 23:18 25:23 40:1,11 41:8,9 42:3 44:23 89:8 90:11 standing [11] 49:7,9,24 74:2,6 75:5,6 78:18,21 79:4,5 start [3] 81:4,6 88:1 state [22] 9:11 36:10 37:14 43:12,19 47:19 51:5 54:2 65:12 66:23 67:23 68:2,2 73:4,19,23 75:11 76:13,23 78:20 83:13 86:5 state's [3] 58:9 77:8 84:7 state-run [4] 16:8,15 70:7 83:17 statement [1] 74:22 STATES [46] 1:1,4,24 4:5 5:23 6:15 16:5,12,14 20:3,10,17 21:16,20 32:18 36:20 43:5,18 46:9,19 48:4,11,22,23 51:3 54:4 60:5,22 65:13,19 66:13 67:2,24 69:3,5,21 73:21 75:13 83:15 85:2,4 88:20,24,25 92:6,20 states' [1] 49:4	status [5] 73:1,9 80:10 82:18 86:22 statute [28] 18:9 19:15 20:10,13,18 21:8 27:3 29:23 34:24,25 35:20,22 38:14,18 40:2 51:24 52:9,20 53:19 71:11 74:19 76:19 78:5,23 80:5 86:19 88:17 90:10 statutes [19] 7:11 17:2 22:18,24 24:4 25:15,17,22 26:15,19 33:14 36:9 55:15 59:20 86:12 88:2,8 90:18,25 statutorily [1] 63:7 statutory [6] 5:8 8:16 17:22,25 24:19 51:6 stay [7] 5:4 24:1 47:12 58:16 83:8 90:21 91:23 stayed [5] 45:11,13 92:14 93:17 94:2 stays [4] 58:21,21 80:19 92:12 step [2] 9:17 84:12 steps [1] 84:18 sterilize [1] 54:14 sterilizing [1] 56:23 stick [1] 34:17 still [8] 25:22 28:25 41:12 43:5 71:22 72:15 82:19 93:6 stop [1] 57:7 story [2] 43:1,6 straight [1] 77:5 stretches [1] 47:2 strike [1] 86:14 strong [1] 31:7 stronger [1] 23:9 structural [3] 24:12 78:5 80:4 structure [2] 45:25 86:20 subject [9] 4:19 8:11 16:7,17 17:4,7,16 66:9 69:18 submission [1] 88:14 submit [2] 55:17 85:17 submitted [4] 75:15,16 94:4,6 subsection [1] 39:2 substantially [1] 83:24 succeeding [1] 38:13 success [4] 24:2 27:8,24 59:23 sudden [1] 46:15 sufficient [1] 45:1 suggest [3] 28:5 32:20 62:13 suggested [4] 12:9 26:12,22 92:12 suggesting [2] 41:18,20 suggestion [1] 33:17 suing [1] 50:1 summer [1] 86:11 supervising [1] 39:8 supervision [2] 37:9,23	supplements [1] 40:18 support [4] 24:7 68:19 86:22 92:4 supported [3] 5:22 32:8 72:19 supports [1] 5:16 Suppose [2] 55:20 61:13 supposed [1] 24:16 SUPREME [2] 1:1,23 surely [1] 13:11 surgeries [2] 60:14,17 surgery [1] 47:1 surgical [5] 8:10 23:11,16,23 26:23 surprise [1] 11:18 surveyors [1] 49:3 Sutton [1] 71:1 swaths [1] 71:14 sweeping [1] 45:24 systems [1] 31:15 <hr/> T table [1] 91:7 tactic [1] 84:12 talked [4] 14:13 38:19,20 44:9 talks [1] 56:2 targeted [2] 80:1,2 teams [1] 86:14 temporal [1] 22:1 temporary [2] 6:9 31:22 tens [1] 47:4 tenure [7] 35:5 36:17 37:2 40:21 41:6,24 79:8 terminating [1] 93:8 terms [7] 15:3 24:25 55:15 62:25 65:24 77:4 78:8 test-and-mask [1] 82:12 tether [1] 79:17 text [5] 19:15 24:19,22,23 45:24 textual [2] 24:13 78:5 themselves [2] 13:24 42:16 there's [21] 21:12,17 22:1,6 38:19 39:10,15 55:3,8 56:12 69:14,15 70:22 77:15 79:11,12 80:14,22 82:11,12 84:21 therefore [1] 59:14 they've [6] 17:15 77:24 80:2 84:16 88:18 89:21 THOMAS [23] 6:18 7:7,13,22 8:24 9:18,25 10:10 15:20 22:17 32:13 47:14 48:1 49:6 50:3,7 62:8 73:15,20 74:1,20 87:1,2 Thomas's [1] 69:8 thorough [1] 34:11 thoroughly [1] 5:22 though [4] 24:10 37:10 41:13 42:21 thousands [3] 47:5 59:11
--	--	---	---	--

Official - Subject to Final Review

<p>61:6 threat ^[5] 11:1 12:18 13:12, 16 43:21 three ^[6] 11:24 13:9 46:25 87:25 91:3,3 throughout ^[4] 13:18 45:23 70:13 89:20 tie ^[1] 84:13 tiny ^[3] 64:16,21 92:8 together ^[2] 79:18,19 tomorrow ^[1] 92:15 took ^[2] 32:19 62:14 touch ^[2] 75:22 79:21 touches ^[1] 11:19 towards ^[1] 39:22 towns ^[1] 61:25 traditional ^[1] 5:11 traditionally ^[2] 46:8 54:3 train ^[1] 40:5 trained ^[1] 40:6 transmitting ^[1] 57:25 treat ^[1] 37:7 treatment ^[3] 28:23 72:12 85:18 trillion ^[1] 15:13 true ^[6] 32:24 50:3 80:13 86:6 88:20 92:16 truth ^[1] 80:14 trying ^[3] 34:16 59:4 83:13 turnover ^[3] 31:25 32:1,5 turns ^[1] 77:3 twice ^[1] 80:16 two ^[19] 5:5 25:3 33:6,17 34:6 44:15 45:19 46:25 50:25 52:1 53:2,8 59:19 60:23 61:11 74:11 84:21 85:6 91:11 types ^[1] 19:20 typically ^[4] 6:24 9:8 88:19, 24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p>U.S ^[1] 54:7 unambiguous ^[1] 51:6 unbelievable ^[1] 59:16 uncomfortable ^[1] 12:22 under ^[10] 6:22,25 7:18 46:11 49:20 50:1 56:8 66:24 78:25 89:6 underestimate ^[1] 75:12 undergo ^[2] 47:1 72:11 underlying ^[1] 72:23 undersell ^[1] 14:7 understand ^[13] 7:7 24:3 25:1 26:9 28:8 34:2 35:15, 19 40:7,8 43:2 54:16 82:6 understanding ^[4] 20:25 53:1 66:1 83:23 understood ^[3] 20:21 30:18 35:23 undone ^[1] 46:5 unfamiliar ^[1] 16:2 unfortunately ^[3] 53:5 61:</p>	<p>19,22 uniform ^[1] 89:23 unique ^[4] 9:5,6 12:18 43:24 uniquely ^[3] 9:12 43:22 44:1 UNITED ^[4] 1:1,4,23 4:5 unlawful ^[3] 45:19 48:18 70:10 unlawfully ^[1] 60:2 unlike ^[2] 34:24 46:4 unnecessarily ^[1] 13:25 unnecessary ^[1] 93:25 unprecedented ^[6] 11:18 15:3,18 45:19 72:14 86:2 until ^[1] 16:21 unusual ^[2] 68:12,17 unvaccinated ^[1] 62:23 unwieldy ^[1] 25:1 up ^[12] 9:14 22:16 31:9 42:25 59:5 63:15 69:8 81:9 83:3,4 86:6 89:8 up-end ^[1] 80:9 urgent ^[1] 6:10 urgently ^[2] 5:2 93:18 urging ^[1] 90:8 useful ^[1] 72:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>vaccinate ^[2] 79:19 82:13 vaccinated ^[9] 4:18 5:13 6:6 9:8 31:8 43:14 57:24 76:15 78:21 vaccination ^[31] 4:20 5:7, 10,16,24 6:8 8:23 9:15 10:4 16:7,20 17:5 23:22 31:3, 10,12,16 32:5 40:12 43:13 46:16 47:20,25 48:4 53:22 66:12 67:12 70:3 88:19 89:19 92:4 vaccinations ^[6] 9:2,11 14:2 15:10 42:16 48:3 vaccine ^[10] 9:23 11:11 45:16 57:12 58:8 67:8 70:18, 24 71:4,4 vaccines ^[12] 9:6 42:22 43:4,11,18,23 44:1 72:7 86:16 88:14 89:12,13 vague ^[1] 45:22 value ^[1] 70:2 variety ^[1] 54:20 various ^[6] 49:11,25 54:11 56:18,18 66:11 vast ^[6] 10:6 28:4,14 30:3 47:2 71:14 versus ^[2] 4:5 85:1 view ^[6] 25:21 29:3 41:5 56:6 62:16 89:23 viewed ^[1] 15:15 virtually ^[2] 11:19 89:23 virus ^[2] 4:16 13:25 vital ^[1] 52:13 voice ^[2] 67:14,22</p>	<p>voices ^[1] 70:13 volumes ^[1] 83:25 voluntarily ^[3] 77:4 89:22 90:9 vulnerability ^[1] 84:17 vulnerable ^[8] 4:14 52:1 53:3,8,9 55:10 60:12 84:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>wait ^[1] 66:15 waiting ^[1] 86:22 walking ^[2] 56:14 57:6 wants ^[6] 14:18 58:10 60:6 65:23 66:25 67:5 wash ^[3] 54:14 56:11 70:20 washing ^[1] 56:23 Washington ^[2] 1:19 2:3 way ^[29] 4:21 5:11 14:9 16:22 19:22 20:20 22:9 29:8, 22 30:18 34:19 35:13 37:8, 8,13 40:6 54:15,17 57:5 58:14 60:23 64:14 73:1 74:12,16 82:17 84:10 86:9 89:25 ways ^[3] 73:24 84:15 93:12 weapon ^[1] 35:25 wear ^[4] 66:2 70:19 88:12 89:1 weary ^[1] 81:19 week ^[1] 60:24 weeks ^[1] 60:23 weigh ^[1] 64:9 weighed ^[1] 65:1 weighing ^[2] 64:4 81:10 weight ^[1] 81:12 welcome ^[2] 6:17 47:13 welcomed ^[1] 31:20 welfare ^[3] 18:22 67:17 84:1 well-being ^[1] 49:16 well-reasoned ^[1] 72:20 whatever ^[3] 51:4 63:3 78:24 Whereupon ^[1] 94:5 whether ^[15] 15:2 36:7 55:7 72:6,8,16 73:17 76:14 78:9,10,24 79:8 80:19 84:23 86:8 whole ^[2] 49:13 90:10 whom ^[1] 63:7 will ^[33] 5:24,25 6:6 14:24 15:9 21:10 34:17 35:9 36:13 46:20,23,24 47:11 49:17,18 55:17 56:15 57:6 58:17,19 60:9 61:15 62:25,25 73:2,3 80:10 81:8,20 82:24 83:1,1 93:24 wise ^[1] 22:20 withholding ^[1] 35:17 within ^[9] 5:8 13:20 19:23 38:1 46:8 78:11,20 84:6 93:3</p>	<p>without ^[5] 21:10 36:5 47:10 72:22 85:20 wonder ^[1] 36:7 word ^[1] 30:22 words ^[1] 50:12 work ^[9] 13:5 23:22 34:1,5 40:14 45:13 60:16 65:7 71:6 work-around ^[1] 79:15 workers ^[21] 4:21 5:13 6:5 9:8 10:7 14:1,9 25:19 28:4 31:7 36:12,18 43:3,6 45:12,13 89:21 91:7 92:2,3,10 working ^[2] 72:10 84:7 workplace ^[5] 10:24 11:1 12:13 13:6,7 world ^[1] 59:2 worse ^[3] 13:5 58:25 81:9 worth ^[2] 90:21 91:18 write ^[2] 33:8 55:15 writing ^[1] 33:12 Wyoming ^[1] 48:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>XAVIER ^[1] 1:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>year ^[1] 32:1 years ^[1] 76:11 yesterday ^[1] 58:24 York ^[1] 61:9 yourself ^[1] 28:6</p>
---	---	---	--