

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

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

- - - - - x

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL :
DEVELOPMENT, ET AL. :

Petitioners : No. 12-10

v. :

ALLIANCE FOR OPEN SOCIETY :
INTERNATIONAL, INC., ET AL. :

- - - - - x

Washington, D.C.

Monday, April 22, 2013

The above-entitled matter came on for oral
argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
at 11:02 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

SRI SRINIVASAN, ESQ., Deputy Solicitor General,
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
Petitioners.

DAVID W. BOWKER, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
Respondents.

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	SRI SRINIVASAN, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	DAVID W. BOWKER, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondents	28
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	SRI SRINIVASAN, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioners	53
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (11:02 a.m.)

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4 next this morning in Case 12-10, Agency for
5 International Development v. The Alliance for Open
6 Society International.

7 Mr. Srinivasan.

8 ORAL ARGUMENT OF SRI SRINIVASAN

9 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS

10 MR. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Mr. Chief
11 Justice, and may it please the Court:

12 Congress's comprehensive program to address
13 the worldwide problem of HIV and AIDS includes a policy
14 of opposing prostitution and sex trafficking because
15 they contribute to the diseases' spread. And
16 correspondingly, Congress determined -- determined that
17 the government should partner with and should grant
18 limited competitive Federal funding to those
19 organizations that agree with the policy opposing
20 prostitution and sex trafficking because organizations
21 that agree with that policy are most likely to carry out
22 the Federal program in conformity with the Federal
23 policy priorities.

24 Now, no organization that carries out HIV
25 programming is required to subscribe to the Federal

1 government's views, but, if an organization wants to
2 partner with the Federal government and get Federal
3 funds to carry out the Federal program, well, that
4 organization --

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but I guess
6 the problem is that there are a number of different ways
7 you could carry out the program. And let's say you have
8 an organization that focuses on a particular -- you
9 know, the administration of hospitals or whatever it is
10 that's covered by the program, and they regard this
11 issue as collateral to what they're concerned with.

12 There -- there have to be some limitations
13 on what type of loyalty oath you can require them to
14 sign, isn't there?

15 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, I think,
16 Mr. Chief Justice, the way that Congress looked at this
17 was to look at -- at the organizations with which the
18 government is going to partner across the mine run of
19 situations, and I think what one can do is look at
20 Respondents' brief because Respondents encompass a
21 variety of different types of organizations.

22 But Respondents' brief itself tells you, at
23 pages 11 to 12 and at pages 32 and 33, that there are
24 going to be situations, in their own experience, in
25 which these issues about prostitution and --

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, what if
2 they --

3 MR. SRINIVASAN: -- and sex trafficking come
4 into issue.

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I appreciate that.
6 What if they're not? What if the government
7 has, in addition to this policy, a strong policy in
8 promoting -- you know, recycling, and so they require
9 everybody with whom they're going to do business, every
10 grantee, to adopt a policy in favor of using renewable
11 resources? Any problem with that?

12 MR. SRINIVASAN: Mr. Chief Justice, I think
13 that would present a different question. Of course, you
14 know that it presents a different question, but it would
15 be a little bit more difficult for the -- for the
16 following reason: That there is a germaneness component
17 to Congress's -- the constitutionality of Congress's
18 funding decisions in this area. And the more sweeping
19 and the less germane the condition would be, the more
20 it's open to constitutional attack.

21 Now, this condition is very, very germane
22 because as -- because, as Congress found, prostitution
23 and sex trafficking contribute to the spread of the
24 disease, and so it makes good sense that Congress would
25 have imposed this condition. And I think it's important

1 to understand --

2 JUSTICE BREYER: Well -- well, on that
3 particular point, what should we do -- as far as I can
4 tell from the briefs, the people who work with the
5 prostitutes to try to prevent AIDS uniformly tell us
6 that, if you go to those prostitutes and you try to get
7 them to take steps to stop AIDS, it's very hard to do
8 if, at the same time, you've announced you're against
9 all prostitution.

10 So what they're saying is that the condition
11 imposed will interfere with the objective, and if there
12 is a germaneness requirement -- and nobody says the
13 opposite. I mean, I've noted nobody denies what they're
14 saying in terms of the effectiveness of their work,
15 so -- I don't think.

16 At least, I didn't read them all with great
17 care; maybe you can point to somebody who does. But, if
18 everyone is telling us that this is counterproductive
19 and the exact opposite -- then can we say, well, it
20 isn't germane?

21 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, Justice Breyer, I
22 don't think so, and two responses on that score. First
23 of all, everybody is not telling you that, and I'll tell
24 you who's not telling you that in a second.

25 But the more -- but the overarching point is

1 that this is a policy determination that Congress, of
2 course, took into account when it fashioned the statute,
3 and it concluded that it was important to have an
4 opposition to prostitution and sex trafficking.

5 Now, as far as the organizations that aren't
6 telling you that, there is an amicus brief that's filed
7 by 46 organizations that it's in our support --

8 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, that's quite a few,
9 yes. That's true.

10 MR. SRINIVASAN: -- that's in our support,
11 and the lead organization is the Coalition Against
12 Trafficking in Women, and they -- they support us, and
13 they think that the best way -- and they -- and they
14 argued this passionately in their brief -- they think
15 that the best way to provide services to the target
16 audience is under a rubric of opposition to prostitution
17 and sex trafficking.

18 And I would urge you to take a look at that
19 brief because it explains why the program should be
20 conducted in this fashion.

21 Now, is there a debate about --

22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Srinivasan, there
23 isn't -- at least I'm not familiar with anything quite
24 like this, where, if you're not told, if you want to run
25 a government program, you have to speak the government's

1 speech.

2 This doesn't require the recipient to speak
3 to anybody at all, except to the government itself, to
4 say, I pledge that my policy is the government's policy.
5 So it's making somebody adopt, as her own, the
6 government's policy, rather than saying, I understand
7 that I get my government money, I have to follow the
8 government's rules about what I can say to the public.

9 Here -- and is -- is there anything else
10 quite like this, where you make a pledge to the
11 government, but with respect to third parties doesn't
12 apply?

13 MR. SRINIVASAN: Justice Ginsburg, if I
14 could just fight the premise of your question just very
15 slightly and then explain why I think this kind of
16 requirement makes sense in this particular context?

17 The goal of this is not to persuade somebody
18 to change their view. The goal of this is to partner
19 with organizations that self-identify as organizations
20 that agree with the government's policy priorities. And
21 the reason the government has done that and the reason
22 why Congress could've thought that that was a good idea is
23 straightforward, and that is that those organizations
24 that agree with Congress's policy priorities are going
25 to be more likely to be reliable and effective partners

1 in carrying out the government's program.

2 And one way to think about it is to envision
3 this: You have a circumstance in which you're down to
4 your last few dollars of a discretionary Federal
5 funding, and you're looking at two different
6 organizations that are competing for that money.

7 One of them comes to you and says, we agree
8 with your policy of an opposition to prostitution and
9 sex trafficking; and the other one says, we're not going
10 to tell you whether we agree, we're going to remain
11 studiously neutral, but we'll tell you that we'll
12 conduct our affairs in a manner that's not inconsistent
13 with your policy priorities.

14 I think it makes all the sense in the world
15 for Congress to decide that the government should
16 preferably partner with the former organization, rather
17 than the latter, because they're going to be more
18 reliable and more effective at carrying out the
19 government's program.

20 And there's another aspect of this that I
21 think that is important to highlight, and that is that
22 we're not just talking about circumstances in which the
23 conduct is -- is, arguably, going to be neutral, so that
24 there's going to be no position taken.

25 There's also going to be occasions in which

1 the organizations that are providing services are going
2 to have the opportunity to affirmatively embrace the
3 government's policy in opposition to prostitution and
4 sex trafficking.

5 JUSTICE ALITO: I'm not aware of any case in
6 which this Court has held that it is permissible for
7 Congress to condition Federal funding on the recipient's
8 expression of agreement with ideas with which the
9 recipient disagrees. I'm not aware of any case in which
10 that kind of compelled speech has been permitted.

11 And I would be interested in -- and it seems
12 to me like quite a -- a dangerous proposition. I would
13 be interested in whatever limitations you think there
14 might be on that rule, which seems to be the general
15 rule that you're advocating. Other than the requirement
16 of germaneness, is there anything else?

17 MR. SRINIVASAN: There -- there is
18 germaneness, Justice Alito, and I can point to a couple
19 of other limiting principles that have been noted in
20 this Court's decisions and I think that are satisfied
21 here.

22 One is that Finley talked about -- and I
23 think it captures some other decisions in this -- this
24 respect, disallowing the government from leveraging its
25 control over funding conditions in a manner that

1 services a speech-suppressive objective. And so you
2 have to be careful, and I think this maps --

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: Say it again. I didn't
4 understand the point.

5 MR. SRINIVASAN: It -- it -- the government
6 is limited from leveraging its control over funding
7 conditions, so that it can achieve a speech --
8 speech-suppressive objective.

9 And I think what the Court was getting at is
10 that you want to be careful that the speech condition --
11 the speech-related condition is tightly tethered to the
12 programmatic objective and not allow the government
13 to -- to have the program seep into other areas where it
14 doesn't have to go.

15 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, let me give you this
16 example, which is mentioned in one of the amicus briefs.
17 The government provides lots of funding to universities
18 to -- in various forms, either directly or through
19 student loans, in the form of tax exemptions, so
20 anything that would be germane to the general purpose of
21 higher education, presumably, could be attached as a
22 condition to those funds.

23 Would that be correct?

24 MR. SRINIVASAN: With -- with certain
25 limitations. I mean, I think germaneness is a -- is a

1 criterion.

2 JUSTICE ALITO: With what -- with what
3 limitations?

4 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, I think --

5 JUSTICE ALITO: The government could have a
6 whole list of things -- of principles that it thinks
7 should be incorporated into higher education, and it
8 could require a university, as a condition of receiving
9 these -- this money, let's say directed through student
10 loans, to express agreement with all of these
11 propositions. Would that be true?

12 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, I -- well, I'm not
13 sure, Justice Alito, and of course it's going to be hard
14 for me to decide that we are not going to defend
15 something. But let me just give you a limiting idea
16 that's out there, which is that I think there is an
17 important distinction between circumstances in which the
18 government is partnering with an organization to carry
19 out a government program and circumstances in which the
20 government is extending a Federal subsidy to an
21 individual organization as kind of an across-the-board
22 entitlement.

23 So in the generally applicable
24 across-the-board --

25 JUSTICE SCALIA: What do you mean by,

1 "partnering"? How does this partnering differ --
2 partnering differ from just giving them the money to do
3 the job?

4 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, I don't know that it
5 the differs from giving the money to do the job. I
6 guess what I'm saying is there are going to be
7 circumstances, for example, like in Speiser, where the
8 financial question doesn't have to do with the
9 expenditure of the money by the recipient in a manner
10 that's commensurate with congressional goals.

11 In that context, you're giving a generally
12 applicable entitlement, and you're not so worried about
13 how the money is being spent because that person is not
14 partnering with the government in carrying out a Federal
15 program. Here, the organizations are partnering with
16 the government in carrying out the Federal program
17 because it's the Federal HIV program that's --

18 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't know what you --
19 what do you mean by, "partnering"? You're just saying
20 they are given money to carry out a particular program.
21 Is that all --

22 MR. SRINIVASAN: Yes.

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Is that all you mean by,
24 "partnering"?

25 MR. SRINIVASAN: They are given money to

1 carry out --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: To carry out a particular
3 program?

4 MR. SRINIVASAN: But in concert with Federal
5 policy priorities, so it's not just -- it's not just a
6 naked grant of money. If you had an entitlement,
7 Justice Scalia, for example, let's just consider your
8 classic entitlement --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: I understand. It is -- it
10 is a naked grant of money to implement a particular
11 program.

12 MR. SRINIVASAN: To implement a particular
13 program and --

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay. And you call that
15 "partnering with the Federal government"?

16 MR. SRINIVASAN: I do.

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: Terrible verb, anyway.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. SRINIVASAN: Okay. My apologies for
20 that. For associating with the organization recipient
21 in carrying out a Federal program.

22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Srinivasan, on this,
23 what does seem to me unusual, as Justice Alito brought
24 out, requiring somebody to say, "I believe this" or "I
25 agree with the government on that." The Rust v.

1 Sullivan, which is one of the precedents on which you
2 rely, made it a point that the doctor was not required
3 to represent -- as his own views, not required to
4 represent an opinion that he doesn't hold.

5 He has to adhere to the government's program
6 in his dealings with the public, but he doesn't have to
7 say, "I agree with the government."

8 MR. SRINIVASAN: Yes. That's true, Justice
9 Ginsburg. But here's why --

10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is that just an
11 irrelevant consideration in Rust, that no one -- no one
12 was being obliged to say, I believe something, that they
13 don't believe?

14 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, here's why I think it
15 makes sense in this context -- it is distinct in that
16 respect, but here's why I think it makes sense in this
17 specific context: What Congress wanted to do is secure
18 an ex ante commitment from the organizations with which
19 the government works to assure that they agreed with the
20 government's policy priorities.

21 Now, where these programs are carried out is
22 in the main, in foreign territory, in distant lands,
23 and, in that context, I think Congress would have
24 understood that monitoring of conduct can be
25 particularly challenging.

1 And that monitoring is made all the more
2 challenging because these issues can come into play
3 through a myriad of interactions between the
4 organizations that are working with the government and
5 the local communities and local officials.

6 JUSTICE BREYER: I see that, and I see you
7 have two sides to the policy question. And then it
8 seems to me that the case that Justice Ginsburg was
9 speaking of is pretty relevant. Why? Well, that case,
10 Regan and League of Women Voters, all seem quite
11 comparable.

12 They are trying to balance the -- the desire
13 of the government to further a policy objective with the
14 undesirability of the government invading what would
15 otherwise be a constitutional protected right to speech.

16 And the way they have done it is quite
17 technical and narrow, but it may be applicable. In
18 both, what they said was, don't worry about your
19 protected speech as much as you are because there is
20 another way you can do it here. You go through a -- an
21 independent structured organization. And where that
22 wasn't present, namely, the League of Women Voters, the
23 Court struck it down.

24 Now, if that's the right framework, then,
25 here, I don't see how you could have an independently

1 structured organization for the reason that a group that
2 said, I am -- I am opposed completely to prostitution,
3 publicly, to get the money, and then set up a structure
4 that said the opposite, would be seen as totally
5 hypocritical. They wouldn't be able to get their
6 message across.

7 They wouldn't be able to express, in any
8 way, what it is they think about the -- the
9 administration of AIDS in the context -- anti-AIDS in
10 the context of prostitution.

11 That's a long question, but you see
12 where -- where I've ended up.

13 MR. SRINIVASAN: I think I do.

14 JUSTICE BREYER: At the moment, for purposes
15 of the question. So why isn't this case more like
16 League of Women Voters and less like the other two?

17 MR. SRINIVASAN: For the following reasons,
18 Justice Breyer: There is an alternative affiliated
19 organizational vehicle in this case as well, and I think
20 that's constitutionally significant. Now, I'm not going
21 to quibble with Your Honor's point about how the
22 organization that's the funding recipient has made this
23 policy agreement and that that can have ripple effects.

24 But here's why that matters: The point of
25 having an alternate vehicle is not that it remedies a

1 constitutional problem that already exists. The point
2 of it is to get to this leveraging purpose that I was
3 talking about earlier, and it's to show that what the
4 government is doing is keeping the condition within its
5 appropriate confines, and it's not allowing that
6 condition to spread beyond that, into other realms.

7 And that purpose is fully served by the
8 organizational affiliate alternative here. And I think
9 it's important --

10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But, Mr. Srinivasan,
11 there is a difference in this international setting --
12 you know, most of those separate affiliates was in
13 Taxation Without Representation, and it was the cure for
14 the Legal of Women Voters. But here, as the D.C.
15 District Court said in its opinion, which was in your
16 favor, oh, all you have to do is spin off a subsidiary
17 that gets the government money; it's just a simple
18 matter of corporate reorganization.

19 But you know that getting an NGO -- a new
20 NGO recognized in dozens of foreign countries is no
21 simple thing to accomplish. I mean, to take a concrete
22 example, look what happened about a year and a half ago
23 in Egypt, when the U.S. NGOs were indicted for
24 criminal -- for not complying with the permit
25 requirements of the country.

1 So it's one thing to set up a 501(c)(3) and
2 501(c)(4) operating in the United States, each does its
3 thing. But to require an NGO to then, in the countries
4 where it's operating, get the necessary permits is quite
5 an arduous thing.

6 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, Justice Ginsburg, I
7 guess it depends on which direction it runs as a
8 principal point. I mean, of course, the recipient
9 organization that's been conducting the program, to
10 date, can continue to conduct the program, and the
11 affiliate that's set up could be the alternate channel.
12 And so you could run in the opposite direction, and I
13 think you wouldn't run into that problem.

14 But I would like to address on this score an
15 important point, which is that I think Respondents have
16 suggested that there is a material distinction between,
17 Justice Breyer, the circumstances in Rust and the
18 circumstances in this case because Rust involves
19 separate programs within a legal entity, and this case
20 involves separate organizations.

21 And I think the point the Respondents are
22 trying to make is that there is a distinction because at
23 least, there, one legal entity could have multiple
24 programs, some of which are subject to the condition and
25 some of which are not, whereas, here, there is a

1 difference because this condition applies to an entire
2 organization.

3 But I think that's a false premise, which --
4 JUSTICE BREYER: I wasn't excepting that
5 one.

6 MR. SRINIVASAN: Okay.

7 JUSTICE BREYER: I was -- I mean, the main
8 difference it seemed to me is, assuming all of that
9 away, is that, here, the separate structure does not
10 fulfill the constitutional need simply because the basic
11 condition has to do with express speech, because when A
12 says, I believe in X, and then they set up a separate
13 structure -- and every one knows they have set it up; I
14 mean, that's the point of it -- and the structure says,
15 "just kidding," nobody believes them from day one.

16 And so you can't do it, and, if the
17 government has its way and has awarded the thing
18 properly, according to your criteria, the part that
19 won't be believed is the "just kidding" part. And so
20 the structure -- separate structure -- just doesn't work
21 in terms of communicating their belief. And I don't
22 think that's true in Rust, and I don't think it's true
23 in Regan, and I do think it's true in FCC v. League of
24 Women Voters.

25 MR. SRINIVASAN: I guess I'd -- I'd make two

1 points, Justice Breyer.

2 One is, as I was suggesting earlier, the
3 purpose of having this alternate channel is not to
4 remedy a constitutional violation that otherwise would
5 exist. I mean, of course, we start from the premise
6 that it's okay to require this condition at the front
7 end. It's not that it's unconstitutional, and the way
8 to compensate for that is to create this affiliate
9 alternative.

10 We think the condition's okay ab initio.
11 What the alternate vehicle does is to address this other
12 problem, that it shows that the condition is
13 appropriately tailored. It's not reaching beyond its
14 appropriate confines because it's allowing --

15 JUSTICE BREYER: Boy, if -- if the
16 structure -- the separate structure is not really part
17 of a constitutional analysis, then the government could
18 say, why not? It's easy to find policy reasons, and
19 really find very, very decent and thoughtful people who
20 agree with the policy reason, you know?

21 There -- there are people on both sides of
22 these questions, and they come in and they say, okay,
23 we're giving money for an anti-abortion purpose or a
24 pro-abortion purpose, you know --

25 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well --

1 JUSTICE BREYER: -- and -- and, suddenly,
2 people can't say anything in these areas in face of such
3 a condition.

4 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, it's part of the -- as
5 part of the constitutional analysis, I guess it's just
6 addressing a different part of the constitutional
7 analysis than -- than what Your -- Your Honor is
8 addressing.

9 I guess the other points that I'd make are
10 twofold. One is that I think there is something to the
11 notion that, if the organizations are sufficiently
12 separate, then -- as they have to be, to comply with the
13 regulations -- then it does work that one organization
14 can say that we have a particular policy, and the
15 organization -- another organization -- another
16 organization can say that we have a different policy,
17 precisely because of the premise that they're
18 sufficiently distinct.

19 So I'm not seeing the same degree of
20 cognitive dissonance you are --

21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But that's --

22 MR. SRINIVASAN: -- and the other point I'd
23 make --

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry.

25 Finish answering him, and then I'll --

1 MR. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Justice
2 Sotomayor.

3 The other point I'd make is this: That the
4 speech-related objections that Respondents levy are
5 twofold, one is they complain about the threshold
6 condition. But the second is -- and this is -- made --
7 manifests at pages 11 to 12 and 32 and 33 of their
8 brief -- is that they want to engage in activities that
9 involve affirmative speech.

10 They want to be able to participate in the
11 dialogue about prostitution and sex trafficking and
12 whether they should be legalized. And, with respect to
13 that aspect of what Respondents are complaining --
14 complaining about, I think the alternate affiliated
15 organization opportunity is a perfect remedy, in the
16 same way that it was in Rust and in the same way that
17 it -- that it was in Regan.

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The problem that I have
19 with that answer is that it doesn't cure the
20 organization's need to stay true to its own beliefs
21 because if -- and I think this is what Justice Breyer is
22 trying to get to -- if it's truly an independent
23 organization speaking, then that's that organization's
24 belief; it's not an alternative under Rust to the needs
25 of that organization to have its own personal views.

1 And -- and so I have that problem, which is
2 how is it an alternative for that organization to be
3 able to have its views?

4 Let me posit a hypothetical that I'm
5 actually very troubled by. Let's assume a city
6 government is undertaking a campaign to prevent teen
7 pregnancy and its associated problems, and it wants to
8 promote the use of contraceptives that protect from
9 contracting -- you know, diseases, things like that.

10 And some of its programs involve the
11 distribution of contraceptives, but others involve
12 parenting classes for teenage mothers and offering them
13 free daycare. And a church seeks funds for the daycare
14 part and the parenting part.

15 Can the city now say, because we have this
16 really important need to avoid sexually transmitted
17 diseases, anyone who seeks our funds also have to say
18 they believe in the use of contraceptives?

19 MR. SRINIVASAN: Justice Sotomayor --

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The church there would
21 say, we don't believe, and why should we say we believe?

22 MR. SRINIVASAN: I -- I'd certainly
23 understand why a church would be reluctant to do that.
24 I mean, I guess -- you know, one way to look at it is
25 that the city, I think, would have to think very long

1 and hard about whether that's a -- a desirable policy
2 objective, precisely because some of the organizations
3 with which it wants to work are going to have difficulty
4 abiding by it. And so there's going to have to be a
5 front-end determination, as a matter of policy, about
6 whether that's an appropriate thing to pursue.

7 But, if the city, as Congress did in this
8 case, thought that it was an appropriate thing to do,
9 then I think I would -- I think I would defend that --
10 apart from -- you know, free exercise issues of other
11 things that aren't in play here -- I think I would
12 defend it, as long as it's sufficiently germane and as
13 long as it's in furtherance of the policy objectives
14 that Congress -- or by, in your hypothetical, the
15 city --

16 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, let me give you
17 another example that's along the same lines. The
18 Federal government provides lots of funds to entities
19 and individuals who are involved in the provision of
20 health care.

21 So let's suppose Congress says that, we
22 think that the issue of guns is very germane to public
23 health, and therefore, we will not allow anybody to
24 receive any of these funds directly or indirectly,
25 unless that entity or person proclaims agreement with

1 whatever we happen to think at the moment about guns.

2 So they must either say we believe that guns
3 should be strictly limited -- access to them should be
4 strictly limited for public health purposes or that guns
5 should be freely available because we think that
6 promotes public health. That would be permissible,
7 wouldn't it?

8 MR. SRINIVASAN: I don't know that it would,
9 Justice Alito, on that --

10 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, why would it not?

11 MR. SRINIVASAN: -- because -- because I
12 think, first of all, it would depend on whether
13 there -- there is the requisite germaneness. It would
14 depend on whether, in fact, the organizations are
15 working with -- I'm trying to avoid using the word
16 "partnering with" -- but are working with the -- the
17 government in carrying out the program. It would depend
18 on those kinds of considerations.

19 And whether -- another point to be made here
20 is that a limitation that's been recognized in this
21 Court's cases is that, at the end of the day, the
22 government -- the government can't be seeking to
23 suppress speech or to suppress disfavored viewpoints,
24 even in the context of subsidization.

25 And you'd have to ask the question whether

1 that scheme is designed to do that. Now, if -- if it
2 crossed all those thresholds, then I think, yes, I would
3 defend that as well, but I do think that it presents
4 different and more difficult questions.

5 I would like to --

6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: One -- one thing before
7 your time is up. I have the same concerns that Justice
8 Ginsburg expressed about the difficulty of simply
9 creating structures in -- in foreign countries. If --
10 and I've looked through all of your cases.

11 What's your closest case -- your best case
12 for the fact that you should get extra deference because
13 this is the foreign affairs field? I mean, I think of
14 U.S. v. Curtis Wright. Anything more specific than
15 that?

16 MR. SRINIVASAN: I don't know that I have a
17 particular case, other than the doctrine, generally,
18 Justice Kennedy. But I do think that the foreign
19 location of this is significant vis-à-vis the concern
20 that I think many of you have raised about why have an
21 affirmative condition that requires espousal of a
22 policy.

23 Precisely because the conduct here is
24 carried out in foreign areas and precisely because it
25 can involve myriad interactions with local officials and

1 local policymakers, as Respondents admittedly want to
2 do, on these sensitive questions, it makes sense in this
3 context -- particular sense in this context to secure an
4 ex ante commitment of agreement with the government's
5 policy because that will have a self-policing aspect to
6 it.

7 It will be more designed to secure conduct
8 in those areas that, in conformity with Federal policy,
9 in a realm in which that conduct is particularly --
10 particularly difficult to monitor.

11 I'd like to reserve the balance of my time
12 for rebuttal, if I might.

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

14 Mr. Bowker?

15 ORAL ARGUMENT OF DAVID W. BOWKER

16 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS

17 MR. BOWKER: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
18 please the Court:

19 Respondents do not dispute that the Spending
20 Clause gives the government significant authority to
21 fund the programs of its choosing and to control speech
22 and conduct within those programs.

23 The problem with the policy requirement is
24 that it aims at grantees, requiring that they profess a
25 personal belief and refrain from certain private speech

1 outside the context of the government program.

2 In Rust v. Sullivan, the Court held that the
3 government could ban abortion-related speech in the
4 government's own family planning program, but the
5 grantees there were left unfettered in their personal
6 beliefs and in their private speech outside the program.

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I don't see why this
8 is a -- you talk about banning their speech. The
9 government is just picking out who is an appropriate
10 partner to -- to assist in this project. It wants to go
11 and find people who, like them, are opposed to
12 prostitution, and all they want to do is make sure that
13 you're opposed to prostitution.

14 It's like any other sort of condition -- you
15 know, we want to make sure that you haven't been
16 convicted of tax fraud over the last 10 years, so sign a
17 certification that you -- you haven't. Yes, it's
18 related to speech, but the whole program is about that.

19 Why would they want to sign up with somebody
20 who didn't share the objectives of the program?

21 MR. BOWKER: Well, I think the policy
22 requirement here has been applied a little differently
23 than Mr. Chief Justice suggests. It -- it is applied in
24 a way that is a funding condition, not part of the
25 selection criteria.

1 When the government goes out to select its
2 partners in this case, it -- it goes out with requests
3 for applications, and those requests for applications
4 pertain to the particular program at issue. And they
5 are very detailed about what precisely is required for
6 that program, including --

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So it would be a
8 different case, in your -- your view, as if -- when they
9 have those criteria, they have one of them is, oh, by
10 the way, you must agree with the objective of the
11 program, which is to eliminate, to the extent possible,
12 prostitution and sex trafficking?

13 MR. BOWKER: No. I don't -- I don't think
14 that's right. I -- I think the government absolutely
15 can pick partners who are dedicated to the particular
16 program for which they are applying, but there are
17 constitutionally permissible ways to do that.

18 One of the ways to do that is to look at
19 technical capacity, past performance, references, what
20 have you done before that shows you're able to do this
21 particular program?

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, it isn't just able to
23 do. Are -- are you saying that they -- they just can't
24 make it a prior condition, but they can select
25 applicants on the basis of which ones they know agree

1 with the government's objectives?

2 You -- you have two equally qualified --
3 technically, two equally qualified applicants, and the
4 government intentionally picks the one whose views on --
5 on prostitution are -- are similar to the government's.
6 Is -- is that bad?

7 MR. BOWKER: Yes. And -- and the reason
8 it's bad is because the government there is focused on
9 viewpoint and not on ability to perform the program.
10 The problem -- the problem with focusing --

11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But let -- let me -- let
12 me ask you this: Suppose that you're a Congressman or a
13 Congresswomen, and you are a constitutional expert, and
14 you take your oath to uphold the Constitution very
15 seriously.

16 A funding bill comes before you. You're the
17 chairman of the committee, and you decide that you're
18 going to fund A, rather than B, because you like their
19 speech much better. Is that a violation of the
20 Constitution?

21 MR. BOWKER: Well --

22 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Because you like their
23 policies much better?

24 MR. BOWKER: The -- the Congress can
25 certainly fund a particular program and not fund others.

1 And we have no -- we have no argument with that. The
2 spending condition -- the Spending Clause definitely
3 comes with that ancillary power. And, in fact, that's
4 what the Congress did here. It said, we want to -- we
5 want to fund a fight against HIV/AIDS. We don't want to
6 support that disease, and we want to oppose
7 prostitution, we don't want to support that practice.

8 What it cannot do, then, is take its
9 viewpoint and impose its viewpoint on the grantee and
10 make it a -- make it a condition.

11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I'm -- I'm not quite
12 sure I -- I see the difference, that the -- a
13 conscientious Congressperson cannot -- can, in your
14 view, say, I'm going to prefer organization A over
15 organization B because I like their policies better --

16 MR. BOWKER: Well, I don't --

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- across the board, with
18 reference to drugs, with reference to guns, with
19 reference to public health.

20 MR. BOWKER: If -- if Congress is looking at
21 the viewpoint of an organization and deciding whether to
22 fund it based on its viewpoint, I think that's
23 problematic. And the reason I think it's problematic is
24 because this Court has said to deny a subsidy or a
25 benefit on the basis of the exercise of one's First

1 Amendment rights, including holding one's own views, to
2 deny a subsidy on that ground --

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, my goodness. They
4 can't --

5 MR. BOWKER: -- is problematic.

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- they can't fund the Boy
7 Scouts of America because they like the programs that
8 the BSA has? They -- they have to treat them
9 equivalently with the Muslim Brotherhood? Is that
10 really what you're suggesting?

11 MR. BOWKER: Not at all. I think --

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, then, you can take
13 into account the -- the principles and the -- and the
14 policies of -- of the organization that you're giving
15 funding to.

16 MR. BOWKER: Well, this Court has never said
17 that the Congress can make a decision based on viewpoint
18 alone.

19 JUSTICE BREYER: But there's no way to
20 separate -- with an organization in the field that does
21 things, there is no way, I don't think, to separate what
22 they do from what they say. Congress has two opposite
23 views on this in front of it.

24 MR. BOWKER: Sure.

25 JUSTICE BREYER: One is the view that the

1 way to fight AIDS is consistent with and is furthered by
2 longer term efforts to abolish trafficking in women,
3 okay? Prostitution.

4 All right. The other view is the better way
5 to do it is to go into the active sex worker area and --
6 and not express views on the merits of what they are
7 doing, okay?

8 So they have two opposite views, and -- and,
9 moreover, the groups that do this act on those views.
10 So why can't they say, we prefer view A or B, whichever
11 it is, and -- because that's what our program is about?

12 MR. BOWKER: Congress can -- can certainly
13 decide what programs to fund and what programs not to
14 fund. But, when Congress makes that decision, Congress
15 then can't take the next step to say the only people who
16 can get funds under this particular program are people
17 who agree with us and who will refrain from saying
18 anything inconsistent in their private speech.

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: But you -- you go further
20 than that. In answer to my question, you -- you go
21 further than that, and you say, moreover, even without
22 making it a condition precedent to getting the money,
23 Congress can -- the government cannot intentionally
24 select those people that it thinks are in accord with
25 its views. Right? Isn't that what you said?

1 MR. BOWKER: The Court has never said that's
2 okay, and it's our -- and it's our --

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm not asking what the
4 Court said; I'm asking what you're saying.

5 MR. BOWKER: It's our position that it is
6 constitutionally problematic to make funding decisions
7 based on the viewpoint of grantees.

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Problematic or -- or
9 unconstitutional?

10 MR. BOWKER: Unconstitutional as applied
11 here.

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.

13 MR. BOWKER: However -- however, we are not
14 saying that there is no circumstance in which the
15 government's interest wouldn't be compelling enough to
16 override the First Amendment right. Now, in our
17 situation --

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So let's just say
19 the government wants to have an ad campaign to
20 discourage people from smoking and they are looking for
21 ad agencies to -- to help them with it. And an ad
22 agency comes in and says, look, we are the best ad
23 agency there is; we know exactly how to get to the
24 markets; we know what's persuasive and all of that.

25 And yet -- and then the ad agency says --

1 you know, come work at our agency if you smoke; we think
2 smoking is okay; we have smoking breaks; we do all this.
3 The government can't take that into account?

4 MR. BOWKER: I think the rules are different
5 when the government hires a spokesperson. When the
6 government hires a spokesperson, the government has the
7 right under the -- under its ancillary power, under the
8 Spending Clause, to control what that spokesperson says
9 for the government. And --

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, isn't that
11 part of what's going on here? One of the things we want
12 to do is eradicate prostitution and sex trafficking, and
13 we want you to get that message out, and the one thing
14 we're sure of is if you're not in -- if you're in
15 favor -- or you're not opposed to it because you have
16 other objectives, you're not going to help get the
17 message out at all?

18 MR. BOWKER: Well, the -- the government
19 does say that. The government says, what we need to
20 prevent is the situation where the -- the government
21 spokesperson says one thing with public funds, turns
22 right around and says the opposite with private funds.

23 And what we say is this is an as-applied
24 challenge. We have -- it's -- the government concedes
25 my clients have not been enlisted as government

1 spokespersons and they are not responsible for conveying
2 any viewpoint or any message.

3 And I'd like to talk for a moment about what
4 my clients really do. In the field, my clients provide
5 services in the fight against HIV/AIDS, things such as
6 preventing mother-to-child transmission of HIV in
7 Tanzania, caring for orphans of AIDS victims in Kenya,
8 and providing HIV/AIDS support services in places like
9 Vietnam.

10 And -- and this is at JA 88 and 89, where you
11 can see the list of things that my clients do. None of
12 those things relate to an opposition to prostitution and
13 none of those things relates to messaging.

14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Excuse me. That's my
15 problem, which is I'm trying to tease out what your
16 position is, okay? I -- I have an understanding of
17 you're saying, you can't compel me to say I don't like
18 something. And -- and that's like a oath of loyalty.
19 That -- that's understandable.

20 But, if the government said the following
21 more clearly -- this is an oddly phrased policy, okay,
22 because it seems to be requiring this oath. But if it
23 simply said, if you're an organization that wants our
24 funds, you have to say that you're not going to promote
25 actively the contrary policy, would that be okay?

1 You're not going to go out there and do
2 things to promote the legalization of prostitution
3 because that's going to undermine our message. Those
4 are two different positions, so tell me where you draw
5 the line.

6 MR. BOWKER: Certainly, that would be okay
7 within the four corners of the government program. The
8 government controls speech and conduct within its
9 program. It can tell us what not to say within the
10 program. And that's Rust.

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Yes, that's Rust.

12 MR. BOWKER: And that's Rust. And what --

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: This is a step further.

14 MR. BOWKER: And what Rust says, and I -- I
15 think we fall back on Rust, which we think is just on
16 all fours with where we are here, and that is what the
17 government cannot do -- and I think this answers your
18 question -- is, outside the government program, the
19 government cannot control private speech.

20 And it was critical in that case -- Justice
21 Rehnquist, at pages 196 and 197, said, "The doctors
22 there and the public health organizations there are free
23 to engage in their own private speech and their own
24 activities, and they are not required to endorse any
25 viewpoint they don't, in fact, hold."

1 And here --

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But that is saying
3 this is what's happening in Rust, okay? And Rust is
4 okay. That's very different from saying, it has to be
5 that way, and, if it's any other way, it's no good. It
6 seems to me that you're just taking the limitation on
7 the facts in Rust and saying that is an absolute
8 requirement, which is a misreading of the case.

9 MR. BOWKER: Rust does not say that, to be
10 clear. But the reasoning of Rust -- and the majority's
11 reasoning there makes quite clear that the reason the
12 Court was comfortable there is that the recipient was
13 not the target of the control. The control was around
14 the program, and the recipient was free outside the
15 program.

16 And -- and Respondents here have respected
17 that line. There is no question that, for the past 10
18 years, even though the policy requirement has not been
19 enforced -- initially because the Department of Justice
20 concluded that it is unconstitutional and then,
21 subsequently, because the district court enjoined it --
22 it has not been enforced for the last decade,
23 essentially.

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So --

25 MR. BOWKER: And there's no evidence of harm

1 at all here, so there's none of this undercutting the
2 program that the government is alleging here.

3 Sorry, Justice.

4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, no, no. I cut you
5 off.

6 But -- but I guess what I'm -- I keep going
7 back -- you keep going back and forth on this it -- it's
8 not okay to tell me to take an oath of loyalty. But
9 would it be okay for you to step outside the doors of
10 this program and pass out literature that promotes the
11 legalization of prostitution?

12 Am I making my question clear?

13 MR. BOWKER: Yes.

14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Which is how do you --
15 how do you answer the question of why does the
16 Constitution bar the government from saying, look, if
17 you're going to work with me, you can't go out there and
18 promote a -- actively promote --

19 MR. BOWKER: Right.

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- a different message?

21 MR. BOWKER: That's not the case here, but
22 taking that case --

23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well --

24 MR. BOWKER: Taking that case, I think the
25 government can't do that. I think the government cannot

1 gag an organization's private speech outside the
2 program.

3 Now, even the government says there has to
4 be some germaneness between what they are doing in the
5 program and what our requirement is. So I do think it
6 would be a tougher case for us and a stronger case for
7 the government if my clients were engaged in a program
8 that opposed prostitution -- we're not, but if we
9 were -- and then we went right outside and said the
10 opposite with our private funds, I think they would have
11 an easier time showing that there is some compelling
12 interest that overrides the First Amendment interest.

13 Now, I think it would depend on the facts,
14 and those are not the facts here.

15 JUSTICE BREYER: Only because -- see, it's
16 not -- it's not, in my opinion, not a viewpoint matter,
17 if they're going to fund a -- a group that wants to end
18 discrimination against women around the world because
19 they think all kinds of good things will flow from that.
20 The government wants to fund it. Of course, such a
21 group has a viewpoint; that's why they're in the
22 business.

23 So the word isn't "viewpoint." And you
24 started to say something about that there is more than
25 that here, it has to do with the express nature. And,

1 then, in answering Justice Sotomayor, you went a little
2 bit further on that. And what are the form of
3 words -- if you were me and if I were to decide in your
4 favor, what form of words would you dictate to describe
5 where it is in your opinion that the First Amendment
6 cuts in with a preventative restriction?

7 How do you describe it? I -- I don't think
8 you can, in terms of viewpoint.

9 MR. BOWKER: I don't think you can, in terms
10 of viewpoint, either, Justice Breyer. I do think that
11 the key -- the key that this Court outlined in Rust is
12 the government's authority to control its program. And,
13 if there is a threat to its program and the government
14 needs to take some action in order to protect its
15 program, prevent the message from being garbled or
16 distorted, whatever the language is, then the
17 government's case is strongest.

18 Here, that is not at all what is happening.
19 As I described, our programs are not opposition to
20 prostitution programs. Our programs are HIV testing.
21 These are mother-to-child transmission situations, where
22 we're trying to stop the disease from spreading.

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Let me -- can I -- can I be
24 sure --

25 MR. BOWKER: Yes.

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- I understand what you've
2 just conceded in -- in your response to Justice Breyer?

3 The government could require, as a condition
4 to come into this program and become a partner with the
5 United States, that the recipient not have the viewpoint
6 of favoring prostitution?

7 MR. BOWKER: No.

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you said it's not a
9 viewpoint thing.

10 MR. BOWKER: No. The government cannot
11 target viewpoint, and, for us, that's -- that's a
12 bright-line rule.

13 JUSTICE SCALIA: I thought that's what you
14 just said to Justice Breyer.

15 JUSTICE BREYER: I did, too, because I -- I
16 didn't see the reason. I thought that was -- I can
17 think of dozens and dozens of programs all over the
18 world that the government supports, in some way or
19 other, and, of course, the people in those programs have
20 a certain viewpoint, and, of course, they don't hold the
21 opposite viewpoint.

22 Otherwise, they wouldn't be in the program.
23 So -- so that's why I didn't find that useful. But,
24 now, I don't think you can have it both ways between
25 answering these questions. What is the answer?

1 MR. BOWKER: Well --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Him or me? You have to
3 choose.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. BOWKER: Mr. Chief Justice, I need your
6 help on --

7 (Laughter.)

8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You can always
9 choose me, too.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. BOWKER: Well, our position here is that
12 viewpoint is not the basis on which a decision can be
13 made. That is our position. We think the government
14 has a multitude of permissible grounds on which to make
15 these types of decisions, and they do it every day in
16 every other program where they don't have this odd
17 policy requirement. They do it every day.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Your approach, it
19 seems to me, is just dealing with the breadth of the
20 program. If the program here solely concerned
21 prostitution and sex trafficking and not other areas
22 where you say, look, we do a great job in these other
23 areas, we just don't get involved in that area.

24 But, if the sole program was on prostitution
25 and sex trafficking, you -- you wouldn't have a leg to

1 stand on, would you?

2 MR. BOWKER: We absolutely would have a leg
3 to stand on, and let me just explain --

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So you're an
5 organization --

6 MR. BOWKER: -- what I attempted to concede
7 before, and that is, if -- if the government -- in that
8 narrow case, where the government is hiring a
9 spokesperson, which is what they've focused on, saying
10 one thing with public funds and turning right around and
11 saying another with private funds, there is no case that
12 says they can gag the private speech of that
13 spokesperson.

14 But what we're saying is it is certainly
15 possible that they would have a stronger case in that
16 particular circumstance; however, this is an as-applied
17 challenge. My clients are not spokespersons; they
18 concede that. My clients are not delivering a message
19 or any particular viewpoint on behalf of the government,
20 and they concede that.

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Let me -- let me just
22 ask -- ask this one more time. It seems -- because it
23 seems to me that, when you get into the details of your
24 answer, you indicate, oh, well, the government has lots
25 of other criteria it could use, which seems to me just

1 an invitation to disguise what the government's real
2 motive is.

3 Suppose the government's interested in
4 preventing and stopping the spread of malaria. And
5 there's an organization that's marvelous at delivering
6 the proper message for this, but they criticize the
7 United States often. So they choose an organization
8 that's not quite as good, but is quiet on these other
9 issues.

10 Is that permissible for the Congress to do?

11 MR. BOWKER: No, I don't think it is. To
12 the extent the -- the criteria used by the Congress are
13 merely pretext to --

14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, this isn't -- no.
15 My concern was that your position was pretext. Here,
16 the Congress is right upfront.

17 MR. BOWKER: And says this is the reason.

18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And they say, the reason
19 we're not giving to organization A is because it's
20 always critical of the United States, even though its
21 technical skills are better, we prefer organization B.
22 Congress cannot do that?

23 MR. BOWKER: Congress cannot do that.

24 Now --

25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And your best case for

1 that proposition is what?

2 MR. BOWKER: Well, even the government
3 concedes that -- that they can't do that. They -- what
4 they say is that in -- it must be germane. That's their
5 limiting principle.

6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I'm -- I'm not sure
7 they should if they're going to -- if they're going to
8 be able to establish the principle that allows them to
9 prevail in this case, and that's why I'm asking.

10 MR. BOWKER: I -- I don't think that that's
11 permissible because all that is, is penalizing a
12 particular viewpoint and withholding a subsidy or
13 benefit based on viewpoint.

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I just want to make
15 sure I -- the government has a program to develop water
16 resources, and let's say it's in South Africa before the
17 abolition of apartheid. And there's a pro-apartheid
18 group and an anti-apartheid group.

19 And you're saying the government can only
20 decide which one is better at digging wells, and it
21 can't say, we're going to prefer the anti-apartheid
22 group?

23 MR. BOWKER: Well, that -- I don't think it
24 can make that decision based on viewpoint. However --

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Viewpoint on

1 apartheid. It can't say -- so the other one shows we've
2 got a better record, we dig the wells quicker.

3 MR. BOWKER: I mean, the -- the reason that
4 that case is so much tougher than this one is because,
5 in this one, they're not attempting to select
6 organizations that will do the best job by using the
7 policy requirement.

8 The policy requirement is being used after
9 the organization has been selected to say, now that
10 you've been selected, we want you to toe the line. We
11 want you to profess your belief in our viewpoint and not
12 to say anything with your private funds outside the
13 program. So it is so far beyond this -- this weighing
14 in a selection situation.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It goes to the
16 effectiveness of the program. It's related to it. The
17 United States doesn't want the company or the organization
18 that goes into a village and says, we're going to bring -
19 you know, this is from the United States, we're bringing
20 you fresh water, and it's a -- it's a pro-apartheid group.

21 That does undermine what they are trying to
22 do, just as in this case, to have the organization
23 providing the services that your organization provides
24 be identified as as an organization that doesn't want to
25 abolish prostitution.

1 MR. BOWKER: Yes, I understand.

2 I -- I think the government could -- if it
3 could make the case that an organization will be unable
4 to do this effectively because of what it has said in
5 the past -- or what it has done in the past or how --
6 how the population associates -- what the population
7 associates with that organization.

8 But here -- here -- and the government even
9 concedes -- there would -- there has to be some -- I
10 think the word was -- it has to be tightly tethered to
11 the programmatic objective. Now, we think that's --
12 that's way too easy to fulfill; that should not be the
13 standard. But that's what they say the limiting
14 principle is, is germaneness, tightly tethered.

15 In -- in your example, I think that probably
16 doesn't even meet their limiting principle. But, in our
17 case -- in our case, there is no tethering at all. We
18 are out testing for the disease by extracting blood and
19 running tests. We're out caring for orphans. We are
20 out improving public health services that NGOs deliver,
21 and they're saying, now, you have to profess your belief
22 in our particular viewpoint --

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Does it say, "profess
24 belief." I was going to ask you about that. That's not
25 what the statute says. It just says they have to have a

1 policy.

2 MR. BOWKER: Well --

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: A policy. Which means, I
4 suppose, they have to tell their employees don't do
5 anything to -- to foster prostitution, but they don't
6 have to get up -- get up and announce publicly, we
7 oppose prostitution, do they?

8 MR. BOWKER: Well, as it's been applied
9 to us, it's more than just have a policy. It's have a
10 policy and then tell us you agree with our policy, and
11 we want to make sure that you believe it, so we know
12 that you will do a good job in the program. So the
13 purpose here is to police --

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: They can get all that
15 without making you profess it, unless -- unless you
16 consider the only -- only profession to be the assurance
17 to the -- to your partner, the United States government,
18 that you -- that you, in, fact oppose prostitution.

19 MR. BOWKER: Well, that's -- that's
20 precisely it, Justice Scalia, is we are required to
21 profess our allegiance to the government.

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: To tell the government.
23 Okay. That's -- that's the only profession you're
24 talking about?

25 MR. BOWKER: That's the profession that

1 we're required to --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Oh, okay.

3 MR. BOWKER: -- that's the pledge. As -- as
4 the author of -- of the provision called it, it was the
5 pledge. That's the pledge to the government. Now --

6 JUSTICE BREYER: And then they're doing
7 that, they say, because we're part of the belief, as a
8 matter of policy, that the best way to go about this,
9 whether you think so or not, is to restrict the grants
10 to those people who will oppose the long-term extension
11 of prostitution expressly.

12 Now, that's their view of how to get rid of
13 AIDS, you say. Might disagree with it, but there are
14 plenty of people who think the opposite. So they're
15 saying we're not doing it for any reason other than to
16 further our policy.

17 MR. BOWKER: The government, no doubt, has a
18 good reason for putting it there. The problem is the
19 First Amendment, and where does that -- where does that
20 end? What is the limiting principle? If all that's
21 required here is germaneness and then you give a dollar
22 and you own the viewpoint and you own the private
23 speech, where does that end?

24 What that means is -- on the government's
25 theory, the government can give you -- can give anyone

1 in the country a dollar in Medicare funds and say, okay,
2 now that you've taken a dollar of our money, we want you
3 to profess your agreement with the Affordable Care Act,
4 and we want you to never say anything inconsistent with
5 that in your private speech.

6 That is -- that is wildly inconsistent with
7 the First Amendment. That's exactly what's happening
8 here. The only difference is the subject of
9 prostitution. That's what makes it less palatable.

10 But for us --

11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Are you -- what -- are
12 you saying that you can -- within the government
13 program, within the government program, the government
14 can specify whatever it wants, including this -- this
15 policy, but it can't then say, and the organization
16 outside the program is also bound by this profession?

17 MR. BOWKER: Within the program, they can
18 tell us, if we are speaking for them, what to say,
19 and -- on their behalf, not ours, and they can tell us
20 what not to say, which is Rust. They cannot command
21 fealty to their viewpoint, and they certainly cannot
22 control our private speech outside the program.

23 Now, to be clear, I just want to address one
24 last thing before my time runs. To be clear,
25 Respondents here do not promote prostitution, nor do

1 they approve of it. They merely want to be free in
2 their own private programs to operate those programs as
3 they see fit, consistent with public health objectives,
4 and they want to be able to participate in the policy
5 conferences.

6 They want to be able to publish papers, and
7 they want to be able to be a part of the discussion in
8 the marketplace of ideas right here in the United
9 States, not in the -- in the nether reaches of the
10 world -- right here in the United States.

11 They would like to be free to engage in this
12 important discussion and to be unfettered by a policy
13 requirement that demands fealty to the government's
14 viewpoint.

15 Now, the First Amendment gives Respondents
16 that right, and -- and that's why we are here.

17 So unless the Court has further questions?

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

19 Mr. Srinivasan, you have 4 minutes
20 remaining.

21 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF SRI SRINIVASAN

22 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS

23 MR. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Mr. Chief
24 Justice.

25 Just a -- a few points in rebuttal.

1 First, by -- by way of characterizing this
2 requirement, I think there has been a suggestion made
3 that what we are trying to do is impose a viewpoint on
4 organizations. This is not a matter of imposing a
5 viewpoint on somebody.

6 It's a matter of picking organizations with
7 which to work who self-identify as having views that are
8 commensurate with the government's views, so that they
9 will be reliable in carrying out the government's
10 program.

11 Now, Justice Kennedy, you'd asked about
12 why -- whether the foreign context of the case--

13 JUSTICE ALITO: I don't -- I don't want to
14 interrupt your rebuttal, but I don't see the difference
15 between those two -- those two things that you just
16 tried to distinguish.

17 MR. SRINIVASAN: Because it goes to
18 the -- the limitation that the Court has imposed in its
19 decisions about leveraging funding so as to suppress
20 viewpoints. That's not what's going on here. This is
21 not a case in which funding is being leveraged to
22 suppress a viewpoint.

23 It's a case in which we are trying to get an
24 ex ante determination of whether the organizations that
25 are going to carry out the Federal program agree with

1 our policies. If they do, they can participate --

2 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, suppose you have an
3 organization that previously has expressed support for
4 the legalization of -- of prostitution, but, then, when
5 you tell them, well, if that's your policy, you can't
6 get our money, they say, well, we need your money, so
7 we're going to have to say uncle and, now, we are
8 opposed to the legalization of prostitution.

9 That then -- that isn't trying to change
10 people's viewpoint?

11 MR. SRINIVASAN: I don't think --

12 JUSTICE ALITO: To change the viewpoint that
13 they are expressing?

14 MR. SRINIVASAN: It's not -- Justice Alito,
15 with all respect, I don't think it's trying to change
16 their viewpoint. I think if they decide, later on, that
17 they would affirm to us that they agree with the policy
18 at that point in time, well, we may -- we may take that
19 observation and engage them.

20 But I don't think that effort is to try to
21 change their viewpoint. It's to try to get them to
22 self -- to self-identify that they are going to be
23 reliable in carrying out the government program.

24 Justice Kennedy, you'd asked the question
25 about whether the foreign context matters, and I talked

1 about why it matters, in the sense that monitoring can
2 be challenging in this context. It also matters in
3 another sense, that I should add, which is that, when
4 the organizations are doing this work in those areas,
5 they are identified as working with the United States
6 government.

7 There is a statutory provision at 291(a) of
8 the Petition Appendix, which is 22 U.S.C. 7611(h), and
9 that requires the global AIDS coordinator to develop a
10 message that enhances awareness by program recipients
11 that the program is an effort on behalf of the citizens
12 of the United States.

13 So there is a real perception out there
14 that, when the organization is carrying out its
15 functions, it's doing so at the behest of the United
16 States citizens. And part of what Congress wanted to do
17 was to avoid a misimpression about why -- about what the
18 United States' policy priorities are.

19 And one way to do that is to assure that the
20 organizations with which the United States works share
21 the United States' policy commitment against
22 prostitution and sex trafficking.

23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I would have less
24 problem accepting your message if there weren't four
25 major organizations who were exempted from the policy

1 requirement and -- medical science -- vaccinators are
2 exempted.

3 There seems to be a bit of selection on the
4 part of the government in terms of who it wants to work
5 with. It would seem to me that, if you really wanted to
6 protect the U.S., you wouldn't exempt anybody from this.

7 MR. SRINIVASAN: Justice Sotomayor, Congress
8 is not required to -- to pursue every objective, no
9 matter what the cost may be. The Court confronted a
10 similar situation in *Regan*. That case involved an
11 exemption for veterans. The Court applied a rationality
12 standard and said -- said that was fine. And there's,
13 certainly, a rationale here --

14 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Srinivasan, that was
15 one -- one -- veterans. Everybody else was subject to
16 the lobbying restriction. Here, it's 20 percent of the
17 funds go to the organizations that are free from this
18 pledge.

19 MR. SRINIVASAN: Justice Ginsburg, I think
20 the exemption for these organizations makes good sense
21 if you consider the character of the organizations.
22 Three of the four are -- have members that are sovereign
23 entities. And so one can understand --

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Srinivasan -

25 MR. SRINIVASAN: Can I just finish this

1 thought?

2 One can understand why Congress would have
3 wanted to tread with sensitivity when -- when we are
4 dealing with foreign countries, especially foreign
5 countries that have different views about prostitution.

6 And there's less of a danger -- and this is
7 the final point -- there's less of a danger in that
8 context that those entities' views are going to be
9 misattributed to the United States precisely because
10 they are foreign countries.

11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
12 Counsel.

13 The case is submitted.

14 (Whereupon, at 12:00 p.m., the case in the
15 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A			APPEARAN...	
ab 21:10 abiding 25:4 ability 31:9 able 17:5,7 23:10 24:3 30:20,22 47:8 53:4,6,7 abolish 34:2 48:25 abolition 47:17 abortion-relat... 29:3 above-entitled 1:13 58:15 absolute 39:7 absolutely 30:14 45:2 accepting 56:24 access 26:3 accomplish 18:21 accord 34:24 account 7:2 33:13 36:3 achieve 11:7 across-the-bo... 12:21,24 act 34:9 52:3 action 42:14 active 34:5 actively 37:25 40:18 activities 23:8 38:24 ad 35:19,21,21 35:22,25 add 56:3 addition 5:7 address 3:12 19:14 21:11 52:23 addressing 22:6 22:8 adhere 15:5 administration 4:9 17:9	admittedly 28:1 adopt 5:10 8:5 advocating 10:15 affairs 9:12 27:13 affiliate 18:8 19:11 21:8 affiliated 17:18 23:14 affiliates 18:12 affirm 55:17 affirmative 23:9 27:21 affirmatively 10:2 Affordable 52:3 Africa 47:16 agencies 35:21 agency 1:3 3:4 35:22,23,25 36:1 ago 18:22 agree 3:19,21 8:20,24 9:7,10 14:25 15:7 21:20 30:10,25 34:17 50:10 54:25 55:17 agreed 15:19 agreement 10:8 12:10 17:23 25:25 28:4 52:3 AIDS 3:13 6:5,7 17:9 34:1 37:7 51:13 56:9 aims 28:24 AL 1:4,8 Alito 10:5,18 11:15 12:2,5 12:13 14:23 25:16 26:9,10 54:13 55:2,12 55:14 allegiance 50:21 alleging 40:2	Alliance 1:7 3:5 allow 11:12 25:23 allowing 18:5 21:14 allows 47:8 alternate 17:25 19:11 21:3,11 23:14 alternative 17:18 18:8 21:9 23:24 24:2 Amendment 33:1 35:16 41:12 42:5 51:19 52:7 53:15 America 33:7 amicus 7:6 11:16 analysis 21:17 22:5,7 ancillary 32:3 36:7 announce 50:6 announced 6:8 answer 23:19 34:20 40:15 43:25 45:24 answering 22:25 42:1 43:25 answers 38:17 ante 15:18 28:4 54:24 anti-abortion 21:23 anti-AIDS 17:9 anti-apartheid 47:18,21 anybody 8:3 25:23 57:6 anyway 14:17 apart 25:10 apartheid 47:17 48:1 apologies 14:19	APPEARAN... 1:16 Appendix 56:8 applicable 12:23 13:12 16:17 applicants 30:25 31:3 applications 30:3,3 applied 29:22,23 35:10 50:8 57:11 applies 20:1 apply 8:12 applying 30:16 appreciate 5:5 approach 44:18 appropriate 18:5 21:14 25:6,8 29:9 appropriately 21:13 approve 53:1 April 1:11 arduous 19:5 area 5:18 34:5 44:23 areas 11:13 22:2 27:24 28:8 44:21,23 56:4 arguably 9:23 argued 7:14 argument 1:14 2:2,5,8 3:3,8 28:15 32:1 53:21 asked 54:11 55:24 asking 35:3,4 47:9 aspect 9:20 23:13 28:5 assist 29:10 associated 24:7 associates 49:6,7 associating 14:20	assume 24:5 assuming 20:8 assurance 50:16 assure 15:19 56:19 as-applied 36:23 45:16 attached 11:21 attack 5:20 attempted 45:6 attempting 48:5 audience 7:16 author 51:4 authority 28:20 42:12 available 26:5 avoid 24:16 26:15 56:17 awarded 20:17 aware 10:5,9 awareness 56:10 a.m 1:15 3:2
				B
				B 31:18 32:15 34:10 46:21 back 38:15 40:7 40:7 bad 31:6,8 balance 16:12 28:11 ban 29:3 banning 29:8 bar 40:16 based 32:22 33:17 35:7 47:13,24 basic 20:10 basis 30:25 32:25 44:12 behalf 1:18,20 2:4,7,10 3:9 28:16 45:19 52:19 53:22 56:11 behest 56:15 belief 20:21

23:24 28:25 48:11 49:21,24 51:7 beliefs 23:20 29:6 believe 14:24 15:12,13 20:12 24:18,21,21 26:2 50:11 believed 20:19 believes 20:15 benefit 32:25 47:13 best 7:13,15 27:11 35:22 46:25 48:6 51:8 better 31:19,23 32:15 34:4 46:21 47:20 48:2 beyond 18:6 21:13 48:13 bill 31:16 bit 5:15 42:2 57:3 blood 49:18 board 32:17 bound 52:16 Bowker 1:20 2:6 28:14,15,17 29:21 30:13 31:7,21,24 32:16,20 33:5 33:11,16,24 34:12 35:1,5 35:10,13 36:4 36:18 38:6,12 38:14 39:9,25 40:13,19,21,24 42:9,25 43:7 43:10 44:1,5 44:11 45:2,6 46:11,17,23 47:2,10,23 48:3 49:1 50:2 50:8,19,25	51:3,17 52:17 Boy 21:15 33:6 breadth 44:19 breaks 36:2 Breyer 6:2,21 7:8 16:6 17:14 17:18 19:17 20:4,7 21:1,15 22:1 23:21 33:19,25 41:15 42:10 43:2,14 43:15 51:6 brief 4:20,22 7:6 7:14,19 23:8 briefs 6:4 11:16 bright-line 43:12 bring 48:18 bringing 48:19 Brotherhood 33:9 brought 14:23 BSA 33:8 business 5:9 41:22 <hr/> C C 2:1 3:1 call 14:14 called 51:4 campaign 24:6 35:19 capacity 30:19 captures 10:23 care 6:17 25:20 52:3 careful 11:2,10 caring 37:7 49:19 carried 15:21 27:24 carries 3:24 carry 3:21 4:3,7 12:18 13:20 14:1,2 54:25 carrying 9:1,18 13:14,16 14:21	26:17 54:9 55:23 56:14 case 3:4 10:5,9 16:8,9 17:15 17:19 19:18,19 25:8 27:11,11 27:17 30:2,8 38:20 39:8 40:21,22,24 41:6,6 42:17 45:8,11,15 46:25 47:9 48:4,22 49:3 49:17,17 54:12 54:21,23 57:10 58:13,14 cases 26:21 27:10 certain 11:24 28:25 43:20 certainly 24:22 31:25 34:12 38:6 45:14 52:21 57:13 certification 29:17 chairman 31:17 challenge 36:24 45:17 challenging 15:25 16:2 56:2 change 8:18 55:9,12,15,21 channel 19:11 21:3 character 57:21 characterizing 54:1 Chief 3:3,10 4:5 4:16 5:1,5,12 28:13,17 29:7 29:23 30:7 35:18 36:10 39:2 44:5,8,18 45:4 47:14,25 48:15 53:18,23	57:24 58:11 choose 44:3,9 46:7 choosing 28:21 church 24:13,20 24:23 circumstance 9:3 35:14 45:16 circumstances 9:22 12:17,19 13:7 19:17,18 citizens 56:11,16 city 24:5,15,25 25:7,15 classes 24:12 classic 14:8 Clause 28:20 32:2 36:8 clear 39:10,11 40:12 52:23,24 clearly 37:21 clients 36:25 37:4,4,11 41:7 45:17,18 closest 27:11 Coalition 7:11 cognitive 22:20 collateral 4:11 come 5:3 16:2 21:22 36:1 43:4 comes 9:7 31:16 32:3 35:22 comfortable 39:12 command 52:20 commensurate 13:10 54:8 commitment 15:18 28:4 56:21 committee 31:17 communicating 20:21 communities	16:5 company 48:17 comparable 16:11 compel 37:17 compelled 10:10 compelling 35:15 41:11 compensate 21:8 competing 9:6 competitive 3:18 complain 23:5 complaining 23:13,14 completely 17:2 comply 22:12 complying 18:24 component 5:16 comprehensive 3:12 concede 45:6,18 45:20 conceded 43:2 concedes 36:24 47:3 49:9 concern 27:19 46:15 concerned 4:11 44:20 concerns 27:7 concert 14:4 concluded 7:3 39:20 concrete 18:21 condition 5:19 5:21,25 6:10 10:7 11:10,11 11:22 12:8 18:4,6 19:24 20:1,11 21:6 21:12 22:3 23:6 27:21 29:14,24 30:24 32:2,10 34:22
--	---	---	--	---

43:3 conditions 10:25 11:7 condition's 21:10 conduct 9:12,23 15:24 19:10 27:23 28:7,9 28:22 38:8 conducted 7:20 conducting 19:9 conferences 53:5 confines 18:5 21:14 conformity 3:22 28:8 confronted 57:9 Congress 3:16 4:16 5:22,24 7:1 8:22 9:15 10:7 15:17,23 25:7,14,21 31:24 32:4,20 33:17,22 34:12 34:14,14,23 46:10,12,16,22 46:23 56:16 57:7 58:2 congressional 13:10 Congressman 31:12 Congressperson 32:13 Congresswom... 31:13 Congress's 3:12 5:17,17 8:24 conscientious 32:13 consider 14:7 50:16 57:21 consideration 15:11 considerations 26:18	consistent 34:1 53:3 Constitution 31:14,20 40:16 constitutional 5:20 16:15 18:1 20:10 21:4,17 22:5,6 31:13 constitutionali... 5:17 constitutionally 17:20 30:17 35:6 context 8:16 13:11 15:15,17 15:23 17:9,10 26:24 28:3,3 29:1 54:12 55:25 56:2 58:8 continue 19:10 contraceptives 24:8,11,18 contracting 24:9 contrary 37:25 contribute 3:15 5:23 control 10:25 11:6 28:21 36:8 38:19 39:13,13 42:12 52:22 controls 38:8 conveying 37:1 convicted 29:16 coordinator 56:9 corners 38:7 corporate 18:18 correct 11:23 correspondin... 3:16 cost 57:9 could've 8:22 counsel 28:13 53:18 58:11,12	counterprodu... 6:18 countries 18:20 19:3 27:9 58:4 58:5,10 country 18:25 52:1 couple 10:18 course 5:13 7:2 12:13 19:8 21:5 41:20 43:19,20 court 1:1,14 3:11 10:6 11:9 16:23 18:15 28:18 29:2 32:24 33:16 35:1,4 39:12 39:21 42:11 53:17 54:18 57:9,11 Court's 10:20 26:21 covered 4:10 create 21:8 creating 27:9 criminal 18:24 criteria 20:18 29:25 30:9 45:25 46:12 criterion 12:1 critical 38:20 46:20 criticize 46:6 crossed 27:2 cure 18:13 23:19 Curtis 27:14 cut 40:4 cuts 42:6 <hr/> D <hr/> D 3:1 danger 58:6,7 dangerous 10:12 date 19:10 DAVID 1:20 2:6	28:15 day 20:15 26:21 44:15,17 daycare 24:13 24:13 dealing 44:19 58:4 dealings 15:6 debate 7:21 decade 39:22 decent 21:19 decide 9:15 12:14 31:17 34:13 42:3 47:20 55:16 deciding 32:21 decision 33:17 34:14 44:12 47:24 decisions 5:18 10:20,23 35:6 44:15 54:19 dedicated 30:15 defend 12:14 25:9,12 27:3 deference 27:12 definitely 32:2 degree 22:19 deliver 49:20 delivering 45:18 46:5 demands 53:13 denies 6:13 deny 32:24 33:2 Department 1:18 39:19 depend 26:12,14 26:17 41:13 depends 19:7 Deputy 1:17 describe 42:4,7 described 42:19 designed 27:1 28:7 desirable 25:1 desire 16:12 detailed 30:5	details 45:23 determination 7:1 25:5 54:24 determined 3:16 3:16 develop 47:15 56:9 Development 1:4 3:5 dialogue 23:11 dictate 42:4 differ 13:1,2 difference 18:11 20:1,8 32:12 52:8 54:14 different 4:6,21 5:13,14 9:5 22:6,16 27:4 30:8 36:4 38:4 39:4 40:20 58:5 differently 29:22 differs 13:5 difficult 5:15 27:4 28:10 difficulty 25:3 27:8 dig 48:2 digging 47:20 directed 12:9 direction 19:7 19:12 directly 11:18 25:24 disagree 51:13 disagrees 10:9 disallowing 10:24 discourage 35:20 discretionary 9:4 discrimination 41:18 discussion 53:7 53:12
--	---	---	---	---

disease 5:24 32:6 42:22 49:18	12:7 effective 8:25 9:18	ET 1:4,8	extracting 49:18	fit 53:3
diseases 3:15 24:9,17	effectively 49:4	everybody 5:9 6:23 57:15	face 22:2	flow 41:19
disfavored 26:23	effectiveness 6:14 48:16	evidence 39:25	fact 26:14 27:12 32:3 38:25 50:18	focused 31:8 45:9
disguise 46:1	effects 17:23	ex 15:18 28:4 54:24	facts 39:7 41:13 41:14	focuses 4:8
dispute 28:19	effort 55:20 56:11	exact 6:19	fall 38:15	focusing 31:10
dissonance 22:20	efforts 34:2	exactly 35:23 52:7	false 20:3	follow 8:7
distant 15:22	Egypt 18:23	example 11:16 13:7 14:7	familiar 7:23	following 5:16 17:17 37:20
distinct 15:15 22:18	either 11:18 26:2 42:10	18:22 25:17 49:15	family 29:4	foreign 15:22 18:20 27:9,13 27:18,24 54:12 55:25 58:4,4 58:10
distinction 12:17 19:16,22	eliminate 30:11	excepting 20:4	far 6:3 7:5 48:13	form 11:19 42:2 42:4
distinguish 54:16	embrace 10:2	Excuse 37:14	fashion 7:20	former 9:16
distorted 42:16	employees 50:4	exempt 57:6	fashioned 7:2	forms 11:18
distribution 24:11	encompass 4:20	exempted 56:25 57:2	favor 5:10 18:16 36:15 42:4	forth 40:7
district 18:15 39:21	ended 17:12	exemption 57:11,20	favoring 43:6	foster 50:5
doctor 15:2	endorse 38:24	exemptions 11:19	FCC 20:23	found 5:22
doctors 38:21	enforced 39:19 39:22	exercise 25:10 32:25	fealty 52:21 53:13	four 38:7 56:24 57:22
doctrine 27:17	engage 23:8 38:23 53:11 55:19	exist 21:5	Federal 3:18,22 3:22,25 4:2,2,3 9:4 10:7 12:20 13:14,16,17 14:4,15,21 25:18 28:8 54:25	fours 38:16
doing 18:4 34:7 41:4 51:6,15 56:4,15	engaged 41:7	exists 18:1	field 27:13 33:20 37:4	framework 16:24
dollar 51:21 52:1,2	enhances 56:10	expenditure 13:9	fight 8:14 32:5 34:1 37:5	fraud 29:16
dollars 9:4	enjoined 39:21	experience 4:24	filed 7:6	free 24:13 25:10 38:22 39:14 53:1,11 57:17
doors 40:9	enlisted 36:25	expert 31:13	final 58:7	freely 26:5
doubt 51:17	entire 20:1	explain 8:15 45:3	financial 13:8	fresh 48:20
dozens 18:20 43:17,17	entities 25:18 57:23 58:8	explains 7:19	find 21:18,19 29:11 43:23	front 21:6 33:23
draw 38:4	entitlement 12:22 13:12 14:6,8	express 12:10 17:7 20:11 34:6 41:25	fine 57:12	front-end 25:5
drugs 32:18	entity 19:19,23 25:25	expressed 27:8 55:3	finish 22:25 57:25	fulfill 20:10 49:12
D.C 1:10,18,20 18:14	envision 9:2	expressing 55:13	Finley 10:22	fully 18:7
	equally 31:2,3	expression 10:8	first 6:22 26:12 32:25 35:16 41:12 42:5 51:19 52:7 53:15 54:1	functions 56:15
	equivalently 33:9	expressly 51:11		fund 28:21 31:18,25,25 32:5,22 33:6 34:13,14 41:17 41:20
E	eradicate 36:12	extending 12:20		funding 3:18 5:18 9:5 10:7 10:25 11:6,17 17:22 29:24
E 2:1 3:1,1	especially 58:4	extension 51:10		
earlier 18:3 21:2	espousal 27:21	extent 30:11 46:12		
easier 41:11	ESQ 1:17,20 2:3 2:6,9	extra 27:12		
easy 21:18 49:12	essentially 39:23			
education 11:21	establish 47:8			

31:16 33:15 35:6 54:19,21 funds 4:3 11:22 24:13,17 25:18 25:24 34:16 36:21,22 37:24 41:10 45:10,11 48:12 52:1 57:17 further 16:13 34:19,21 38:13 42:2 51:16 53:17 furtherance 25:13 furthered 34:1	53:15 giving 13:2,5,11 21:23 33:14 46:19 global 56:9 go 6:6 11:14 16:20 29:10 34:5,19,20 38:1 40:17 51:8 57:17 goal 8:17,18 goals 13:10 goes 30:1,2 48:15,18 54:17 going 4:18,24 5:9 8:24 9:9,10 9:17,23,24,25 10:1 12:13,14 13:6 17:20 25:3,4 31:18 32:14 36:11,16 37:24 38:1,3 40:6,7,17 41:17 47:7,7 47:21 48:18 49:24 54:20,25 55:7,22 58:8 good 5:24 8:22 39:5 41:19 46:8 50:12 51:18 57:20 goodness 33:3 government 3:17 4:2,18 5:6 7:25 8:3,7,11 8:21 9:15 10:24 11:5,12 11:17 12:5,18 12:19,20 13:14 13:16 14:15,25 15:7,19 16:4 16:13,14 18:4 18:17 20:17 21:17 24:6 25:18 26:17,22 26:22 28:20 29:1,3,9 30:1	30:14 31:4,8 34:23 35:19 36:3,5,6,6,9,18 36:19,20,24,25 37:20 38:7,8 38:17,18,19 40:2,16,25,25 41:3,7,20 42:13 43:3,10 43:18 44:13 45:7,8,19,24 47:2,15,19 49:2,8 50:17 50:21,22 51:5 51:17,25 52:12 52:13,13 55:23 56:6 57:4 government's 4:1 7:25 8:4,6 8:8,20 9:1,19 10:3 15:5,20 28:4 29:4 31:1 31:5 35:15 42:12,17 46:1 46:3 51:24 53:13 54:8,9 grant 3:17 14:6 14:10 grantee 5:10 32:9 grantees 28:24 29:5 35:7 grants 51:9 great 6:16 44:22 ground 33:2 grounds 44:14 group 17:1 41:17,21 47:18 47:18,22 48:20 groups 34:9 guess 4:5 13:6 19:7 20:25 22:5,9 24:24 40:6 guns 25:22 26:1 26:2,4 32:18	H half 18:22 happen 26:1 happened 18:22 happening 39:3 42:18 52:7 hard 6:7 12:13 25:1 harm 39:25 health 25:20,23 26:4,6 32:19 38:22 49:20 53:3 hear 3:3 held 10:6 29:2 help 35:21 36:16 44:6 higher 11:21 12:7 highlight 9:21 hires 36:5,6 hiring 45:8 HIV 3:13,24 13:17 37:6 42:20 HIV/AIDS 32:5 37:5,8 hold 15:4 38:25 43:20 holding 33:1 Honor 22:7 Honor's 17:21 hospitals 4:9 hypocritical 17:5 hypothetical 24:4 25:14	18:9 19:15 24:16 53:12 impose 32:9 54:3 imposed 5:25 6:11 54:18 imposing 54:4 improving 49:20 includes 3:13 including 30:6 33:1 52:14 inconsistent 9:12 34:18 52:4,6 incorporated 12:7 independent 16:21 23:22 independently 16:25 indicate 45:24 indicted 18:23 indirectly 25:24 individual 12:21 individuals 25:19 initially 39:19 initio 21:10 intentionally 31:4 34:23 interactions 16:3 27:25 interest 35:15 41:12,12 interested 10:11 10:13 46:3 interfere 6:11 international 1:3,8 3:5,6 18:11 interrupt 54:14 invading 16:14 invitation 46:1 involve 23:9 24:10,11 27:25 involved 25:19
G G 3:1 gag 41:1 45:12 garbled 42:15 general 1:17 10:14 11:20 generally 12:23 13:11 27:17 germane 5:19 5:21 6:20 11:20 25:12,22 47:4 germaneness 5:16 6:12 10:16,18 11:25 26:13 41:4 49:14 51:21 getting 11:9 18:19 34:22 Ginsburg 7:22 8:13 14:22 15:9,10 16:8 18:10 19:6 27:8 52:11 57:14,19 give 11:15 12:15 25:16 51:21,25 51:25 given 13:20,25 gives 28:20			I idea 8:22 12:15 ideas 10:8 53:8 identified 48:24 56:5 implement 14:10,12 important 5:25 7:3 9:21 12:17	

44:23 57:10 involves 19:18 19:20 irrelevant 15:11 issue 4:11 5:4 25:22 30:4 issues 4:25 16:2 25:10 46:9 it's 22:4 23:22	46:18,25 47:6 47:14,25 48:15 49:23 50:3,14 50:20,22 51:2 51:6 52:11 53:18,24 54:11 54:13 55:2,12 55:14,24 56:23 57:7,14,19,24 58:11	legal 18:14 19:19,23 legalization 38:2 40:11 55:4,8 legalized 23:12 let's 4:7 12:9 14:7 24:5 25:21 35:18 47:16 leveraged 54:21 leveraging 10:24 11:6 18:2 54:19 levy 23:4 limitation 26:20 39:6 54:18 limitations 4:12 10:13 11:25 12:3 limited 3:18 11:6 26:3,4 limiting 10:19 12:15 47:5 49:13,16 51:20 line 38:5 39:17 48:10 lines 25:17 list 12:6 37:11 literature 40:10 little 5:15 29:22 42:1 loans 11:19 12:10 lobbying 57:16 local 16:5,5 27:25 28:1 location 27:19 long 17:11 24:25 25:12,13 longer 34:2 long-term 51:10 look 4:17,19 7:18 18:22 24:24 30:18 35:22 40:16 44:22 looked 4:16	27:10 looking 9:5 32:20 35:20 lots 11:17 25:18 45:24 loyalty 4:13 37:18 40:8	53:1 merits 34:6 message 17:6 36:13,17 37:2 38:3 40:20 42:15 45:18 46:6 56:10,24 messaging 37:13 mine 4:18 minutes 53:19 misattributed 58:9 misimpression 56:17 misreading 39:8 moment 17:14 26:1 37:3 Monday 1:11 money 8:7 9:6 12:9 13:2,5,9 13:13,20,25 14:6,10 17:3 18:17 21:23 34:22 52:2 55:6,6 monitor 28:10 monitoring 15:24 16:1 56:1 morning 3:4 mothers 24:12 mother-to-child 37:6 42:21 motive 46:2 multiple 19:23 multitude 44:14 Muslim 33:9 myriad 16:3 27:25
J	K		M	
JA 37:10 job 13:3,5 44:22 48:6 50:12 Justice 1:18 3:3 3:11 4:5,16 5:1 5:5,12 6:2,21 7:8,22 8:13 10:5,18 11:3 11:15 12:2,5 12:13,25 13:18 13:23 14:2,7,9 14:14,17,22,23 15:8,10 16:6,8 17:14,18 18:10 19:6,17 20:4,7 21:1,15 22:1 22:21,24 23:1 23:18,21 24:19 24:20 25:16 26:9,10 27:6,7 27:18 28:13,17 29:7,23 30:7 30:22 31:11,22 32:11,17 33:3 33:6,12,19,25 34:19 35:3,8 35:12,18 36:10 37:14 38:11,13 38:20 39:2,19 39:24 40:3,4 40:14,20,23 41:15 42:1,10 42:23 43:1,2,8 43:13,14,15 44:2,5,8,18 45:4,21 46:14	keep 40:6,7 keeping 18:4 Kennedy 27:6 27:18 31:11,22 32:11,17 45:21 46:14,18,25 47:6 54:11 55:24 Kenya 37:7 key 42:11,11 kidding 20:15 20:19 kind 8:15 10:10 12:21 kinds 26:18 41:19 know 4:9 5:8,14 13:4,18 18:12 18:19 21:20,24 24:9,24 25:10 26:8 27:16 29:15 30:25 35:23,24 36:1 48:19 50:11 knows 20:13		main 15:22 20:7 major 56:25 majority's 39:10 making 8:5 34:22 40:12 50:15 malaria 46:4 manifests 23:7 manner 9:12 10:25 13:9 maps 11:2 marketplace 53:8 markets 35:24 marvelous 46:5 material 19:16 matter 1:13 18:18 25:5 41:16 51:8 54:4,6 57:9 58:15 matters 17:24 55:25 56:1,2 mean 6:13 11:25 12:25 13:19,23 18:21 19:8 20:7,14 21:5 24:24 27:13 48:3 means 50:3 51:24 medical 57:1 Medicare 52:1 meet 49:16 members 57:22 mentioned 11:16 merely 46:13	53:1 merits 34:6 message 17:6 36:13,17 37:2 38:3 40:20 42:15 45:18 46:6 56:10,24 messaging 37:13 mine 4:18 minutes 53:19 misattributed 58:9 misimpression 56:17 misreading 39:8 moment 17:14 26:1 37:3 Monday 1:11 money 8:7 9:6 12:9 13:2,5,9 13:13,20,25 14:6,10 17:3 18:17 21:23 34:22 52:2 55:6,6 monitor 28:10 monitoring 15:24 16:1 56:1 morning 3:4 mothers 24:12 mother-to-child 37:6 42:21 motive 46:2 multiple 19:23 multitude 44:14 Muslim 33:9 myriad 16:3 27:25
	L			N
	lands 15:22 language 42:16 Laughter 14:18 44:4,7,10 lead 7:11 League 16:10,22 17:16 20:23 left 29:5 leg 44:25 45:2			N 2:1,1 3:1 naked 14:6,10 narrow 16:17 45:8 nature 41:25 necessary 19:4

need 20:10 23:20 24:16 36:19 44:5 55:6	37:16,21,25 38:6 39:3,4 40:8,9 50:23 51:2 52:1	52:15 55:3 56:14	55:1	25:25
needs 23:24 42:14	ones 30:25	organizational 17:19 18:8	particular 4:8 6:3 8:16 13:20 14:2,10,12 22:14 27:17 28:3 30:4,15 30:21 31:25 34:16 45:16,19 47:12 49:22	personal 23:25 28:25 29:5
nether 53:9	one's 32:25 33:1	organizations 3:19,20 4:17 4:21 7:5,7 8:19 8:19,23 9:6 10:1 13:15 15:18 16:4 19:20 22:11 25:2 26:14 38:22 48:6 54:4,6,24 56:4 56:20,25 57:17 57:20,21	particularly 15:25 28:9,10	persuade 8:17
neutral 9:11,23	open 1:7 3:5 5:20		parties 8:11	persuasive 35:24
never 33:16 35:1 52:4	operate 53:2		partner 3:17 4:2 4:18 8:18 9:16 29:10 43:4 50:17	pertain 30:4
new 18:19	operating 19:2,4		partnering 12:18 13:1,1,2 13:14,15,19,24 14:15 26:16	Petition 56:8
NGO 18:19,20 19:3	opinion 15:4 18:15 41:16 42:5		partners 8:25 30:2,15	Petitioners 1:5 1:19 2:4,10 3:9 53:22
NGOs 18:23 49:20	opportunity 10:2 23:15		pass 40:10	phrased 37:21
noted 6:13 10:19	oppose 32:6 50:7,18 51:10	organization's 23:20,23 41:1	passionately 7:14	pick 30:15
notion 22:11	opposed 17:2 29:11,13 36:15 41:8 55:8	orphans 37:7 49:19	penalizing 47:11	picking 29:9 54:6
number 4:6	opposing 3:14 3:19	outlined 42:11	people 6:4 21:19 21:21 22:2 29:11 34:15,16 34:24 35:20 43:19 51:10,14	picks 31:4
<hr/> O <hr/>	opposite 6:13,19 17:4 19:12 33:22 34:8 36:22 41:10 43:21 51:14	outside 29:1,6 38:18 39:14 40:9 41:1,9 48:12 52:16,22	people's 55:10	places 37:8
O 2:1 3:1	opposition 7:4 7:16 9:8 10:3 37:12 42:19	overarching 6:25	percent 57:16	planning 29:4
oath 4:13 31:14 37:18,22 40:8	oral 1:13 2:2,5 3:8 28:15	override 35:16	perception 56:13	play 16:2 25:11
objections 23:4	order 42:14	overrides 41:12	perfect 23:15	please 3:11 28:18
objective 6:11 11:1,8,12 16:13 25:2 30:10 49:11 57:8	organization 3:24 4:1,4,8 7:11 9:16 12:18,21 14:20 16:21 17:1,22 19:9 20:2 22:13,15,15,16 23:15,23,25 24:2 32:14,15 32:21 33:14,20 37:23 45:5 46:5,7,19,21 48:9,17,22,23 48:24 49:3,7	<hr/> P <hr/>	perform 31:9	pledge 8:4,10 51:3,5,5 57:18
objectives 25:13 29:20 31:1 36:16 53:3		P 3:1	performance 30:19	plenty 51:14
obliged 15:12		PAGE 2:2	permissible 10:6 26:6 30:17 44:14 46:10 47:11	point 6:3,17,25 10:18 11:4 15:2 17:21,24 18:1 19:8,15 19:21 20:14 22:22 23:3 26:19 55:18 58:7
observation 55:19		pages 4:23,23 23:7 38:21	people 6:4 21:19 21:21 22:2 29:11 34:15,16 34:24 35:20 43:19 51:10,14	points 21:1 22:9 53:25
occasions 9:25		palatable 52:9	per 56:13	police 50:13
odd 44:16		papers 53:6	perfect 23:15	policies 31:23 32:15 33:14 55:1
oddly 37:21		parenting 24:12 24:14	perform 31:9	
offering 24:12		part 20:18,19 21:16 22:4,5,6 24:14,14 29:24 36:11 51:7 53:7 56:16 57:4	performance 30:19	policy 3:13,19 3:21,23 5:7,7 5:10 7:1 8:4,4 8:6,20,24 9:8 9:13 10:3 14:5 15:20 16:7,13 17:23 21:18,20 22:14,16 25:1 25:5,13 27:22
officials 16:5 27:25		participate 23:10 53:4	permit 18:24	
oh 18:16 30:9 45:24 51:2			permits 19:4	
okay 14:14,19 20:6 21:6,10 21:22 34:3,7 35:2,12 36:2			permitted 10:10	
			person 13:13	

28:5,8,23 29:21 37:21,25 39:18 44:17 48:7,8 50:1,3,9 50:10,10 51:8 51:16 52:15 53:4,12 55:5 55:17 56:18,21 56:25 policymakers 28:1 population 49:6 49:6 posit 24:4 position 9:24 35:5 37:16 44:11,13 46:15 positions 38:4 possible 30:11 45:15 power 32:3 36:7 practice 32:7 precedent 34:22 precedents 15:1 precisely 22:17 25:2 27:23,24 30:5 50:20 58:9 prefer 32:14 34:10 46:21 47:21 preferably 9:16 pregnancy 24:7 premise 8:14 20:3 21:5 22:17 present 5:13 16:22 presents 5:14 27:3 presumably 11:21 pretext 46:13,15 pretty 16:9 prevail 47:9 prevent 6:5 24:6 36:20 42:15	preventative 42:6 preventing 37:6 46:4 previously 55:3 principal 19:8 principle 47:5,8 49:14,16 51:20 principles 10:19 12:6 33:13 prior 30:24 priorities 3:23 8:20,24 9:13 14:5 15:20 56:18 private 28:25 29:6 34:18 36:22 38:19,23 41:1,10 45:11 45:12 48:12 51:22 52:5,22 53:2 probably 49:15 problem 3:13 4:6 5:11 18:1 19:13 21:12 23:18 24:1 28:23 31:10,10 37:15 51:18 56:24 problematic 32:23,23 33:5 35:6,8 problems 24:7 proclaims 25:25 profess 28:24 48:11 49:21,23 50:15,21 52:3 profession 50:16 50:23,25 52:16 program 3:12 3:22 4:3,7,10 7:19,25 9:1,19 11:13 12:19 13:15,16,17,20 14:3,11,13,21 15:5 19:9,10	26:17 29:1,4,6 29:18,20 30:4 30:6,11,16,21 31:9,25 34:11 34:16 38:7,9 38:10,18 39:14 39:15 40:2,10 41:2,5,7 42:12 42:13,15 43:4 43:22 44:16,20 44:20,24 47:15 48:13,16 50:12 52:13,13,16,17 52:22 54:10,25 55:23 56:10,11 programmatic 11:12 49:11 programming 3:25 programs 15:21 19:19,24 24:10 28:21,22 33:7 34:13,13 42:19 42:20,20 43:17 43:19 53:2,2 project 29:10 promote 24:8 37:24 38:2 40:18,18 52:25 promotes 26:6 40:10 promoting 5:8 proper 46:6 properly 20:18 proposition 10:12 47:1 propositions 12:11 prostitutes 6:5,6 prostitution 3:14,20 4:25 5:22 6:9 7:4,16 9:8 10:3 17:2 17:10 23:11 29:12,13 30:12 31:5 32:7 34:3 36:12 37:12	38:2 40:11 41:8 42:20 43:6 44:21,24 48:25 50:5,7 50:18 51:11 52:9,25 55:4,8 56:22 58:5 protect 24:8 42:14 57:6 protected 16:15 16:19 provide 7:15 37:4 provides 11:17 25:18 48:23 providing 10:1 37:8 48:23 provision 25:19 51:4 56:7 pro-abortion 21:24 pro-apartheid 47:17 48:20 public 8:8 15:6 25:22 26:4,6 32:19 36:21 38:22 45:10 49:20 53:3 publicly 17:3 50:6 publish 53:6 purpose 11:20 18:2,7 21:3,23 21:24 50:13 purposes 17:14 26:4 pursue 25:6 57:8 putting 51:18 p.m 58:14	39:17 40:12,15 55:24 questions 21:22 27:4 28:2 43:25 53:17 quibble 17:21 quicker 48:2 quiet 46:8 quite 7:8,23 8:10 10:12 16:10,16 19:4 32:11 39:11 46:8
R				
R 3:1 raised 27:20 rationale 57:13 rationality 57:11 reaches 53:9 reaching 21:13 read 6:16 real 46:1 56:13 really 21:16,19 24:16 33:10 37:4 57:5 realm 28:9 realms 18:6 reason 5:16 8:21 8:21 17:1 21:20 31:7 32:23 39:11 43:16 46:17,18 48:3 51:15,18 reasoning 39:10 39:11 reasons 17:17 21:18 rebuttal 2:8 28:12 53:21,25 54:14 receive 25:24 receiving 12:8 recipient 8:2 10:9 13:9 14:20 17:22				
Q				
qualified 31:2,3 question 5:13,14 8:14 13:8 16:7 17:11,15 26:25 34:20 38:18				

19:8 39:12,14 43:5 recipients 56:10 recipient's 10:7 recognized 18:20 26:20 record 48:2 recycling 5:8 reference 32:18 32:18,19 references 30:19 refrain 28:25 34:17 Regan 16:10 20:23 23:17 57:10 regard 4:10 regulations 22:13 Rehnquist 38:21 relate 37:12 related 29:18 48:16 relates 37:13 relevant 16:9 reliable 8:25 9:18 54:9 55:23 reluctant 24:23 rely 15:2 remain 9:10 remaining 53:20 remedies 17:25 remedy 21:4 23:15 renewable 5:10 reorganization 18:18 represent 15:3,4 Representation 18:13 requests 30:2,3 require 4:13 5:8 8:2 12:8 19:3 21:6 43:3 required 3:25 15:2,3 30:5	38:24 50:20 51:1,21 57:8 requirement 6:12 8:16 10:15 28:23 29:22 39:8,18 41:5 44:17 48:7,8 53:13 54:2 57:1 requirements 18:25 requires 27:21 56:9 requiring 14:24 28:24 37:22 requisite 26:13 reserve 28:11 resources 5:11 47:16 respect 8:11 10:24 15:16 23:12 55:15 respected 39:16 Respondents 1:21 2:7 4:20 4:20,22 19:15 19:21 23:4,13 28:1,16,19 39:16 52:25 53:15 response 43:2 responses 6:22 responsible 37:1 restrict 51:9 restriction 42:6 57:16 rid 51:12 right 16:15,24 30:14 34:4,25 35:16 36:7,22 40:19 41:9 45:10 46:16 53:8,10,16 rights 33:1 ripple 17:23 ROBERTS 3:3 4:5 5:1,5 28:13	29:7 30:7 35:18 36:10 39:2 44:8,18 45:4 47:14,25 48:15 53:18 57:24 58:11 rubric 7:16 rule 10:14,15 43:12 rules 8:8 36:4 run 4:18 7:24 19:12,13 running 49:19 runs 19:7 52:24 Rust 14:25 15:11 19:17,18 20:22 23:16,24 29:2 38:10,11 38:12,14,15 39:3,3,7,9,10 42:11 52:20 <hr/> S S 2:1 3:1 satisfied 10:20 saying 6:10,14 8:6 13:6,19 30:23 34:17 35:4,14 37:17 39:2,4,7 40:16 45:9,11,14 47:19 49:21 51:15 52:12 says 6:12 9:7,9 20:12,14 25:21 35:22,25 36:8 36:19,21,22 38:14 41:3 45:12 46:17 48:18 49:25,25 Scalia 11:3 12:25 13:18,23 14:2,7,9,14,17 30:22 33:3,6 33:12 34:19 35:3,8,12 42:23 43:1,8	43:13 44:2 49:23 50:3,14 50:20,22 51:2 scheme 27:1 science 57:1 score 6:22 19:14 Scouts 33:7 second 6:24 23:6 secure 15:17 28:3,7 see 16:6,6,25 17:11 29:7 32:12 37:11 41:15 43:16 53:3 54:14 seeing 22:19 seeking 26:22 seeks 24:13,17 seen 17:4 seep 11:13 select 30:1,24 34:24 48:5 selected 48:9,10 selection 29:25 48:14 57:3 self 55:22 self-identify 8:19 54:7 55:22 self-policing 28:5 sense 5:24 8:16 9:14 15:15,16 28:2,3 56:1,3 57:20 sensitive 28:2 sensitivity 58:3 separate 18:12 19:19,20 20:9 20:12,20 21:16 22:12 33:20,21 seriously 31:15 served 18:7 services 7:15 10:1 11:1 37:5 37:8 48:23 49:20	set 17:3 19:1,11 20:12,13 setting 18:11 sex 3:14,20 5:3 5:23 7:4,17 9:9 10:4 23:11 30:12 34:5 36:12 44:21,25 56:22 sexually 24:16 share 29:20 56:20 show 18:3 showing 41:11 shows 21:12 30:20 48:1 sides 16:7 21:21 sign 4:14 29:16 29:19 significant 17:20 27:19 28:20 similar 31:5 57:10 simple 18:17,21 simply 20:10 27:8 37:23 situation 35:17 36:20 48:14 57:10 situations 4:19 4:24 42:21 skills 46:21 slightly 8:15 smoke 36:1 smoking 35:20 36:2,2 Society 1:7 3:6 sole 44:24 solely 44:20 Solicitor 1:17 somebody 6:17 8:5,17 14:24 29:19 54:5 sorry 22:24 40:3 sort 29:14 Sotomayor
--	---	---	--	---

22:21,24 23:2 23:18 24:19,20 37:14 38:11,13 39:24 40:4,14 40:20,23 42:1 56:23 57:7 South 47:16 sovereign 57:22 speak 7:25 8:2 speaking 16:9 23:23 52:18 specific 15:17 27:14 specify 52:14 speech 8:1 10:10 11:7,10 16:15 16:19 20:11 23:9 26:23 28:21,25 29:3 29:6,8,18 31:19 34:18 38:8,19,23 41:1 45:12 51:23 52:5,22 speech-related 11:11 23:4 speech-suppre... 11:1,8 Speiser 13:7 spending 28:19 32:2,2 36:8 spent 13:13 spin 18:16 spokesperson 36:5,6,8,21 45:9,13 spokespersons 37:1 45:17 spread 3:15 5:23 18:6 46:4 spreading 42:22 SRI 1:17 2:3,9 3:8 53:21 Srinivasan 1:17 2:3,9 3:7,8,10 4:15 5:3,12 6:21 7:10,22	8:13 10:17 11:5,24 12:4 12:12 13:4,22 13:25 14:4,12 14:16,19,22 15:8,14 17:13 17:17 18:10 19:6 20:6,25 21:25 22:4,22 23:1 24:19,22 26:8,11 27:16 53:19,21,23 54:17 55:11,14 57:7,14,19,24 57:25 stand 45:1,3 standard 49:13 57:12 start 21:5 started 41:24 States 1:1,14 19:2 43:5 46:7 46:20 48:17,19 50:17 53:9,10 56:5,12,16,18 56:20,21 58:9 statute 7:2 49:25 statutory 56:7 stay 23:20 step 34:15 38:13 40:9 steps 6:7 stop 6:7 42:22 stopping 46:4 straightforward 8:23 strictly 26:3,4 strong 5:7 stronger 41:6 45:15 strongest 42:17 struck 16:23 structure 17:3 20:9,13,14,20 20:20 21:16,16 structured 16:21 17:1	structures 27:9 student 11:19 12:9 studiously 9:11 subject 19:24 52:8 57:15 submitted 58:13 58:15 subscribe 3:25 subsequently 39:21 subsidiary 18:16 subsidization 26:24 subsidy 12:20 32:24 33:2 47:12 suddenly 22:1 sufficiently 22:11,18 25:12 suggested 19:16 suggesting 21:2 33:10 suggestion 54:2 suggests 29:23 Sullivan 15:1 29:2 support 7:7,10 7:12 32:6,7 37:8 55:3 supports 43:18 suppose 25:21 31:12 46:3 50:4 55:2 suppress 26:23 26:23 54:19,22 Supreme 1:1,14 sure 12:13 29:12 29:15 32:12 33:24 36:14 42:24 47:6,15 50:11 sweeping 5:18 <hr/> T T 2:1,1	tailored 21:13 take 6:7 7:18 18:21 31:14 32:8 33:12 34:15 36:3 40:8 42:14 55:18 taken 9:24 52:2 talk 29:8 37:3 talked 10:22 55:25 talking 9:22 18:3 50:24 Tanzania 37:7 target 7:15 39:13 43:11 tax 11:19 29:16 Taxation 18:13 tease 37:15 technical 16:17 30:19 46:21 technically 31:3 teen 24:6 teenage 24:12 tell 6:4,5,23 9:10 9:11 38:4,9 40:8 50:4,10 50:22 52:18,19 55:5 telling 6:18,23 6:24 7:6 tells 4:22 term 34:2 terms 6:14 20:21 42:8,9 57:4 Terrible 14:17 territory 15:22 testing 42:20 49:18 tests 49:19 tethered 11:11 49:10,14 tethering 49:17 Thank 3:10 23:1 28:13 53:18,23 58:11	theory 51:25 thing 18:21 19:1 19:3,5 20:17 25:6,8 27:6 36:13,21 43:9 45:10 52:24 things 12:6 24:9 25:11 33:21 36:11 37:5,11 37:12,13 38:2 41:19 54:15 think 4:15,19 5:12,25 6:15 6:22 7:13,14 8:15 9:2,14,21 10:13,20,23 11:2,9,25 12:4 12:16 15:14,16 15:23 17:8,13 17:19 18:8 19:13,15,21 20:3,22,22,23 21:10 22:10 23:14,21 24:25 24:25 25:9,9 25:11,22 26:1 26:5,12 27:2,3 27:13,18,20 29:21 30:13,14 32:22,23 33:11 33:21 36:1,4 38:15,15,17 40:24,25 41:5 41:10,13,19 42:7,9,10 43:17,24 44:13 46:11 47:10,23 49:2,10,11,15 51:9,14 54:2 55:11,15,16,20 57:19 thinks 12:6 34:24 third 8:11 thought 8:22 25:8 43:13,16 58:1
--	--	---	---	---

thoughtful 21:19	16:7 17:16 20:25 31:2,3	upfront 46:16	54:7,8 58:5,8	30:18 43:24
threat 42:13	33:22 34:8	uphold 31:14	village 48:18	weighing 48:13
Three 57:22	38:4 54:15,15	urge 7:18	violation 21:4	wells 47:20 48:2
threshold 23:5	twofold 22:10	use 24:8,18	31:19	went 41:9 42:1
thresholds 27:2	23:5	45:25	vis-à-vis 27:19	weren't 56:24
tightly 11:11	type 4:13	useful 43:23	Voters 16:10,22	we'll 3:3 9:11,11
49:10,14	types 4:21 44:15	U.S 18:23 27:14	17:16 18:14	we're 9:9,10,22
time 6:8 27:7	<hr/> U <hr/>	57:6	20:24	21:23 36:14
28:11 41:11	unable 49:3	U.S.C 56:8	<hr/> W <hr/>	41:8 42:22
45:22 52:24	uncle 55:7	<hr/> V <hr/>	W 1:20 2:6	45:14 46:19
55:18	unconstitutio...	v 1:6 3:5 14:25	28:15	47:21 48:18,19
toe 48:10	21:7 35:9,10	20:23 27:14	want 7:24 11:10	49:19 51:1,7
told 7:24	39:20	29:2	23:8,10 28:1	51:15 55:7
totally 17:4	undercutting	vaccinators 57:1	29:12,15,19	we've 48:1
tougher 41:6	40:1	variety 4:21	32:4,5,5,6,7	whichever 34:10
48:4	undermine 38:3	various 11:18	36:11,13 47:14	wildly 52:6
trafficking 3:14	48:21	vehicle 17:19,25	48:10,11,17,24	withholding
3:20 5:3,23 7:4	understand 6:1	21:11	50:11 52:2,4	47:12
7:12,17 9:9	8:6 11:4 14:9	verb 14:17	52:23 53:1,4,6	women 7:12
10:4 23:11	24:23 43:1	veterans 57:11	53:7 54:13	16:10,22 17:16
30:12 34:2	49:1 57:23	57:15	wanted 15:17	18:14 20:24
36:12 44:21,25	58:2	victims 37:7	56:16 57:5	34:2 41:18
56:22	understandable	Vietnam 37:9	58:3	word 26:15
transmission	37:19	view 8:18 30:8	wants 4:1 24:7	41:23 49:10
37:6 42:21	understanding	32:14 33:25	25:3 29:10	words 42:3,4
transmitted	37:16	34:4,10 51:12	35:19 37:23	work 6:4,14
24:16	understood	viewpoint 31:9	41:17,20 52:14	20:20 22:13
tread 58:3	15:24	32:9,9,21,22	57:4	25:3 36:1
treat 33:8	undertaking	33:17 35:7	Washington	40:17 54:7
tried 54:16	24:6	37:2 38:25	1:10,18,20	56:4 57:4
troubled 24:5	undesirability	41:16,21,23	wasn't 16:22	worker 34:5
true 7:9 12:11	16:14	42:8,10 43:5,9	20:4	working 16:4
15:8 20:22,22	unfettered 29:5	43:11,20,21	water 47:15	26:15,16 56:5
20:23 23:20	53:12	44:12 45:19	48:20	works 15:19
truly 23:22	uniformly 6:5	47:12,13,24,25	way 4:16 7:13	56:20
try 6:5,6 55:20	United 1:1,14	48:11 49:22	7:15 9:2 16:16	world 9:14
55:21	19:2 43:5 46:7	51:22 52:21	16:20 17:8	41:18 43:18
trying 16:12	46:20 48:17,19	53:14 54:3,5	20:17 21:7	53:10
19:22 23:22	50:17 53:8,10	54:22 55:10,12	23:16,16 24:24	worldwide 3:13
26:15 37:15	56:5,12,15,18	55:16,21	29:24 30:10	worried 13:12
42:22 48:21	56:20,21 58:9	viewpoints	33:19,21 34:1	worry 16:18
54:3,23 55:9	universities	26:23 54:20	34:4 39:5,5	wouldn't 17:5,7
55:15	11:17	views 4:1 15:3	43:18 49:12	19:13 26:7
turning 45:10	university 12:8	23:25 24:3	51:8 54:1	35:15 43:22
turns 36:21	unusual 14:23	31:4 33:1,23	56:19	44:25 57:6
two 6:22 9:5		34:6,8,9,25	ways 4:6 30:17	Wright 27:14

X				
x 1:2,9 20:12				
Y				
year 18:22				
years 29:16				
39:18				
1				
10 29:16 39:17				
11 4:23 23:7				
11:02 1:15 3:2				
12 4:23 23:7				
12-10 1:5 3:4				
12:00 58:14				
196 38:21				
197 38:21				
2				
20 57:16				
2013 1:11				
22 1:11 56:8				
28 2:7				
291(a) 56:7				
3				
3 2:4				
32 4:23 23:7				
33 4:23 23:7				
4				
4 53:19				
46 7:7				
5				
501(c)(3) 19:1				
501(c)(4) 19:2				
53 2:10				
7				
7611(h) 56:8				
8				
88 37:10				
89 37:10				