1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE	UNITED STATES
2		x
3	LINDA A. WATTERS,	:
4	COMMISSIONER, MICHIGAN	:
5	OFFICE OF INSURANCE AND	:
6	FINANCIAL SERVICES,	:
7	Petitioner	:
8	V.	: No. 05-1342
9	WACHOVIA BANK, N.A., ET AL.	:
10		x
11	Washingt	ton, D.C.
12	Wednesda	ay, November 29, 2006
13		
14	The above-entitle	ed matter came on for oral
15	argument before the Supreme Cou	urt of the United States
16	at 11:04 a.m.	
17	APPEARANCES:	
18	E.JOHN BLANCHARD, ESQ., Lansing	g, Mich; on behalf of
19	Petitioner.	
20	ROBERT A. LONG, JR., ESQ., Wash	nington, D.C.; on
21	behalf of Respondents.	
22	SRI SRINIVASAN, ESQ., Assistant	t to the Solicitor
23	General, Department of Just:	ice, Washington, D.C.; on
24	behalf of the United States,	, as amicus curiae,
25	supporting Respondents.	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	E.JOHN BLANCHARD, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	ROBERT A. LONG, JR., ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondents	25
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	SRI SRINIVASAN, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the United States, as amicus	
11	curiae, supporting Respondents	41
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	E.JOHN BLANCHARD, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of Petitioner	52
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(11:04 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4	next in 05-1342, Watters v. Wachovia Bank.
5	Mr. Blanchard.
6	ORAL ARGUMENT OF E. JOHN BLANCHARD
7	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
8	MR. BLANCHARD: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
9	it please the Court:
10	The dual banking system of State and Federal
11	regulation in our nation which we've enjoyed for over
12	140 years is one of the finest examples of cooperative
13	federalism in our history. For 35 years, the States,
14	not the OCC, have prudently exercised their authority
15	over non-bank State-chartered operating local
16	subsidiaries of national banks. Indeed, respondent
17	Wachovia Mortgage complied with Michigan law for 6 years
18	until in 2003 there was a corporate reshuffling and now
19	it claims it's exempt from the same Michigan laws it
20	complied with.
21	The OCC through its Regulation 7.40006 has
22	disrupted the careful balance and seeks to deprive the
23	States of the regulatory authority that they have
24	historically exercised.
25	JUSTICE GINSBURG: If the national bank set

- 1 up its mortgage operations as a division or as a
- 2 department, then the sole regulator would be OCC, right?
- 3 MR. BLANCHARD: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 4 But Wachovia Bank and Wachovia Mortgage made a choice.
- 5 They made a business judgment to create a
- 6 State-chartered operating subsidiary.
- 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Why did they do
- 8 that? What's the advantage to them having that
- 9 subsidiary rather than doing this directly?
- 10 MR. BLANCHARD: Your Honor, the advantage is
- 11 that Wachovia Bank insulates itself from liability,
- 12 because it's a bedrock principle of state corporate law
- 13 that the parent corporation is not liable for the acts
- 14 of the subsidiary corporation.
- 15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So mortgage
- 16 subsidiary could possibly get into some trouble that the
- 17 bank wants to protect itself from and not have -- they
- 18 have a certain number of assets that are subject to
- 19 liability in the subsidiary, but they would -- otherwise
- they'd expose the whole bank to those liabilities?
- 21 MR. BLANCHARD: Absolutely, Your Honor.
- 22 From -- the conception behind operating subsidiaries was
- 23 to separate a certain part of the business and the
- 24 attendant risks of that business also to separate.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, I assume that the

- 1 Federal regulating authorities require a certain ratio
- 2 of loans to real estate value, things of that sort. And
- 3 I assume that the States may have different rules with
- 4 regard to that; right? In other words, the oversight
- 5 might be different. The States may be more permissive
- 6 as to certain loans or as to, you know, what the balance
- 7 sheet of the bank has to look like than the Federal
- 8 Government is. And if you have a State subsidiary that
- 9 is overseen by state authorities, you might have a
- 10 different result.
- 11 MR. BLANCHARD: Possibly, but --
- 12 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, if not I don't see
- 13 any advantage in this great Federal banking system
- 14 you're talking about, if it's Tweedledum and Tweedledee.
- 15 MR. BLANCHARD: Well, the States do not --
- 16 exclusive visitorial powers over national banks rest
- 17 with the OCC. But Wachovia Bank and Wachovia Mortgage
- 18 are separate and distinct.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You're not seeking
- 20 visit -- "visitorial," is that the word?
- MR. BLANCHARD: Correct.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You're not seeking
- 23 visitorial rights with respect to the parent bank.
- MR. BLANCHARD: Absolutely not.
- 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You're not arguing

- 1 that because you need to see more about the mortgage
- 2 subsidiary you need to see what the parent is up to?
- 3 MR. BLANCHARD: No.
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay.
- 5 MR. BLANCHARD: No, we're not. Michigan and
- 6 the States want to be able to help their citizens with
- 7 abusive and predatory lending complaints.
- 8 JUSTICE BREYER: Suppose that it was a
- 9 national bank. Forget the subsidiary. And your State
- 10 says: Well, we want to have a law here that says we
- 11 want to send our own bank examiners in. And moreover,
- 12 we don't want them to make any loans in excess of 12
- 13 percent interest. Fine. Would that be constitutional?
- I mean, wouldn't be preempted?
- 15 MR. BLANCHARD: As to the national bank?
- JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.
- MR. BLANCHARD: Yes.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Yes, of course, because it
- 19 conflicts and they don't want it.
- MR. BLANCHARD: Yes.
- JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Do they have
- 22 the authority to say a subsidiary is a national bank?
- MR. BLANCHARD: No.
- JUSTICE BREYER: No, they can't? Where is
- 25 it in the law that says they don't have the authority to

- 1 say that a subsidiary of a national bank owned by a
- 2 national bank is a national bank? Is there something
- 3 specifically that stops them from saying that?
- 4 MR. BLANCHARD: Yes.
- JUSTICE BREYER: What?
- 6 MR. BLANCHARD: The Gold Foods case, the --
- 7 JUSTICE BREYER: What is it? What is it --
- 8 I mean, what statute or what is it that prevents them
- 9 from saying it? I don't know the Gold Foods case.
- 10 MR. BLANCHARD: Well, the point is that the
- 11 corporate law recognizes the two as separate and
- 12 distinct corporate entities.
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: I thought your point was
- 14 that the statute defines national bank, but also defines
- 15 affiliates, and refers to them as two separate entities.
- MR. BLANCHARD: Yes, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: And I thought your point
- 18 was that the effect of this regulation is to simply
- 19 eliminate that distinction?
- MR. BLANCHARD: You're right.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Their argument, they
- 22 haven't argued -- I realize this was a hypothetical, but
- 23 they haven't argued that the subsidiary should be
- 24 treated as a national bank. They're arguing that
- 25 they're entitled to say that the same preemption that

- 1 applies to the national bank applies to the
- 2 subsidiaries.
- MR. BLANCHARD: Exactly. That's what they
- 4 --
- 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Presumably, if they
- 6 said it's treated as a national bank they would lose the
- 7 benefit of the separate corporate existence when it came
- 8 to issues of liability. If they said this subsidiary is
- 9 a national bank, then presumably the separate corporate
- 10 existence they're seeking to take advantage of would be
- 11 obliterated.
- MR. BLANCHARD: Well, but that's the -- they
- 13 are trying to contend that they are one and the same.
- 14 But they can't have their cake and eat it, too.
- 15 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I guess we can ask
- 16 the respondents. But is it your understanding that
- 17 respondents take the position that the State has no
- 18 control at all over whether or not the shares have been
- 19 properly issued, whether or not certain accounting
- 20 requirements applicable to all corporations have been
- 21 complied with?
- MR. BLANCHARD: Yes, that is my
- 23 understanding of their position.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: They say that there's no
- 25 area of State law that is applicable to the subsidiary

- 1 corporation? 2 MR. BLANCHARD: They are saying that 3 visitorial powers over the State-chartered operating 4 subs is exclusively --5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I could understand that 6 with reference to just the amount of consumer loans, as 7 Justice Scalia was talking about. But just to see if 8 the corporation has a -- had -- had a meeting that year, has duly elected its officers under State law, do the 9 10 respondents take the position you have no authority to 11 visit the corporation to determine that? 12 MR. BLANCHARD: They take the authority --13 the position that Michigan has no authority to impose on 14 the State-chartered operating sub the two Michigan 15 laws --JUSTICE GINSBURG: But let's -- there are 16 17 two different kinds of regulations. I think 18 Justice Kennedy was talking about regulations of a 19 chartering State. This subsidiary was set up under the 20 law of a State. It wasn't Michigan. Is there -- is 21 anyone contesting that --was it North Carolina? 22 MR. BLANCHARD: Yes, you're correct.
- MR. BLANCHARD: Yes, you're correct.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- that they have to meet
- 24 all the requirements for setting up a corporation and
- 25 having meetings and all that that North Carolina

- 1 requires of corporations that are incorporated in that
- 2 State?
- 3 MR. BLANCHARD: No, I've not heard them say
- 4 that as to North Carolina law. But what they're saying
- 5 is that the Michigan Mortgage Broker, Lenders and
- 6 Servicers Licensing Act and the Michigan Secondary
- 7 Mortgage Act do not apply to them.
- 8 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, that seems to be a
- 9 standard preemption case. It's not as broad as just
- 10 visitorial powers generally. Maybe I'm wrong. Do some
- 11 subsidiaries of the -- of a national bank do things
- 12 other than banking, say title insurance or something
- 13 like that? I don't see anything in the record where the
- 14 OCC wants to displace the State as to that. This is
- 15 just a standard preemption case. When the OCC has
- 16 regulations that control, then the State has no
- 17 authority to add to those regulations or to have, or to
- 18 have contrary regulations. But if it's something that
- 19 doesn't have to do with banking at all, then I suppose
- 20 they would say -- I can ask them -- I suppose they say
- 21 the State has authority to regulate.
- MR. BLANCHARD: The important point, though,
- 23 Your Honor, is that the OCC has no independent power to
- 24 preempt the validly enacted legislation of a sovereign
- 25 State.

1 JUSTICE BREYER: Doesn't it have exactly the 2 same power that any other agency or Congress has? That 3 it has the power, if its regulation is authorized, it 4 has the power to what they say, preempt a state law that 5 obstructs, impairs, or conditions a bank's ability fully 6 to exercise its federally authorized real estate lending 7 powers? That's what they say, and then they list some 8 examples. 9 Suppose they said nothing. Wouldn't we be 10 in the same boat? After all, a state cannot under the 11 Federal Constitution normally enact a law that interferes or stands as an obstacle to the achievement 12 13 of the objective of the Federal law. 14 So if that's right, or if it's wrong, 15 explain why it's wrong, but if it's right, why don't you 16 tell me whether the two laws that you are worried about 17 do or do not stand as an obstacle to the full 18 achievement of the purposes of the statute as 19 implemented by their regulation? 20 MR. BLANCHARD: They do not. 21 First of all, if the OCC -- if Congress intends to alter the balance that I spoke of earlier, it 22 must do so with clear and manifest language. There must 23 24 be unmistakably clear language that Congress intended to 25 authorize the OCC to preempt the state law.

1 JUSTICE BREYER: Let's assume I don't agree 2 with you about that, that I think conflict preemption 3 does not require clear language. Assume that, even 4 though you disagree with it. Now on my assumption that 5 you can have the law if it doesn't conflict, but you 6 can't have the law if it does conflict, so now you 7 explain to me why the two laws at issue here don't 8 conflict. 9 MR. BLANCHARD: Your Honor, in the Barnett 10 case and in the Atherton case, in order to have the kind 11 of problem you're talking about, there must be a significant interference with the business of banking or 12 13 an incapacitation of the business of banking. Our 14 Michigan law doesn't incapacitate what --JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Blanchard, may I ask 15 16 you a question, perhaps preliminary to what you are 17 launching into? My understanding was that you did not 18 question the OCC's regulatory authority over a unit that 19 it says can do what the national bank itself could do in 20 the real estate business, no more, no less. OCC 21 regulation, visitation, all the rest, OCC's regulations 22 validly applied to this subsidiary that has been set up 23 in North Carolina and is operating in Michigan; is that 24 right? It is one thing for you to say we have the 25 authority to regulate. Are you saying at the same time

- 1 that OCC is out of the picture because its dual
- 2 regulation conflicts with the inevitable?
- 3 MR. BLANCHARD: I am not saying that. What
- 4 I am saying is the OCC does not have the exclusive
- 5 right.
- 6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Ah, you're saying, you
- 7 started to say they can't have their cake and eat it
- 8 too, but you're saying they can have the worst of all
- 9 possible regulatory worlds, so that they've got two
- 10 equally competent regulators, and they have to meet the
- 11 requirements of both?
- 12 MR. BLANCHARD: Yes. I am saying that --
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And if they don't
- 14 want to, they don't have to set up a separate
- 15 subsidiary, right? They can do this business directly
- 16 as a national bank and they're not going to be subject
- 17 to any visitation?
- 18 MR. BLANCHARD: You are absolutely correct.
- 19 As I started to say earlier, they made that choice and
- 20 they came to Michigan, and they obtained a certificate
- 21 of authority from the Michigan Corporations Division as
- 22 a foreign for-profit corporation doing business in the
- 23 state.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right. And I would
- 25 have thought your answer to Justice Breyer was yes, that

- 1 they get to regulate to the extent they want to, and the
- 2 state does, and if there's a conflict, the federal
- 3 regulation will prevail, but what's the problem here is
- 4 that they're issuing a categorical regulation saying the
- 5 state can't regulate at all.
- 6 MR. BLANCHARD: Yes. They are claiming
- 7 exclusive preemptive authority.
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: I didn't understand that
- 9 you made this --
- 10 JUSTICE STEVENS: May I just finish, please?
- 11 You argued, as I understand it, correctly, that the
- 12 state does, exercises certain regulatory controls that
- 13 will not be exercised -- will not be replaced by federal
- 14 controls; is that right? In other words, you -- that
- 15 they will be unregulated to a certain extent? There
- 16 will be less regulation under the federal sovereign than
- 17 there is under the state; is that correct?
- 18 MR. BLANCHARD: You are correct, Your Honor,
- 19 in that Wachovia Mortgage as a subsidiary of a national
- 20 bank is a registrant under Michigan law. And as a
- 21 registrant, it is not subject to an annual --
- JUSTICE STEVENS: Can you give me some
- 23 specific examples of what Michigan would require that
- 24 the OCC does not require? You mentioned licensing, for
- 25 example.

1	MR. BLANCHARD: Michigan would require
2	Wachovia Mortgage to register. There's a difference
3	between registration and licensure. As a subsidiary of
4	Wachovia Bank, they are a registrant like they've been
5	for the last
6	JUSTICE STEVENS: Does that have any impact
7	on the way they run their business?
8	MR. BLANCHARD: No.
9	JUSTICE STEVENS: I mean, does it make any
10	difference as a matter of what they have to do in order
11	to comply with the law that they are now exempt from
12	Michigan rules and subject to Federal rules instead?
13	MR. BLANCHARD: No. Michigan just wants to
14	be able to and the other states to deal with fraud
15	and deceit and material misrepresentation in mortgage
16	transactions, and to have a say over the corporations
17	that come to their state and do business.
18	JUSTICE SCALIA: Mr. Blanchard, if I could
19	go back to what you were saying before this last line of
20	questioning, I didn't understand your position to be
21	that the OCC can come in and regulate this non-Federal
22	bank up to the point where its well, can do it
23	apparently without limitation. And where its regulation
24	conflicts with the state regulation, the Federal
25	prevails.

- 1 MR. BLANCHARD: Or the more restrictive.
- 2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Ah, or the more
- 3 restrictive.
- 4 MR. BLANCHARD: That's the difference.
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: The Federal Government says
- 6 you can have outstanding loans of \$10 billion and the
- 7 state says no, you can have outstanding loans of
- 8 8 billion.
- 9 MR. BLANCHARD: No, Your Honor, the --
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Wait. What happens in that
- 11 situation?
- MR. BLANCHARD: Well, it doesn't happen in
- 13 Michigan because --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, invent some other
- 15 hypothetical then. I'm talking about a situation in
- 16 which the Federal law is more permissive than the state
- 17 law. Which law prevails? The Federal law allows this
- 18 bank to do things which the state law would not allow it
- 19 to do. As I understood your prior answer, you say oh,
- 20 of course, if the Federal law allows to it do things the
- 21 state law doesn't allow to it do, the Federal law
- 22 prevails. I didn't understand that to be your position.
- 23 And if it is your position, I don't know what all this
- 24 fuss is about. That's the end of the game, isn't it?
- MR. BLANCHARD: No, Your Honor. You see,

- 1 in -- we do not conduct -- they are exempt from an
- 2 examination where we go in and look yearly at such
- 3 things as capital assets management, earnings,
- 4 liquidity. Those aren't the kinds of things that we're
- 5 talking about. They, as a registrant, they are exempt
- 6 from that, from an annual examination. They're not
- 7 incapacitated, nor are --
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Exempt from state
- 9 examination?
- MR. BLANCHARD: Yes. The state chartered
- 11 corporation, Wachovia Mortgage, is exempt under Michigan
- 12 law from an annual examination.
- 13 JUSTICE BREYER: We're not looking for that.
- 14 We're looking for the opposite. As I read this, the
- 15 banking agency has not said, we wipe out all of your
- 16 laws. They've said, we wipe out a subset of laws, which
- 17 are defined as those laws that obstruct, impair, or
- 18 limit the ability of this bank to fulfill its federally
- 19 mandated powers. Okay? So they're just saying, we only
- 20 get the ones that are in conflict. Now, they then have
- 21 a list of which ones they preempt and which ones they
- 22 don't. So my question to you is, give me a list here of
- 23 which ones they think conflict that you think don't.
- MR. BLANCHARD: They -- their position is
- 25 that both laws that we append to our brief, both laws in

- 1 their entirety, are preempted.
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Their position is
- 3 not that it only preempts in cases of conflict. Under
- 4 12c apart, 7.4006, it says, state laws apply to national
- 5 bank operated subsidiaries, which is what we're dealing
- 6 with here, to the same extent that those laws apply to
- 7 the parent national bank, which is to say not at all.
- 8 MR. BLANCHARD: Correct.
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So it's not a case
- 10 of conflict preemption. They're trying to preempt state
- 11 law whether it conflicts or not, right?
- MR. BLANCHARD: That's correct, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: You do have -- one thing
- 14 that seems concrete and clear to me -- correct me if I
- 15 get this wrong -- Michigan is kind of deferring to OCC
- 16 in its primary jurisdiction sense. It says customers,
- if you've got complaints about what this operating
- 18 subsidiary is doing, you go first to the OCC; and then
- 19 if we think -- we, Michigan -- thinks OCC has not given
- 20 you an adequate response to your complaint, we take
- 21 over.
- MR. BLANCHARD: You are exactly correct.
- 23 That's the Michigan regulatory --
- 24 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So it's kind of a reverse
- 25 supremacy. Where it's usually the feds that have the

- 1 last word, but here you're saying Michigan has decided
- 2 that it will let OCC go first and Michigan will be kind
- 3 of a supervisor for the adequacy of the OCC's handling
- 4 of the consumer's complaint?
- 5 MR. BLANCHARD: Yes, you are exactly
- 6 correct. Our regulatory framework in Michigan says that
- 7 the complaint is referred to the appropriate Federal
- 8 agency, and only if that complaint is not being
- 9 adequately pursued does the commissioner have that
- 10 window of investigative authority for her to pursue it.
- 11 It is a cooperative type of statute.
- 12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do you know another
- 13 arrangement where the Federal agency goes first but then
- 14 the state agency has authority to say Federal agency,
- 15 you didn't deal with this consumer adequately, so we
- 16 will take over? I know schemes that work the other way
- 17 where the state goes first, and then the Federal
- 18 authority, but do you know another one?
- 19 MR. BLANCHARD: Another one that --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Where the primary
- 21 adjudicator, decision-maker would be the Federal
- 22 authority, but then the state can override that if it
- 23 thinks the Federal authority hasn't done an adequate
- 24 job?
- MR. BLANCHARD: Well, in a sense, in our

- 1 statute, the commissioner of the state agency is able to
- 2 investigate if the complaint referred to the comptroller
- 3 has not been adequately --
- 4 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's not the question.
- 5 Justice Ginsburg is trying to find out if you know any
- 6 other situation where when the Federal agency doesn't do
- 7 an adequate job, the state agency comes in?
- 8 MR. BLANCHARD: No situations come directly
- 9 to mind.
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Maybe civil rights actions
- 11 where there's a Federal agency that has some remedial
- 12 powers and if the Federal agency doesn't act, the
- 13 citizen is free to bring litigation in state court? I
- 14 guess that would be --
- 15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Or environmental
- 16 regulation where just because the Federal EPA doesn't
- 17 take a particular action against a polluter, doesn't
- 18 mean that the state can't take action against the
- 19 polluter.
- MR. BLANCHARD: Yes, Your Honor.
- 21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Isn't the action an
- 22 inadequate action? Michigan is saying yeah, the Federal
- 23 authority can do with respect to this unit just what it
- 24 would do to a national bank itself, but if we think that
- 25 is inadequate, that is a question of just one act or the

- 1 other, but if the -- it is the state judging the
- 2 adequacy of a particular Federal response.
- 3 MR. BLANCHARD: Yes.
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So if the Federal
- 5 U.S. Attorney prosecutes, decides to prosecute someone
- 6 for manslaughter, the state can decide that's not an
- 7 adequate enough response and prosecute them for murder,
- 8 right?
- 9 MR. BLANCHARD: Yes, Your Honor.
- 10 JUSTICE ALITO: Could the OCC --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Did this go through your --
- 12 can I just ask --
- 13 JUSTICE ALITO: Sure.
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: This still goes to the same
- 15 thing. Does Michigan do this by grace? If Michigan
- 16 wanted to, could it just tell the feds to butt out and
- 17 say, you know, all these years we've been letting you
- 18 come in first, and we only step in when we think you
- 19 haven't done a good job, but we've had it.
- 20 (Laughter.)
- 21 JUSTICE SCALIA: Especially after this
- 22 lawsuit, get out, we're going to regulate our state
- 23 banks?
- MR. BLANCHARD: No, Your Honor. That would
- 25 be contrary to the express statutory scheme in Michigan.

Τ	JUSTICE SCALIA: I KNOW IN MICHIGAN. I'M
2	saying, could Michigan change its statutory scheme to
3	kick the Feds out? Or would that be prevented by this
4	Federal statute we're discussing here? I'm trying to
5	see what you think this Federal statute does. Or what
6	the
7	MR. BLANCHARD: The Federal rule provides
8	that the operating the State chartered operating subs
9	are to be treated just like the law pertaining to the
10	parent national bank. And there is no authority from
11	Congress given to the OCC that kind of rule. The OCC
12	only has the authority that Congress gives it, either
13	through a preemptive statute or through the dell
14	designation of preemptive authority; and Congress has
15	not given them that kind of power.
16	JUSTICE SOUTER: Let me ask the question
17	the regulatory question. You do not dispute Michigan
18	does not dispute that the operating well, strike
19	that.
20	Michigan does not dispute that national
21	banks can go into business of real estate loans?
22	And Michigan does not dispute that Congress
23	has authorized national banks to operate through
24	subsidiaries for specific purposes like this.
25	My question is can you give me any plausible

- 1 reason to think that Congress would have contemplated
- 2 this system of potentially more restrictive State
- 3 legislation when its national bank in a given instance
- 4 decides to do -- to exercise its Federal banking power
- 5 through a subsidiary rather than directly?
- 6 Can you think of any reason that Congress
- 7 would have contemplated the scheme that you're, that
- 8 you're defending?
- 9 MR. BLANCHARD: Well, first of all, Your
- 10 Honor, I'm not defending that Michigan has a more
- 11 restrictive scheme or that Michigan law in any way
- 12 incapacitates or significantly interferes with the
- 13 business of banking.
- 14 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, if, if -- if the
- 15 banks have got, let's say, a subsidiary has to go
- 16 through two rounds of bank inspection every year instead
- of one round, it is going to cost them something.
- 18 Regulation costs the regulated entity something. It is
- 19 a burden on them.
- 20 And we also have to assume that there may be
- 21 instances -- you brought it up -- in, in which the, the
- 22 -- the State burden is heavier. So with those
- 23 possibilities in mind, can you think of any reason why
- 24 Congress in authorizing the exercise of the Federal
- 25 banking power through a subsidiary would have

- 1 contemplated Michigan or any State would have this
- 2 authority?
- It seems counterintuitive to me. They're
- 4 saying you can -- you can -- you banks can exercise
- 5 the Federal banking power through a subsidiary. It
- 6 would seem strange to me that Congress would silently
- 7 say, "and, of course, we acquiesce to a -- a dual system
- 8 of regulation that would not apply to the bank itself."
- 9 What reason would Congress have had for
- 10 assuming that might be the result?
- 11 MR. BLANCHARD: A recognition that the
- 12 States have a sovereign, compelling and legitimate
- 13 interest in regulating those corporations that it
- 14 charters and that do business within its borders. And
- 15 -- and that that balance should be respected.
- 16 JUSTICE SOUTER: So it is state sovereign
- 17 immunity in effect, is the answer -- State sovereignty
- 18 is rather the answer?
- 19 MR. BLANCHARD: But the but the key point,
- 20 and I would like to reserve whatever time I may have.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You better hurry
- 22 then.
- MR. BLANCHARD: The key, the key point is
- 24 that Congress has distinguished clearly and
- 25 unequivocally between affiliates and national banks; but

- 1 it has not included affiliates in either Section 481 or
- 2 484 of the National Bank Act.
- 3 National banks are not synonymous or
- 4 equivalent to the State-chartered operating
- 5 subsidiaries.
- THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Blanchard.
- 7 Mr. Long?
- 8 ORAL ARGUMENT OF ROBERT A. LONG
- 9 ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT
- 10 MR. LONG: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 11 please the Court.
- 12 I would like to start with the question that
- 13 Justice Souter asked because there are some important
- 14 principles that are really not disputed in this case,
- and I think they help to focus the issue that is before
- 16 the Court.
- There is no dispute, as we understand it,
- 18 that mortgage lending by national banks is supervised
- 19 exclusively by the Comptroller of the Currency. And
- 20 there is also no dispute that national banks' incidental
- 21 powers under Section 247 include the power to make
- 22 mortgage loans through a operating subsidiary. And an
- 23 additional point is that both Federal statutes and
- 24 Federal regulations state that when national banks make
- 25 mortgage loans or exercise their banking powers through

- 1 subsidiaries they do so subject to the same terms and
- 2 conditions that apply to the exercise of the power by
- 3 the national --
- JUSTICE STEVENS: Mr. Blanchard, may I ask
- 5 you a question. I just want to understand. Wachovia
- 6 has branch banks all over the country. Are they
- 7 generally subsidiaries or are they divisions of the
- 8 bank?
- 9 MR. LONG: Well, a branch of a national bank
- 10 has a particular status under Section 36 of the National
- 11 Bank Act.
- 12 JUSTICE STEVENS: I understand that. I'm
- 13 asking a factual question.
- MR. LONG: It would not be separately
- 15 incorporated. So --
- 16 JUSTICE STEVENS: They are actually
- 17 divisions, in effect, of the national bank itself?
- 18 MR. LONG: Well, I think they are generally
- 19 referred to as branches but I think its would be more a
- 20 division. That would be --
- JUSTICE STEVENS: At least they are not
- 22 separate corporate subsidiaries.
- MR. LONG: That -- that --
- JUSTICE STEVENS: Why is that, that the Best
- 25 bank decided to use the subsidiary approach for this

- 1 business, rather than the more traditional banking
- 2 approach.
- MR. LONG: Well, of course, anything that a
- 4 bank does through an operating subsidiary it could do
- 5 through the bank. It can always do it through the bank.
- 6 But there are many reasons why a bank may choose an
- 7 operating subsidiary. They can be managerial reasons;
- 8 it's -- just sometimes works better as matter of
- 9 business management.
- 10 JUSTICE STEVENS: It protects from
- 11 liability, too.
- MR. LONG: Well, that is one of the reasons.
- 13 Although --
- 14 JUSTICE STEVENS: -- in the district.
- 15 MR. LONG: I will say, Justice Stevens, I
- 16 have not been able to find examples of national bank
- 17 operating subsidiaries that have become insolvent. They
- 18 are regulated very heavily by the Comptroller and so
- 19 they don't.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But you have a
- 21 subsidiary that's in the mortgage lending business that
- 22 presumably competes with other companies in the mortgage
- 23 lending business that are not associated with national
- 24 banks, and you're claiming an immunity from the
- 25 regulation that their competitors are subject to. Is

1 that right? 2 MR. LONG: Well, but again, Mr. Chief 3 Justice, the national banks compete. And its undisputed 4 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And that's fine, and 6 they have an express provision in 48 -- 484(a) that says 7 they're, they're exempt from regulation. The question is whether a separate subsidiary that is not a national 8 bank that competes with other mortgage lending companies 9 10 is immune from the regulation that those other companies --11 12 MR. LONG: But again, Mr. Chief Justice, 13 thrifts, S&Ls, State-Chartered banks in all 50 States 14 are permitted to have operating subsidiaries. It's 15 recognized not just for national banks, but really for 16 all types of banking institutions, that are operating 17 subsidiaries are a useful tool of banking. This is not 18 a sort of special privilege that's given --19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Breyer's 20 questions were pointing out, to the extent your 21 regulation -- the Federal regulation of your subsidiary conflicts with the State law, that regulation is going 22 23 to prevail. The question is whether or not you are 24 immune from State regulation across the board --25 MR. LONG: Well, and you asked that

- 1 question. I mean, I think it might be useful to think
- 2 first about national banks and then about the operating
- 3 subsidiaries. It is not true that there are no State
- 4 laws that apply to national banks.
- 5 This Court's unanimous Barnett Bank decision
- 6 is the clearest statement of the principle. Any State
- 7 laws that prevent or significantly impair or impede the
- 8 exercise of national banking powers are preempted. But
- 9 many State laws having to do with contracts --
- 10 JUSTICE ALITO: In real world terms, what's
- 11 involved here? What are examples of some of the things
- 12 that Michigan does or some other State does that impair
- or impede the operations to the --
- 14 MR. LONG: The beginning is, it is a
- 15 complete separate set of regulation. You have to
- 16 register or obtain a license. You have to submit to
- 17 examination by the regulator. Investigation.
- 18 Enforcement. There are substantive laws; Michigan has
- 19 some that are not directly at issue in this case --
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: One of those laws
- 21 might be, I mean, let's say they have a law, when you're
- issuing a mortgage to a consumer, you have to give them
- 23 a disclosure about how much they're going to end up
- 24 paying over the life of the loan and all that. And they
- 25 require that of anybody who issues a mortgage in

- 1 Michigan. Could that law be applied to your subsidiary?
- 2 MR. LONG: Well, the question, Mr. Chief
- 3 Justice, would be is it preempted as to the national
- 4 bank? The Comptroller of the Currency would say yes.
- 5 But the issue in this case is if it is preempted as to
- 6 the national bank, then it is also preempted when the
- 7 national bank chooses to exercise this power that it has
- 8 under Section 24 --
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Isn't -- isn't your
- 10 friend correct then? You are really trying to have your
- 11 cake and eat it, too. You're saying if we did this
- 12 without a subsidiary, we wouldn't be subject to that.
- 13 But you want to be able to operate through a subsidiary
- 14 and yet not be subject to the same rules that apply to
- 15 other people.
- 16 MR. LONG: Well, but it, it with respect, it
- 17 is not really a case of having our cake and eating it,
- 18 too. We are in the area of powers of national banks.
- 19 And the Court has recognized for a century that in that
- 20 area, when national banks have powers, including
- 21 incidental powers recognized by the Comptroller, they
- 22 generally preempt any State law that prevents or
- 23 significantly interferes --
- 24 JUSTICE BREYER: That's the question I had.
- 25 I got somewhat thrown by the Chief Justice's question,

- 1 because I thought first, when I read the reg, 34.4.ab,
- 2 that those things that are preempted are those things
- 3 that obstruct, impair or condition, or in other words
- 4 limit, the Federal powers of a national bank.
- 5 MR. LONG: That, that is correct.
- JUSTICE BREYER: But I thought we were
- 7 basically dealing with conflict --
- 8 MR. LONG: Yes.
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: -- not fielding.
- 10 MR. LONG: It's -- that's one level --
- 11 JUSTICE BREYER: But -- but the last part of
- 12 the reg says that what applies, no State law applies to
- 13 a national bank operating subsidiary if it doesn't apply
- 14 to the parent bank. And I began to think it fields
- 15 preemption. Am I right in thinking that it is conflict
- 16 preemption, not field, because it is conflict in the
- 17 case of a national bank?
- 18 MR. LONG: Well -- it's, it's a very
- 19 important point. And our position is there are actually
- 20 several ways in which you could analyze this case and
- 21 arrive at the conclusion that the Comptroller's
- 22 regulations are valid. One is looking simply at
- 23 statutory language and saying we would, we the Court
- 24 would reach this result as we did in the Franklin
- 25 National Bank case even without any regulation. And

- 1 second of all is to say the regulations are a reasonable
- 2 interpretation of the statute. A third is to say that
- 3 the Comptroller has broad rulemaking authority. And as
- 4 this Court recognized in De La Cuesta and many other
- 5 cases, an agency exercising its rulemaking authority can
- 6 preempt State laws even though the statute itself would
- 7 not --
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think, the question is
- 9 not whether it can preempt State laws but whether the
- 10 rulemaking authority can, can eliminate a, a basic
- 11 division of the statute into a national bank and
- 12 affiliates of the national bank. The statute makes a
- 13 clear distinction between the two. And the effect of
- 14 what, of what the agency has to done here is simply to
- 15 eliminate that distinction, and to say really it doesn't
- 16 matter.
- 17 MR. LONG: No. It -- I --
- 18 JUSTICE SCALIA: If you are an affiliate of
- 19 a national bank, you have the same immunity that the
- 20 national bank has. That's not what the statute says.
- 21 MR. LONG: I have a two-part answer to that
- 22 question, Justice Scalia. One is that Section 484 of
- 23 the section you're referring to does limit the
- 24 visitorial authority as to national banks, but it is
- 25 silent as to operating subsidiaries or any other type of

- 1 affiliate. States do exercise visitorial authority over
- 2 some affiliates of national banks. That's established.
- 3 Operating subsidiaries are a special type of affiliate;
- 4 484, which was enacted during the Civil War, a hundred
- 5 years before operating subsidiaries were authorized,
- 6 really doesn't address the question of visitorial
- 7 authority.
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: I mean, an operating
- 9 subsidiary is an affiliate, right? What kind of
- 10 affiliates did they have before they had operating
- 11 subsidiaries? Did they rent pool halls, or what?
- 12 MR. LONG: It's a type of affiliate --
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: I would have thought that
- 14 any affiliate of a national bank would, would be engaged
- in essentially banking business.
- 16 MR. LONG: But, but this really became
- 17 clear, in answer to your question, in part two of my
- 18 answer. In 1999 when Congress enacted the
- 19 Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, it directly addressed this
- 20 question of affiliates of national banks. And this is
- 21 on page 2A of our appendix. It refers to, it created a
- 22 new type of affiliate, for the first time, financial
- 23 subsidiaries which can do anything financial in nature.
- 24 So they can actually engage in activities that the
- 25 parent national bank could not.

1 But if you look at the bottom of page 2A of 2 our appendix, this is Section 24A now of the act, it 3 said that financial subsidiaries can also engage in 4 activities that are permitted for national banks to 5 engage in directly, subject to the same terms and 6 conditions that govern the conduct of the activities by 7 a national bank. 8 And then at the bottom of 3A and going over to 4A where they actually define financial subsidiaries, 9 10 they do so by distinguishing them from the operating subsidiaries which had existed for decades. And at the 11 top of 4A you see that the operating subsidiary again 12 13 engages only in activities that the national banks may 14 engage in directly and are conducted subject to the same 15 terms and conditions. 16 Then if you'll bear with me a moment longer, 17 on page 12A of our appendix some additional provisions 18 of GLBA -- actually, that's the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, 19 GLBA people call it -- said -- this is on 12A -- that 20 securities activities and insurance activities, 21 activities that have been traditionally subject to State 22 regulation, if they're engaged in by a functionally 23 regulated subsidiary, operating subsidiary or a 24 financial subsidiary, then they may be regulated by 25 relevant State securities authorities or State insurance

- 1 authorities.
- 2 So Congress was actually quite specific.
- 3 I mean, your question is about statutory language. You
- 4 don't find this in 484, which is, since it's a century
- 5 old, doesn't really get into this. But in this 1999
- 6 statute, it's all about subsidiaries of national banks.
- 7 Congress was pretty clear if it's securities, if it's
- 8 insurance, it can be regulated by States. They were
- 9 specific about that. If it's a banking activity that
- 10 the bank itself can undertake, it's subject to the same
- 11 terms and conditions.
- 12 And so, going back to the Chief
- 13 Justice's question, you have this question of would it
- 14 be a preempted State preempted state law if it were
- 15 applied to the national bank when the national bank is
- 16 making a mortgage loan. Not every State law is
- 17 preempted because not every State law conflicts. But if
- 18 it does --
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What authority
- 20 do you have for the proposition that when then Federal
- 21 law says subject to the same terms and conditions that
- 22 they're referring To State regulation as opposed to the
- 23 same Federal regulation that applies to the national
- 24 banks?
- MR. LONG: Well, I mean, we have section

- 1 7.4006, which is the OCC's regulation interpreting that
- 2 language in the statute and in its own OPSUB
- 3 regulations, section 5.34. And we also relied simply on
- 4 the ordinary meaning of "terms and conditions." It
- 5 means prerequisites, limitations.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Was 7.4006 issued
- 7 pursuant to -- what did you call it, GLBA?
- 8 MR. LONG: GLBA?
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes. Or did it
- 10 predate that?
- 11 MR. LONG: 7.4006 was issued pursuant to
- 12 24-7, which is this incidental powers provision, and
- 13 24(a), which I've just been walking you through, which
- 14 is a provision of GLBA. So it is based partly upon
- 15 GLBA, and it is an interpretation of the same terms and
- 16 conditions language.
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: Conflict preemption
- 18 basically strikes down a State law that stands as an
- 19 obstacle to the full enforcement of the Federal law.
- MR. LONG: Yes.
- 21 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Now, with that
- in mind, suppose that you didn't have either 7.4006 or
- 23 34.4(a)(B). Neither existed. But we listened to what
- 24 the agency said as a Court and they explained how the
- 25 regulation worked. Would you expect to come to

1 precisely the same result? 2 MR. LONG: Well, I mean, of course --3 JUSTICE BREYER: Would you or not? 4 MR. LONG: We do have them and we think that 5 makes the case easier, of course. 6 JUSTICE BREYER: I know, but would you --7 would you expect to come to the same result or not? 8 MR. LONG: Yes. We would say that if you start with 24-7 and the incidental powers of national 9 10 banks and the undisputed point that one of those 11 incidental powers is for the national bank --12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: How does it conflict 13 with Federal banking authority for the State to audit 14 the books of the mortgage subsidiary? 15 MR. LONG: Well, it has been established 16 since the beginning of the national banking system 17 that -- and this goes back to the history of the first 18 and second Bank of the United States in McCullough 19 against Maryland -- that the national banking system is 20 protected from possibly unfriendly State legislation. 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Take my earlier case 22 about the consumer disclosure. Michigan has a law, I 23 assume, that any mortgage lender has to tell the 24 consumer all this information. Would that conflict with 25 the authority of a national bank?

- 1 MR. LONG: The Comptroller's view as I 2 understand it is that it would. But again let me 3 emphasize --4 THE COURT: How? 5 MR. LONG: Because --6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So you think any 7 regulation would conflict with the national bank status? 8 MR. LONG: Well, I think that may go too far. But I think what Comptroller has done, it has --9 10 has been to look at a series of these State regulations and determine whether in fact they do impair or impede 11 12 the exercise --13 THE COURT: I'm trying to get a handle on 14 it. As I understood the case that came, I don't think there's disagreement on either side about how conflict 15
- 16 preemption works. But I thought your position was that
- 17 more is involved here and that the State can't regulate
- 18 it at all, and you're not getting into a conflict
- preemption question. It's just if it's a State 19
- 20 regulation it can't --
- 21 MR. LONG: I think our position is there are
- 22 multiple roots that we can win this case. One is based
- 23 on conflict preemption. Another --
- 24 JUSTICE STEVENS: But you do take a field
- 25 preemption position, don't you?

1 MR. LONG: Yes, of course. And another 2 route is simply that the agency has --3 JUSTICE STEVENS: I mean, it's truly broader 4 than just conflict preemption. 5 MR. LONG: Yes. 6 JUSTICE STEVENS: Literally. 7 MR. LONG: Yes. And the agency has broad 8 rulemaking power. It's exercised it here. There's really no dispute about what the OCC's rules mean. The 9 10 only question is whether they're valid and then what is 11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What's your best case for 12 13 the proposition that an agency and not the Congress 14 defines the extent of field preemption? 15 MR. LONG: That an agency and not the --16 certainly the Delaquesta line of cases stand for the 17 proposition that if an agency has preempted State law by 18 regulation, the questions are simply whether the agency 19 has acted within the scope of its delegated authority 20 and whether it is a reasonable accommodation of the 21 conflicting principles and whether there's any reason to think that Congress would have disagreed with it. Are 22 23 there -- I mean, there are examples. For example, in 24 the world of Federal thrifts OTS has a sort of field 25 preemption as I understand it. It's evolved differently

- 1 in the world of national banks. That's conflict
- 2 preemption.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: What is a functionally
- 4 regulated subsidiary of a depository institution.
- 5 MR. LONG: Well, that that again goes to
- 6 this scheme of GLBA that I was trying to describe. The
- 7 notion that Congress had is that you're going to
- 8 regulate by function. So if it's insurance, the State
- 9 can regulate it whether it's in the subsidiary or in the
- 10 bank. If it's securities, the SEC and in some
- 11 circumstances the States can regulate it. But if it's
- 12 core banking functions like mortgage lending, that's
- 13 going to be regulated subject to the same terms and
- 14 conditions that apply when the bank itself conducts
- 15 those activities.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: And is that a functionally
- 17 regulated subsidiary?
- 18 MR. LONG: Yes.
- 19 JUST SCALIA: If it's just engaging in
- 20 banking activities?
- 21 MR. LONG: That is the concept as I
- 22 understand it. It's going by function and we think that
- 23 shows actually Congress did --
- JUSTICE STEVENS: Does Wachovia have any
- 25 branch banks in Michigan?

Τ	MR. LONG: Wachovia does not, although I
2	mean, an interesting feature of the Michigan law is if
3	they did Michigan's law would not apply, which we think
4	is not consistent with their view that the OCC is an
5	inadequate regulator, because it would be exactly the
6	same whether or not there's a branch.
7	JUSTICE STEVENS: Are there States in which
8	Wachovia has both branch banks and subsidiaries
9	comparable to this?
LO	MR. LONG: Yes, yes. North Carolina and
L1	others.
L2	I will add, there was a point at the
L3	beginning that this Wachovia Mortgage Company actually
L 4	was regulated by Michigan for 6 years and there were no
L5	problems. During that period it was a subsidiary of a
L 6	bank holding company, and that's a completely different
L7	situation. Those are not regulated at all by the OCC.
L8	So of course they were regulated by Michigan. That's
L 9	the way subsidiaries of bank holding companies are
20	regulated. That's simply a different situation.
21	If there are no further questions, I will -
22	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Long
23	Mr. Srinivasan.
24	ORAL ARGUMENT OF SRI SRINIVASAN
25	ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES, AS AMICUSCURIAE,

Τ	SUPPORTING RESPONDENTS
2	MR. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Mr. Chief
3	Justice, and may it please the Court:
4	Let me begin by addressing this question of
5	whether what's going on here is conflict preemption or
6	field preemption. Now, it depends on how one defines
7	those terms. But as we understand it it's conflict
8	preemption, not field preemption, in the following
9	sense. Our position is not that State laws have no
10	application to operating subsidiaries or to national
11	banks for that matter. It's that State laws apply to
12	the same extent to operating subsidiaries as they would
13	to national banks. And as this court has made clear in
14	the Atherton case and in the Barnett Bank case, State
15	laws do apply to national banks and operating
16	subsidiaries in a variety of respects, and State
17	contract law would be an example. But with operating
18	subsidiaries in particular, State laws dealing with
19	corporate governance questions, for example the process
20	of incorporation, dissolution, shareholder voting, and
21	things of that sort, would be controlling and so federal
22	law doesn't control those sorts of aspects.
23	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It's field
24	preemption when it comes to regulation. Yes, if the
25	bank is sued the normal rules of contract are going to

- 1 apply for enforcing a contract. But you're claiming
- 2 field preemption with respect to regulation, correct?
- 3 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, I guess it depends on
- 4 the degree to which the regulations apply to the
- 5 national banks. That's my only point, is that State
- 6 laws apply to the same extent to the operating
- 7 subsidiary as to the national bank.
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: State laws generally
- 9 -- State agencies generally don't regulate national
- 10 banks at all, right?
- 11 MR. SRINIVASAN: State agencies don't
- 12 generally do that because there's a specific statutory
- 13 prohibition on that. And Justice Scalia, this goes to
- 14 your questions about the scope of these provisions at 12
- 15 U.S.C. 484(a) and 481. It's true that those provisions
- 16 say by their terms that visitorial authority resides
- 17 exclusively with the Comptroller of the Currency with
- 18 respect to national banks, and there's another provision
- 19 that deals with affiliates.
- 20 And so that's the point with visitorial
- 21 authority. But visitorial authority by its very nature
- 22 is asserted in service of and enforcement of some
- 23 underlying substantive requirement, and the underlying
- 24 substantive requirement at issue here is the requirement
- 25 that operating subsidiaries register with the State.

- 1 And so there's a question of conflict preemption that
- 2 applies both to the national bank and the operating
- 3 subsidiary of whether that underlying substantive
- 4 registration requirement could be applied to the
- 5 national bank or could be applied to the operating
- 6 subsidiary.
- 7 JUSTICE STEVENS: Yes, but it is true, is it
- 8 not, that as long as this mortgage company was a
- 9 subsidiary of a holding company rather than the bank
- 10 itself, the State would have done the visiting, the
- 11 visitorial power, whereas once they changed the Federal
- 12 Government assumed that responsibility?
- MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, I don't know what you
- 14 mean by "holding company," Justice Stevens.
- 15 JUSTICE STEVENS: Well, as your co-counsel
- 16 pointed out, previously this very company was a
- 17 subsidiary of a holding company that also owned the
- 18 bank, and at that time it was exclusively regulated by
- 19 Michigan.
- MR. SRINIVASAN: That's right, because it
- 21 wasn't an operating subsidiary of a federally chartered
- 22 national bank.
- JUSTICE STEVENS: And the change in the
- 24 corporate structure is the sole basis for saying now
- 25 it's exclusively regulated by the OCC?

- 1 MR. SRINIVASAN: It is, but it's changing
- 2 the corporate structure in a fundamentally important
- 3 way. That's that it's no owned and controlled by a
- 4 federally chartered national bank.
- 5 JUSTICE STEVENS: But this results in field
- 6 preemption to the extent that the exercise of visitorial
- 7 power is a regulatory function?
- 8 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, again it depends on
- 9 how one defines those terms. And I don't take issue
- 10 with the fact that as a consequence of the fact that
- 11 this became a subsidiary --
- 12 JUSTICE STEVENS: Well, it is now only the
- 13 Federal agency that does the visiting, whereas it used
- 14 to be only the State agency?
- MR. SRINIVASAN: That's right.
- 16 JUSTICE STEVENS: And the question that led
- 17 me to is how many additional personnel did OOC employ
- 18 when it took over this area for 48 States?
- 19 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, I don't have an
- 20 empirical answer to that question.
- 21 JUSTICE STEVENS: But it was certainly quite
- 22 a few people, I assume.
- MR. SRINIVASAN: But Justice Stevens, in the
- 24 regulatory materials that attended the promulgation of
- 25 these rules OCC specifically addressed the question

- 1 whether it had sufficient resources to exercise
- 2 oversight authority over operating subsidiaries of
- 3 national banks. And let's be clear. It's not that the
- 4 OCC previously had no authority over operating
- 5 subsidiaries. The question is whether the OCC has
- 6 exclusive authority over operating subsidiaries. And
- 7 the OCC determined in the regulatory materials that it
- 8 had sufficient resources to exercise oversight authority
- 9 over operating subsidiaries --
- 10 JUSTICE STEVENS: But the authority under
- 11 the old regime was just to make sure that the operation
- 12 did not affect the financial stability of the parent
- 13 bank.
- MR. SRINIVASAN: But that's because it
- 15 wasn't an operating subsidiary of a federally chartered
- 16 national bank, and that changes things in a fundamental
- 17 way for the following reason: That under the Barnett
- 18 Bank case the rule of preemption, the special rule of
- 19 preemption that applies in the context of national
- 20 banking, is that when you're dealing with enumerated or
- 21 incidental powers of national banks -- and one
- 22 incidental power of a national bank is undisputed to be
- 23 the power to conduct affairs through an operating
- 24 subsidiary -- that the grants of those powers are
- 25 normally preemptive of rather than preempted by State

- 1 law> And so once the operating --
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: That was an effort
- 3 of the State to prohibit the national bank from engaging
- 4 in the activity, correct?
- 5 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, that was. But the
- 6 Court --
- 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: That's an obvious
- 8 case of conflict preemption. Here we have a question of
- 9 whether or not the State can regular the operating
- 10 subsidiary to any extent.
- 11 MR. SRINIVASAN: But the Court's decisions
- 12 aren't limited to prohibitions of that sort. I'd make
- 13 two points in that regard. First of all, in one sense
- 14 this is a prohibition, because the operating subsidiary
- 15 can't engage in federally authorized activities unless
- 16 and until it gets the State's permission. So at least
- 17 there is a prohibition at the outset. But more
- importantly, the Court's cases aren't limited to
- 19 situations involving prohibitions of the sort that Your
- 20 Honor posits, because in the Franklin National Bank case
- 21 that was a situation in which the national bank had the
- 22 power to accept savings deposits and the State law that
- 23 was deemed to be preempted there didn't prohibit the
- 24 national bank from accepting savings deposits.
- 25 JUSTICE SCALIA: What comes next? Can the

- 1 OCC say, well, the corporate law of this State doesn't
- 2 really allow subsidiaries to do as much as we think a
- 3 subsidiary of a national bank ought to be able to do, so
- 4 we're going to attribute additional corporate powers to
- 5 this subsidiary? Can it do that?
- 6 MR. SRINIVASAN: No, not if you're talking
- 7 about corporate powers, because those are governed by
- 8 State law. What it could do, though, is regulate the
- 9 subsidiary's conduct of the business of banking,
- 10 because, after all, an operating subsidiary has one
- 11 purpose and one purpose only, and that's to carry out
- 12 functions that the national bank itself could perform.
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: What troubles me, and maybe
- 14 you can answer to it more specifically than you have, is
- 15 that the core function of a banking regulatory agency is
- 16 the visitation power, and the Banking Act makes it very
- 17 clear that there is visitation power to national banks
- 18 and makes it very clear that there is not for
- 19 subsidiaries.
- 20 And here is a regulation which under the
- 21 guise, it seems to me, of defining the powers of the
- 22 national bank simply eliminates that distinction. And
- 23 it seems to me that perhaps goes beyond what an agency
- 24 regulation is allowed to do.
- MR. SRINIVASAN: With respect,

- 1 Justice Scalia, I don't think the statutes say that at
- 2 all. There is a statute, 484(a), that says that the
- 3 OCC's visitorial authority is exclusive with respect to
- 4 national banks. But there is no statute that says that
- 5 the OCC's visitorial authority is not exclusive with
- 6 respect to subsidiaries. There's another statute that
- 7 deals with affiliates. Now one point is that affiliates
- 8 are not limited to subsidiaries, but they could include
- 9 for example, I guess brother and sister corporations for
- 10 lack of a better term, that are controlled by a common
- 11 parent. But another point is that at the time these
- 12 statutes were enacted, Congress simply didn't have
- 13 within its field of vision the notion that a national
- 14 bank would have the power to exercise its functions
- 15 through a subsidiary corporation.
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Why should we assume
- 17 that they wanted to preempt state laws to that extent.
- 18 MR. SRINIVASAN: Because what Congress was
- 19 trying to do is to make sure that the OCC had exclusive
- 20 visitorial authority with respect to the conduct of
- 21 national bank function. It's just at the time that
- 22 these statutes were enacted, the only play that national
- 23 bank functions were being conducted was by a national
- 24 bank itself. Now later on, when the laws of all 50
- 25 states, the OTS, the Federal Reserve with respect to

- 1 state member banks, and the comptroller gives banks the
- 2 authority to conduct national -- to conduct bank
- 3 functions through its subsidiaries, then this issue
- 4 arises about who exercises visitorial authority with
- 5 respect to the conduct of those functions for a
- 6 subsidiary. And it stands to reason that if the
- 7 baseline rule is that with respect to the conduct of
- 8 national bank functions through a national bank itself,
- 9 the OCC visitorial authority is exclusive, then when a
- 10 national bank exercises its Federal entitlement to
- 11 conduct those very same functions through an operating
- 12 subsidiary, the OCC's visitorial authority, likewise,
- 13 would be exclusive. That seems to me to be an entirely
- 14 reasonable regulatory determination by the comptroller,
- 15 and there's nothing in those statutory provisions that
- 16 speaks directly to that issue and that in any way
- 17 precludes the comptroller from reaching that
- 18 determination.
- 19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Practically, is there any
- 20 difference between the way they operated when they were
- just a corporation as before, and now a parent and sub?
- 22 MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, there could be. I
- 23 don't know about this particular case but there
- 24 absolutely could be, Justice Ginsburg, because when they
- 25 become subsidiaries they are controlled by the national

- 1 bank and not by some other entity. And the reason that
- 2 a national bank would choose to engage in this sort of
- 3 structure rather than folding the enterprise into the
- 4 bank itself are many fold. And in part it's for
- 5 efficiency purposes because you can have focused
- 6 management, especially when you're dealing with the sort
- 7 of specialized things that operating subsidiaries
- 8 typically do. But there's also other reasons. For
- 9 example, there's a modularity component to this in the
- 10 sense that the best specialized functions such as
- 11 mortgage lending, very often a national bank will
- 12 purchase an entity that conducts that activity, and may
- 13 be interested in selling the entity later, and it's much
- 14 more straightforward to do that if those functions are
- 15 maintained in a separate subsidiary corporation.
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Is there any aspect
- 17 of state law, including liability limitation, that they
- 18 want to take advantage of by establishing a subsidiary
- 19 chartered under state law, Michigan or another state,
- 20 and yet they're claiming immunity from all other state
- 21 regulations?
- MR. SRINIVASAN: Well, with respect to
- 23 liability limitation in particular, Mr. Chief Justice, I
- 24 should clarify that veil piercing principles and things
- 25 of that sort would be governed by state law with respect

- 1 to the operating subsidiary. So if the question is
- 2 whether the corporate veil is pierced, state law would
- 3 dictate an answer to that question.
- But, may I just finish one thought?
- 5 States won't have an incentive to liberally
- 6 construe veil piercing principles with respect to
- 7 national banks precisely because state member banks in
- 8 all 50 states also have operating subsidiaries through
- 9 which they charter banks to conduct banking functions.
- 10 Thank you.
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 12 Mr. Blanchard, you have a minute remaining.
- 13 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF E. JOHN BLANCHARD
- 14 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
- MR. BLANCHARD: Two key points.
- 16 First, Section 484 and 481 have been amended
- 17 subsequent to the time operating subsidiaries came into
- 18 play. Congress knew of operating subsidiaries when it
- 19 amended 484 twice in the 1980s, and 481 was amended four
- 20 times. Yet, never did Congress insert the word
- 21 "affiliates" into the exclusive power of the OCC in 488.
- 22 Secondly, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley act is
- 23 being greatly distorted. The same terms and conditions
- language that my opponent referred to was meant to
- 25 return op subs only to the authority that the parent

_	bank could engage in. It wasn't preemptive or meant to
2	preempt the states. The comptroller had issued a
3	ruling, 34.F, (f), and they had allowed operating
4	subsidiaries to do things differently from the parent
5	bank.
6	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
7	Mr. Blanchard. The case is submitted.
8	(Whereupon, at 12:03 p.m., the case in the
9	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L 4	
L5	
L 6	
L7	
L8	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	İ	İ	ı	ı
A	19:23 20:7	annual 14:21	arrangement	11:6 22:23
ability 11:5	21:7	17:6,12	19:13	33:5 47:15
17:18	adequately 19:9	answer 13:25	arrive 31:21	authorizing
able 6:6 15:14	19:15 20:3	16:19 24:17,18	asked 25:13	23:24
20:1 27:16	adjudicator	32:21 33:17,18	28:25	a.m 1:16 3:2
30:13 48:3	19:21	45:20 48:14	asking 26:13	
above-entitled	advantage 4:8	52:3	aspect 51:16	B
1:14 53:9	4:10 5:13 8:10	anybody 29:25	aspects 42:22	back 15:19
absolutely 4:21	51:18	apart 18:4	asserted 43:22	35:12 37:17
5:24 13:18	affairs 46:23	apparently	assets 4:18 17:3	balance 3:22 5:6
50:24	affect 46:12	15:23	Assistant 1:22	11:22 24:15
abusive 6:7	affiliate 32:18	APPEARAN	associated 27:23	bank 1:9 3:4,25
accept 47:22	33:1,3,9,12,14	1:17	assume 4:25 5:3	4:4,11,17,20
accepting 47:24	33:22	append 17:25	12:1,3 23:20	5:7,17,23 6:9
accommodation	affiliates 7:15	appendix 33:21	37:23 45:22	6:11,15,22 7:1
39:20	24:25 25:1	34:2,17	49:16	7:2,2,14,24 8:1
accounting 8:19	32:12 33:2,10	applicable 8:20	assumed 44:12	8:6,9 10:11
achievement	33:20 43:19	8:25	assuming 24:10	12:19 13:16
11:12,18	49:7,7 52:21	application	assumption 12:4	14:20 15:4,22
acquiesce 24:7	agencies 43:9,11	42:10	Atherton 12:10	16:18 17:18
act 10:6,7 20:12	agency 11:2	applied 12:22	42:14	18:5,7 20:24
20:25 25:2	17:15 19:8,13	30:1 35:15	attendant 4:24	22:10 23:3,16
26:11 33:19	19:14,14 20:1	44:4,5	attended 45:24	24:8 25:2 26:8
34:2,18 48:16	20:6,7,11,12	applies 8:1,1	Attorney 21:5	26:9,11,17,25
52:22	32:5,14 36:24	31:12,12 35:23	attribute 48:4	27:4,5,5,6,16
acted 39:19	39:2,7,13,15	44:2 46:19	audit 37:13	28:9 29:5 30:4
action 20:17,18	39:17,18 45:13	apply 10:7 18:4	authorities 5:1,9	30:6,7 31:4,13
20:21,22	45:14 48:15,23	18:6 24:8 26:2	34:25 35:1	31:14,17,25
actions 20:10	agree 12:1	29:4 30:14	authority 3:14	32:11,12,19,20
activities 33:24	Ah 13:6 16:2	31:13 40:14	3:23 6:22,25	33:14,25 34:7
34:4,6,13,20	AL 1:9	41:3 42:11,15	9:10,12,13	35:10,15,15
34:20,21 40:15	ALITO 21:10	43:1,4,6	10:17,21 12:18	37:11,18,25
40:20 47:15	21:13 29:10	approach 26:25	12:25 13:21	38:7 40:10,14
activity 35:9	allow 16:18,21	27:2	14:7 19:10,14	41:16,19 42:14
47:4 51:12	48:2	appropriate	19:18,22,23	42:25 43:7
acts 4:13	allowed 48:24	19:7	20:23 22:10,12	44:2,5,9,18,22
add 10:17 41:12	53:3	area 8:25 30:18	22:14 24:2	45:4 46:13,16
additional 25:23	allows 16:17,20	30:20 45:18	32:3,5,10,24	46:18,22 47:3
34:17 45:17	alter 11:22	argued 7:22,23	33:1,7 35:19	47:20,21,24
48:4	amended 52:16	14:11	37:13,25 39:19	48:3,12,22
address 33:6	52:19,19	arguing 5:25	43:16,21,21	49:14,21,23,24
addressed 33:19	amicus 1:24	7:24	46:2,4,6,8,10	50:2,8,8,10
45:25	2:10	argument 1:15	49:3,5,20 50:2	51:1,2,4,11
addressing 42:4	AMICUSCU	2:2,5,8,12 3:3	50:4,9,12	53:1,5
adequacy 19:3	41:25	3:6 7:21 25:8	52:25	banking 3:10
21:2	amount 9:6	41:24 52:13	authorize 11:25	5:13 10:12,19
adequate 18:20	analyze 31:20	arises 50:4	authorized 11:3	12:12,13 17:15
aucquaic 10.20	•			
		ı	1	1

	1	•	1	1
23:4,13,25	better 24:21	broader 39:3	44:23	come 15:17,21
24:5 25:25	27:8 49:10	Broker 10:5	changed 44:11	20:8 21:18
27:1 28:16,17	beyond 48:23	brother 49:9	changes 46:16	36:25 37:7
29:8 33:15	billion 16:6,8	brought 23:21	changing 45:1	comes 20:7
35:9 37:13,16	Blanchard 1:18	burden 23:19,22	charter 52:9	42:24 47:25
37:19 40:12,20	2:3,13 3:5,6,8	business 4:5,23	chartered 17:10	commissioner
46:20 48:9,15	4:3,10,21 5:11	4:24 12:12,13	22:8 44:21	1:4 19:9 20:1
48:16 52:9	5:15,21,24 6:3	12:20 13:15,22	45:4 46:15	common 49:10
banks 3:16 5:16	6:5,15,17,20	15:7,17 22:21	51:19	companies
21:23 22:21,23	6:23 7:4,6,10	23:13 24:14	chartering 9:19	27:22 28:9,11
23:15 24:4,25	7:16,20 8:3,12	27:1,9,21,23	charters 24:14	41:19
25:3,18,20,24	8:22 9:2,12,22	33:15 48:9	Chief 3:3,8 4:7	company 41:13
26:6 27:24	10:3,22 11:20	butt 21:16	4:15 5:19,22	41:16 44:8,9
28:3,13,15	12:9,15 13:3		5:25 6:4 7:21	44:14,16,17
29:2,4 30:18	13:12,18 14:6	C	8:5 13:13,24	comparable
30:20 32:24	14:18 15:1,8	C 2:1 3:1	18:2,9 20:15	41:9
33:2,20 34:4	15:13,18 16:1	cake 8:14 13:7	21:4 24:21	compelling
34:13 35:6,24	16:4,9,12,25	30:11,17	25:10 27:20	24:12
37:10 40:1,25	17:10,24 18:8	call 34:19 36:7	28:2,5,12,19	compete 28:3
41:8 42:11,13	18:12,22 19:5	capital 17:3	29:20 30:2,9	competent
42:15 43:5,10	19:19,25 20:8	careful 3:22	30:25 35:12,19	13:10
43:18 46:3,21	20:20 21:3,9	Carolina 9:21	36:6,9 37:12	competes 27:22
48:17 49:4	21:24 22:7	9:25 10:4	37:21 38:6	28:9
50:1,1 52:7,7,9	23:9 24:11,19	12:23 41:10	41:22 42:2,23	competitors
bank's 11:5	24:23 25:6	carry 48:11	43:8 47:2,7	27:25
Barnett 12:9	26:4 52:12,13	case 7:6,9 10:9	49:16 51:16,23	complaint 18:20
29:5 42:14	52:15 53:7	10:15 12:10,10	52:11 53:6	19:4,7,8 20:2
46:17	board 28:24	18:9 25:14	choice 4:4 13:19	complaints 6:7
based 36:14	boat 11:10	29:19 30:5,17	choose 27:6 51:2	18:17
38:22	books 37:14	31:17,20,25	chooses 30:7	complete 29:15
baseline 50:7	borders 24:14	37:5,21 38:14	circumstances	completely
basic 32:10	bottom 34:1,8	38:22 39:12	40:11	41:16
basically 31:7	branch 26:6,9	42:14,14 46:18	citizen 20:13	complied 3:17
36:18	40:25 41:6,8	47:8,20 50:23	citizens 6:6	3:20 8:21
basis 44:24	branches 26:19	53:7,8	civil 20:10 33:4	comply 15:11
bear 34:16	Breyer 6:8,16	cases 18:3 32:5	claiming 14:6	component 51:9
bedrock 4:12	6:18,21,24 7:5	39:16 47:18	27:24 43:1	comptroller
began 31:14	7:7 11:1 12:1	categorical 14:4	51:20	20:2 25:19
beginning 29:14	13:25 17:13	century 30:19	claims 3:19	27:18 30:4,21
37:16 41:13	30:24 31:6,9	35:4	clarify 51:24	32:3 38:9
behalf 1:18,21	31:11 36:17,21	certain 4:18,23	clear 11:23,24	43:17 50:1,14
1:24 2:4,7,10	37:3,6	5:1,6 8:19	12:3 18:14	50:17 53:2
2:14 3:7 25:9	Breyer's 28:19	14:12,15	32:13 33:17	Comptroller's
41:25 52:14	brief 17:25	certainly 39:16 45:21	35:7 42:13	31:21 38:1
benefit 8:7	bring 20:13	certificate 13:20	46:3 48:17,18	concept 40:21
best 26:24 39:12	broad 10:9 32:3	change 22:2	clearest 29:6	conception 4:22
51:10	39:7	Change 22.2	clearly 24:24	conclusion
	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>	<u>l</u>	<u> </u>

	1	I	1	1
31:21	6:13	31:5 43:2 47:4	decision-maker	disagree 12:4
concrete 18:14	construe 52:6	correctly 14:11	19:21	disagreed 39:22
condition 31:3	consumer 9:6	cost 23:17	deemed 47:23	disagreement
conditions 11:5	19:15 29:22	costs 23:18	defending 23:8	38:15
26:2 34:6,15	37:22,24	counsel 52:11	23:10	disclosure 29:23
35:11,21 36:4	consumer's 19:4	counterintuitive	deferring 18:15	37:22
36:16 40:14	contemplated	24:3	define 34:9	discussing 22:4
52:23	23:1,7 24:1	country 26:6	defined 17:17	displace 10:14
conduct 17:1	contend 8:13	course 6:18	defines 7:14,14	dispute 22:17,18
34:6 46:23	contesting 9:21	16:20 24:7	39:14 42:6	22:20,22 25:17
48:9 49:20	context 46:19	27:3 37:2,5	45:9	25:20 39:9
50:2,2,5,7,11	contract 42:17	39:1 41:18	defining 48:21	disputed 25:14
52:9	42:25 43:1	court 1:1,15 3:9	degree 43:4	disrupted 3:22
conducted 34:14	contracts 29:9	20:13 25:6,11	Delaquesta	dissolution
49:23	contrary 10:18	25:16 30:19	39:16	42:20
conducts 40:14	21:25	31:23 32:4	delegated 39:19	distinct 5:18
51:12	control 8:18	36:24 38:4,13	dell 22:13	7:12
conflict 12:2,5,6	10:16 42:22	42:3,13 47:6	department	distinction 7:19
12:8 14:2	controlled 45:3	Court's 29:5	1:23 4:2	32:13,15 48:22
17:20,23 18:3	49:10 50:25	47:11,18	depends 42:6	distinguished
18:10 31:7,15	controlling	co-counsel	43:3 45:8	24:24
31:16 36:17	42:21	44:15	depository 40:4	distinguishing
37:12,24 38:7	controls 14:12	create 4:5	deposits 47:22	34:10
38:15,18,23	14:14	created 33:21	47:24	distorted 52:23
39:4 40:1 42:5	cooperative	Cuesta 32:4	deprive 3:22	district 27:14
42:7 44:1 47:8	3:12 19:11	curiae 1:24 2:11	describe 40:6	division 4:1
conflicting	core 40:12 48:15	Currency 25:19	designation	13:21 26:20
39:21	corporate 3:18	30:4 43:17	22:14	32:11
conflicts 6:19	4:12 7:11,12	customers 18:16	determination	divisions 26:7
13:2 15:24	8:7,9 26:22		50:14,18	26:17
18:11 28:22	42:19 44:24	D	determine 9:11	doing 4:9 13:22
35:17	45:2 48:1,4,7	D 3:1	38:11	18:18
Congress 11:2	52:2	De 32:4	determined 46:7	dual 3:10 13:1
11:21,24 22:11	corporation	deal 15:14 19:15	dictate 52:3	24:7
22:12,14,22	4:13,14 9:1,8	dealing 18:5	difference 15:2	duly 9:9
23:1,6,24 24:6	9:11,24 13:22	31:7 42:18	15:10 16:4	D.C 1:11,20,23
24:9,24 33:18	17:11 49:15	46:20 51:6	50:20	
35:2,7 39:13	50:21 51:15	deals 43:19 49:7	different 5:3,5	E
39:22 40:7,23	corporations	decades 34:11	5:10 9:17	E 2:1 3:1,1,6
49:12,18 52:18	8:20 10:1	deceit 15:15	41:16,20	52:13
52:20	13:21 15:16	decide 21:6	differently	earlier 11:22
consequence	24:13 49:9	decided 19:1	39:25 53:4	13:19 37:21
45:10	correct 4:3 5:21	26:25	directly 4:9	earnings 17:3
consistent 41:4	9:22 13:18	decides 21:5	13:15 20:8	easier 37:5
Constitution	14:17,18 18:8	23:4	23:5 29:19	eat 8:14 13:7
11:11	18:12,14,22	decision 29:5	33:19 34:5,14	30:11
constitutional	19:6 30:10	decisions 47:11	50:16	eating 30:17
	•	•	•	

	ı	ı	I	l
effect 7:18 24:17	equivalent 25:4	39:8	federalism 3:13	function 40:8,22
26:17 32:13	especially 21:21	exercises 14:12	federally 11:6	45:7 48:15
efficiency 51:5	51:6	50:4,10	17:18 44:21	49:21
effort 47:2	ESQ 1:18,20,22	exercising 32:5	45:4 46:15	functionally
either 22:12	2:3,6,9,13	existed 34:11	47:15	34:22 40:3,16
25:1 36:22	essentially 33:15	36:23	feds 18:25 21:16	functions 40:12
38:15	established 33:2	existence 8:7,10	22:3	48:12 49:14,23
elected 9:9	37:15	expect 36:25	field 31:16 38:24	50:3,5,8,11
eliminate 7:19	establishing	37:7	39:14,24 42:6	51:10,14 52:9
32:10,15	51:18	explain 11:15	42:8,23 43:2	fundamental
eliminates 48:22	estate 5:2 11:6	12:7	45:5 49:13	46:16
emphasize 38:3	12:20 22:21	explained 36:24	fielding 31:9	fundamentally
empirical 45:20	ET 1:9	expose 4:20	fields 31:14	45:2
employ 45:17	evolved 39:25	express 21:25	financial 1:6	further 41:21
enact 11:11	exactly 8:3 11:1	28:6	33:22,23 34:3	fuss 16:24
enacted 10:24	18:22 19:5	extent 14:1,15	34:9,24 46:12	
33:4,18 49:12	41:5	18:6 28:20	find 20:5 27:16	$\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G}^{2}}$
49:22	examination	39:14 42:12	35:4	G3:1
enforcement	17:2,6,9,12	43:6 45:6	fine 6:13 28:5	game 16:24
29:18 36:19	29:17	47:10 49:17	finest 3:12	General 1:23
43:22	examiners 6:11	E.JOHN 1:18	finish 14:10 52:4	generally 10:10
enforcing 43:1	example 14:25	2:3,13	first 11:21 18:18	26:7,18 30:22
engage 33:24	39:23 42:17,19	F	19:2,13,17	43:8,9,12
34:3,5,14	49:9 51:9		21:18 23:9	getting 38:18
47:15 51:2	examples 3:12	f 53:3	29:2 31:1	Ginsburg 3:25
53:1	11:8 14:23	fact 38:11 45:10	33:22 37:17	9:16,23 12:15
engaged 33:14	27:16 29:11	45:10	47:13 52:16	13:6 18:13,24
34:22	39:23	factual 26:13	focus 25:15	19:12,20 20:5
engages 34:13	excess 6:12	far 38:9	focused 51:5	20:21 50:19,24
engaging 40:19	exclusive 5:16	feature 41:2 federal 3:10 5:1	fold 51:4	give 14:22 17:22 22:25 29:22
47:3	13:4 14:7 46:6		folding 51:3	
enjoyed 3:11	49:3,5,19 50:9	5:7,13 11:11	following 42:8	given 18:19
enterprise 51:3	50:13 52:21	11:13 14:2,13	46:17	22:11,15 23:3 28:18
entirely 50:13	exclusively 9:4	14:16 15:12,24 16:5,16,17,20	Foods 7:6,9	
entirety 18:1	25:19 43:17	16:21 19:7,13	foreign 13:22	gives 22:12 50:1 GLBA 34:18,19
entities 7:12,15	44:18,25	19:14,17,21,23	Forget 6:9	36:7,8,14,15
entitled 7:25	exempt 3:19	20:6,11,12,16	for-profit 13:22	40:6
entitlement	15:11 17:1,5,8	20:22 21:2,4	four 52:19	go 15:19 17:2
50:10	17:11 28:7	22:4,5,7 23:4	framework 19:6	18:18 19:2
entity 23:18	exercise 11:6	23:24 24:5	Franklin 31:24 47:20	21:11 22:21
51:1,12,13 enumerated	23:4,24 24:4 25:25 26:2	25:23,24 28:21	fraud 15:14	23:15 38:8
46:20	29:8 30:7 33:1	31:4 35:20,23	free 20:13	goes 19:13,17
environmental	38:12 45:6	36:19 37:13	friend 30:10	21:14 37:17
20:15	46:1,8 49:14	39:24 42:21	fulfill 17:18	40:5 43:13
EPA 20:16	exercised 3:14	44:11 45:13	full 11:17 36:19	48:23
equally 13:10	3:24 14:13	49:25 50:10	fully 11:5	going 13:16
cquarry 13.10	J.27 17.1J	.>	Tully 11.3	8,8 10.10
	I	I	I	l

21:22 23:17	23:10 47:20	incorporated	50:3,16	36:6,9,17,21
28:22 29:23	hundred 33:4	10:1 26:15	issued 8:19 36:6	37:3,6,12,21
34:8 35:12	hurry 24:21	incorporation	36:11 53:2	38:6,24 39:3,6
40:7,13,22	hypothetical	42:20	issues 8:8 29:25	39:12 40:3,16
42:5,25 48:4	7:22 16:15	independent	issuing 14:4	40:24 41:7,22
Gold 7:6,9		10:23	29:22	42:3,23 43:8
good 21:19	I	inevitable 13:2		43:13 44:7,14
govern 34:6	immune 28:10	information	J	44:15,23 45:5
governance	28:24	37:24	job 19:24 20:7	45:12,16,21,23
42:19	immunity 24:17	insert 52:20	21:19	46:10 47:2,7
governed 48:7	27:24 32:19	insolvent 27:17	JOHN 3:6 52:13	47:25 48:13
51:25	51:20	inspection 23:16	JR 1:20 2:6	49:1,16 50:19
Government 5:8	impact 15:6	instance 23:3	judging 21:1	50:24 51:16,23
16:5 44:12	impair 17:17	instances 23:21	judgment 4:5	52:11 53:6
grace 21:15	29:7,12 31:3	institution 40:4	jurisdiction	Justice's 30:25
Gramm-Leac	38:11	institutions	18:16	35:13
33:19 34:18	impairs 11:5	28:16	Justice 1:23 3:3	
52:22	impede 29:7,13	insulates 4:11	3:8,25 4:7,15	K
grants 46:24	38:11	insurance 1:5	4:25 5:12,19	Kennedy 8:15
great 5:13	implemented	10:12 34:20,25	5:22,25 6:4,8	8:24 9:5,18
greatly 52:23	11:19	35:8 40:8	6:16,18,21,24	10:8 39:12
guess 8:15 20:14	important 10:22	intended 11:24	7:5,7,13,17,21	key 24:19,23,23
43:3 49:9	25:13 31:19	intends 11:22	8:5,15,24 9:5,7	52:15
guise 48:21	45:2	interest 6:13	9:16,18,23	kick 22:3
	importantly	24:13	10:8 11:1 12:1	kind 12:10
<u>H</u>	47:18	interested 51:13	12:15 13:6,13	18:15,24 19:2
halls 33:11	impose 9:13	interesting 41:2	13:24,25 14:8	22:11,15 33:9
handle 38:13	inadequate	interference	14:10,22 15:6	kinds 9:17 17:4
handling 19:3	20:22,25 41:5	12:12	15:9,18 16:2,5	knew 52:18
happen 16:12	incapacitate	interferes 11:12	16:10,14 17:8	know 5:6 7:9
happens 16:10	12:14	23:12 30:23	17:13 18:2,9	16:23 19:12,16
hear 3:3	incapacitated	interpretation	18:13,24 19:12	19:18 20:5
heard 10:3	. 17:7	32:2 36:15	19:20 20:4,5	21:17 22:1
heavier 23:22	incapacitates	interpreting	20:10,15,21	37:6 44:13
heavily 27:18	23:12	36:1	21:4,10,11,13	50:23
help 6:6 25:15	incapacitation	invent 16:14	21:14,21 22:1	L
historically 3:24	12:13	investigate 20:2	22:16 23:14	La 32:4
history 3:13	incentive 52:5	Investigation	24:16,21 25:10	lack 49:10
37:17	incidental 25:20	29:17	25:13 26:4,12	language 11:23
holding 41:16	30:21 36:12	investigative	26:16,21,24	11:24 12:3
41:19 44:9,14 44:17	37:9,11 46:21 46:22	19:10	27:10,14,15,20 28:3,5,12,19	31:23 35:3
Honor 4:3,10,21	include 25:21	involved 29:11	28:19 29:10,20	36:2,16 52:24
7:16 10:23	49:8	38:17	30:3,9,24 31:6	Lansing 1:18
12:9 14:18	included 25:1	involving 47:19	31:9,11 32:8	Laughter 21:20
16:9,25 18:12	included 23.1	issue 12:7 25:15	32:18,22 33:8	launching 12:17
20:20 21:9,24	51:17	29:19 30:5	33:13 35:19	law 3:17 4:12
20.20 21.3,24	J1.1/	43:24 45:9	33.13 33.17	6:10,25 7:11
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

8:25 9:9,20	liberally 52:5	31:22	14:20,23 15:1	27:16,23 28:3
10:4 11:4,11	license 29:16	lose 8:6	15:12,13 16:13	28:8,15 29:2,4
11:13,25 12:5	licensing 10:6	1050 0.0	17:11 18:15,19	29:8 30:3,6,7
12:6,14 14:20	14:24	M	18:23 19:1,2,6	30:18,20 31:4
15:11 16:16,17	licensure 15:3	maintained	20:22 21:15,15	31:13,17,25
16:17,17,18,20	life 29:24	51:15	21:25 22:1,2	32:11,12,19,20
16:21,21 17:12	likewise 50:12	making 35:16	22:17,20,22	32:24 33:2,14
18:11 22:9	limit 17:18 31:4	management	23:10,11 24:1	33:20,25 34:4
23:11 28:22	32:23	17:3 27:9 51:6	29:12,18 30:1	34:7,13 35:6
29:21 30:1,22	limitation 15:23	managerial 27:7	37:22 40:25	35:15,15,23
31:12 35:14,16		mandated 17:19		
	51:17,23 limitations 36:5	manifest 11:23	41:2,14,18	37:9,11,16,19
35:17,21 36:18		manslaughter	44:19 51:19	37:25 38:7
36:19 37:22	limited 47:12,18	21:6	Michigan's 41:3	40:1 42:10,13
39:17 41:2,3	49:8	Maryland 37:19	mind 20:9 23:23	42:15 43:5,7,9
42:17,22 47:1	LINDA 1:3	material 15:15	36:22	43:18 44:2,5
47:22 48:1,8	line 15:19 39:16	materials 45:24	minute 52:12	44:22 45:4
51:17,19,25	liquidity 17:4	46:7	misrepresenta	46:3,16,19,21
52:2	list 11:7 17:21	matter 1:14	15:15	46:22 47:3,20
laws 3:19 9:15	17:22	15:10 27:8	modularity 51:9	47:21,24 48:3
11:16 12:7	listened 36:23	32:16 42:11	moment 34:16	48:12,17,22
17:16,16,17,25	Literally 39:6	53:9	mortgage 3:17	49:4,13,21,22
17:25 18:4,6	litigation 20:13		4:1,4,15 5:17	49:23 50:2,8,8
29:4,7,9,18,20	loan 29:24 35:16	McCullough	6:1 10:5,7	50:10,25 51:2
32:6,9 42:9,11	loans 5:2,6 6:12	37:18	14:19 15:2,15	51:11 52:7
42:15,18 43:6	9:6 16:6,7	mean 6:14 7:8	17:11 25:18,22	nature 33:23
43:8 49:17,24	22:21 25:22,25	15:9 20:18	25:25 27:21,22	43:21
lawsuit 21:22	local 3:15	29:1,21 33:8	28:9 29:22,25	need 6:1,2
led 45:16	long 1:20 2:6	35:3,25 37:2	35:16 37:14,23	Neither 36:23
legislation 10:24	25:7,8,10 26:9	39:3,9,23 41:2	40:12 41:13	never 52:20
23:3 37:20	26:14,18,23	44:14	44:8 51:11	new 33:22
legitimate 24:12	27:3,12,15	meaning 36:4	multiple 38:22	non-bank 3:15
lender 37:23	28:2,12,25	means 36:5	murder 21:7	non-Federal
Lenders 10:5	29:14 30:2,16	meant 52:24		15:21
lending 6:7 11:6	31:5,8,10,18	53:1	N	normal 42:25
25:18 27:21,23	32:17,21 33:12	meet 9:23 13:10	N 2:1,1 3:1	normally 11:11
28:9 40:12	33:16 35:25	meeting 9:8	nation 3:11	46:25
51:11	36:8,11,20	meetings 9:25	national 3:16,25	North 9:21,25
letting 21:17	37:2,4,8,15	member 50:1	5:16 6:9,15,22	10:4 12:23
let's 9:16 12:1	38:1,5,8,21	52:7	7:1,2,2,14,24	41:10
23:15 29:21	39:1,5,7,15	mentioned	8:1,6,9 10:11	notion 40:7
46:3	40:5,18,21	14:24	12:19 13:16	49:13
level 31:10	41:1,10,22	Mich 1:18	14:19 18:4,7	November 1:12
liabilities 4:20	44:8	Michigan 1:4	20:24 22:10,20	number 4:18
liability 4:11,19	longer 34:16	3:17,19 6:5	22:23 23:3	N.A 1:9
8:8 27:11	look 5:7 17:2	9:13,14,20	24:25 25:2,3	
51:17,23	34:1 38:10	10:5,6 12:14	25:18,20,24	0
liable 4:13	looking 17:13,14	12:23 13:20,21	26:3,9,10,17	O 2:1 3:1
	=	=	-	=

objective 11:13	33:10 34:10,12	particular 20:17	38:16,21,25	12:2 18:10
obliterated 8:11	34:23 42:10,12	21:2 26:10	42:9	31:15,16 36:17
obstacle 11:12	42:15,17 43:6	42:18 50:23	posits 47:20	38:16,19,23,25
11:17 36:19	43:25 44:2,5	51:23	possibilities	39:4,14,25
obstruct 17:17	44:21 46:2,4,6	partly 36:14	23:23	40:2 42:5,6,8,8
31:3	46:9,15,23	paying 29:24	possible 13:9	42:24 43:2
obstructs 11:5	47:1,9,14	people 30:15	possibly 4:16	44:1 45:6
obtain 29:16	48:10 50:11	34:19 45:22	5:11 37:20	46:18,19 47:8
obtained 13:20	51:7 52:1,8,17	percent 6:13	potentially 23:2	preemptive 14:7
obvious 47:7	52:18 53:3	perform 48:12	power 10:23	22:13,14 46:25
OCC 3:14,21	operation 46:11	period 41:15	11:2,3,4 22:15	53:1
4:2 5:17 10:14	operations 4:1	permission	23:4,25 24:5	preempts 18:3
10:15,23 11:21	29:13	47:16	25:21 26:2	preliminary
11:25 12:20	opponent 52:24	permissive 5:5	30:7 39:8	12:16
13:1,4 14:24	opposed 35:22	16:16	44:11 45:7	prerequisites
15:21 18:15,18	opposite 17:14	permitted 28:14	46:22,23 47:22	36:5
18:19 19:2	OPSUB 36:2	34:4	48:16,17 49:14	presumably 8:5
21:10 22:11,11	oral 1:14 2:2,5,8	personnel 45:17	52:21	8:9 27:22
41:4,17 44:25	3:6 25:8 41:24	pertaining 22:9	powers 5:16 9:3	pretty 35:7
45:25 46:4,5,7	order 12:10	Petitioner 1:7	10:10 11:7	prevail 14:3
48:1 49:19	15:10	1:19 2:4,14 3:7	17:19 20:12	28:23
50:9 52:21	ordinary 36:4	52:14	25:21,25 29:8	prevails 15:25
OCC's 12:18,21	OTS 39:24	picture 13:1	30:18,20,21	16:17,22
19:3 39:9 49:3	49:25	pierced 52:2	31:4 36:12	prevent 29:7
49:5 50:12	ought 48:3	piercing 51:24	37:9,11 46:21	prevented 22:3
OFFICE 1:5	outset 47:17	52:6	46:24 48:4,7	prevents 7:8
officers 9:9	outstanding	plausible 22:25	48:21	30:22
oh 16:19	16:6,7	play 49:22 52:18	Practically	previously
Okay 6:4 17:19	override 19:22	please 3:9 14:10	50:19	44:16 46:4
old 35:5 46:11	overseen 5:9	25:11 42:3	precisely 37:1	primary 18:16
once 44:11 47:1	oversight 5:4	point 7:10,13,17	52:7	19:20
ones 17:20,21,21	46:2,8	10:22 15:22	precludes 50:17	principle 4:12
17:23	owned 7:1 44:17	24:19,23 25:23	predate 36:10	29:6
OOC 45:17	45:3	31:19 37:10	predatory 6:7	principles 25:14
op 52:25		41:12 43:5,20	preempt 10:24	39:21 51:24
operate 22:23	P	49:7,11	11:4,25 17:21	52:6
30:13	P 3:1	pointed 44:16	18:10 30:22	prior 16:19
operated 18:5	page 2:2 33:21	pointing 28:20	32:6,9 49:17	privilege 28:18
50:20	34:1,17	points 47:13	53:2	problem 12:11
operating 3:15	parent 4:13 5:23	52:15	preempted 6:14	14:3
4:6,22 9:3,14	6:2 18:7 22:10	polluter 20:17	18:1 29:8 30:3	problems 41:15
12:23 18:17	31:14 33:25	20:19	30:5,6 31:2	process 42:19
22:8,8,18 25:4	46:12 49:11	pool 33:11	35:14,14,17	prohibit 47:3,23
25:22 27:4,7	50:21 52:25	position 8:17,23	39:17 46:25	prohibition
27:17 28:14,16	53:4	9:10,13 15:20	47:23	43:13 47:14,17
29:2 31:13	part 4:23 31:11	16:22,23 17:24	preemption	prohibitions
32:25 33:3,5,8	33:17 51:4	18:2 31:19	7:25 10:9,15	47:12,19
			,	, ·
L	I	1	1	1

promulgation	quite 35:2 45:21	14:21 15:4	45:7,24 46:7	results 45:5
45:24		17:5	48:15 50:14	return 52:25
properly 8:19	R	registration	relevant 34:25	reverse 18:24
proposition	R 3:1	15:3 44:4	relied 36:3	right 4:2 5:4
35:20 39:13,17	ratio 5:1	regular 47:9	remaining 52:12	6:21 7:20
prosecute 21:5,7	reach 31:24	regulate 10:21	remedial 20:11	11:14,15 12:24
prosecutes 21:5	reaching 50:17	12:25 14:1,5	rent 33:11	13:5,15,24
protect 4:17	read 17:14 31:1	15:21 21:22	replaced 14:13	14:14 18:11
protected 37:20	real 5:2 11:6	38:17 40:8,9	require 5:1 12:3	21:8 28:1
protects 27:10	12:20 22:21	40:11 43:9	14:23,24 15:1	31:15 33:9
provides 22:7	29:10	48:8	29:25	36:21 43:10
provision 28:6	realize 7:22	regulated 23:18	requirement	44:20 45:15
36:12,14 43:18	really 25:14	27:18 34:23,24	43:23,24,24	rights 5:23
provisions 34:17	28:15 30:10,17	35:8 40:4,13	44:4	20:10
43:14,15 50:15	32:15 33:6,16	40:17 41:14,17	requirements	risks 4:24
prudently 3:14	35:5 39:9 48:2	41:18,20 44:18	8:20 9:24	ROBERT 1:20
purchase 51:12	reason 23:1,6,23	44:25	13:11	2:6 25:8
purpose 48:11	24:9 39:21	regulating 5:1	requires 10:1	ROBERTS 3:3
48:11	46:17 50:6	24:13	reserve 24:20	4:7,15 5:19,22
purposes 11:18	51:1	regulation 3:11	49:25	5:25 6:4 7:21
22:24 51:5	reasonable 32:1	3:21 7:18 11:3	reshuffling 3:18	8:5 13:13,24
pursuant 36:7	39:20 50:14	11:19 12:21	resides 43:16	18:2,9 20:15
36:11	reasons 27:6,7	13:2 14:3,4,16	resources 46:1,8	21:4 24:21
pursue 19:10	27:12 51:8	15:23,24 20:16	respect 5:23	27:20 28:5,19
pursued 19:9	REBUTTAL	23:18 24:8	20:23 30:16	29:20 30:9
p.m 53:8	2:12 52:13	27:25 28:7,10	43:2,18 48:25	35:19 36:6,9
	recognition	28:21,21,22,24	49:3,6,20,25	37:12,21 38:6
Q	24:11	29:15 31:25	50:5,7 51:22	41:22 42:23
question 12:16	recognized	34:22 35:22,23	51:25 52:6	43:8 47:2,7
12:18 17:22	28:15 30:19,21	36:1,25 38:7	respected 24:15	49:16 51:16
20:4,25 22:16	32:4	38:20 39:18	respects 42:16	52:11 53:6
22:17,25 25:12	recognizes 7:11	42:24 43:2	respondent 3:16	roots 38:22
26:5,13 28:7	record 10:13	48:20,24	25:9	round 23:17
28:23 29:1	reference 9:6	regulations 9:17	respondents	rounds 23:16
30:2,24,25	referred 19:7	9:18 10:16,17	1:21,25 2:7,11	route 39:2
32:8,22 33:6	20:2 26:19	10:18 12:21	8:16,17 9:10	rule 22:7,11
33:17,20 35:3	52:24	25:24 31:22	42:1	46:18,18 50:7
35:13,13 38:19	referring 32:23	32:1 36:3	response 18:20	rulemaking
39:10 42:4	35:22	38:10 43:4	21:2,7	32:3,5,10 39:8
44:1 45:16,20	refers 7:15	51:21	responsibility	rules 5:3 15:12
45:25 46:5	33:21	regulator 4:2	44:12	15:12 30:14
47:8 52:1,3	reg 31:1,12	29:17 41:5	rest 5:16 12:21	39:9 42:25
questioning	regard 5:4 47:13	regulators 13:10	restrictive 16:1	45:25
15:20	regime 46:11	regulatory 3:23	16:3 23:2,11	ruling 53:3
questions 28:20	register 15:2	12:18 13:9	result 5:10	run 15:7
39:18 41:21	29:16 43:25	14:12 18:23	24:10 31:24	
42:19 43:14	registrant 14:20	19:6 22:17	37:1,7	S

S 2:1 3:1	9:7 10:13	situations 20:8	state 3:10 4:12	25:4 28:13
savings 47:22,24	16:25 22:5	47:19	5:8,9 6:9 8:17	status 26:10
saying 7:3,9 9:2	34:12	sole 4:2 44:24	8:25 9:9,19,20	38:7
10:4 12:25	seeking 5:19,22	Solicitor 1:22	10:2,14,16,21	statute 7:8,14
13:3,4,6,8,12	8:10	somewhat 30:25	10:25 11:4,10	11:18 19:11
14:4 15:19	seeks 3:22	sort 5:2 28:18	11:25 13:23	20:1 22:4,5,13
17:19 19:1	selling 51:13	39:24 42:21	14:2,5,12,17	32:2,6,11,12
20:22 22:2	send 6:11	47:12,19 51:2	15:17,24 16:7	32:20 35:6
24:4 30:11	sense 18:16	51:6,25	16:16,18,21	36:2 49:2,4,6
31:23 44:24	19:25 42:9	sorts 42:22	17:8,10 18:4	statutes 25:23
says 6:10,10,25	47:13 51:10	Souter 22:16	18:10 19:14,17	49:1,12,22
12:19 16:5,7	separate 4:23,24	23:14 24:16	19:22 20:1,7	statutory 21:25
18:4,16 19:6	5:18 7:11,15	25:13	20:13,18 21:1	22:2 31:23
28:6 31:12	8:7,9 13:14	sovereign 10:24	21:6,22 22:8	35:3 43:12
32:20 35:21	26:22 28:8	14:16 24:12,16	23:2,22 24:1	50:15
49:2,4	29:15 51:15	sovereignty	24:16,17 25:24	step 21:18
Scalia 4:25 5:12	separately 26:14	24:17	28:22,24 29:3	Stevens 14:10
7:13,17 9:7	series 38:10	speaks 50:16	29:6,9,12	14:22 15:6,9
14:8 15:18	service 43:22	special 28:18	30:22 31:12	26:4,12,16,21
16:2,5,10,14	Servicers 10:6	33:3 46:18	32:6,9 34:21	26:24 27:10,14
17:8 20:4,10	SERVICES 1:6	specialized 51:7	34:25,25 35:14	27:15 38:24
21:11,14,21	set 3:25 9:19	51:10	35:14,16,17,22	39:3,6 40:24
22:1 32:8,18	12:22 13:14	specific 14:23	36:18 37:13,20	41:7 44:7,14
32:22 33:8,13	29:15	22:24 35:2,9	38:10,17,19	44:15,23 45:5
40:3,16,19	setting 9:24	43:12	39:17 40:8	45:12,16,21,23
43:13 47:25	shareholder	specifically 7:3	42:9,11,14,16	46:10
48:13 49:1	42:20	45:25 48:14	42:18 43:5,8,9	stops 7:3
scheme 21:25	shares 8:18	spoke 11:22	43:11,25 44:10	straightforward
22:2 23:7,11	sheet 5:7	SRI 1:22 2:9	45:14 46:25	51:14
40:6	shows 40:23	41:24	47:3,9,22 48:1	strange 24:6
schemes 19:16	side 38:15	Srinivasan 1:22	48:8 49:17	strike 22:18
scope 39:19	significant	2:9 41:23,24	50:1 51:17,19	strikes 36:18
43:14	12:12	42:2 43:3,11	51:19,20,25	structure 44:24
SEC 40:10	significantly	44:13,20 45:1	52:2,7	45:2 51:3
second 32:1	23:12 29:7	45:8,15,19,23	statement 29:6	sub 9:14 50:21
37:18	30:23	46:14 47:5,11	states 1:1,15,24	subject 4:18
Secondary 10:6	silent 32:25	48:6,25 49:18	2:10 3:13,23	13:16 14:21
Secondly 52:22	silently 24:6	50:22 51:22	5:3,5,15 6:6	15:12 26:1
section 25:1,21	simply 7:18	stability 46:12	15:14 24:12	27:25 30:12,14
26:10 30:8	31:22 32:14	stand 11:17	28:13 33:1	34:5,14,21
32:22,23 34:2	36:3 39:2,18	39:16	35:8 37:18	35:10,21 40:13
35:25 36:3	41:20 48:22	standard 10:9	40:11 41:7,25	submit 29:16
52:16	49:12	10:15	45:18 49:25	submitted 53:7
securities 34:20	sister 49:9	stands 11:12	52:5,8 53:2	53:9
34:25 35:7	situation 16:11	36:18 50:6	State's 47:16	subs 9:4 22:8
40:10	16:15 20:6	start 25:12 37:9	State-chartered	52:25
see 5:12 6:1,2	41:17,20 47:21	started 13:7,19	3:15 4:6 9:3,14	subsequent
			<u> </u>	

	1	1	<u> </u>	1
52:17	supervised	16:18,20 17:3	22:4 30:10	unregulated
subset 17:16	25:18	17:4 2 9:11	38:13 40:6	14:15
subsidiaries	supervisor 19:3	31:2,2 42:21	49:19	use 26:25
3:16 4:22 8:2	supporting 1:25	46:16 51:7,24	Tweedledee	useful 28:17
10:11 18:5	2:11 42:1	53:4	5:14	29:1
22:24 25:5	suppose 6:8	think 9:17 12:2	Tweedledum	usually 18:25
26:1,7,22	10:19,20 11:9	17:23,23 18:19	5:14	U.S 21:5
27:17 28:14,17	36:22	20:24 21:18	twice 52:19	U.S.C 43:15
29:3 32:25	supremacy	22:5 23:1,6,23	two 7:11,15 9:14	
33:3,5,11,23	18:25	25:15 26:18,19	9:17 11:16	V
34:3,9,11 35:6	Supreme 1:1,15	29:1,1 31:14	12:7 13:9	v 1:8 3:4
41:8,19 42:10	sure 21:13 46:11	32:8 37:4 38:6	23:16 32:13	valid 31:22
42:12,16,18	49:19	38:8,9,14,21	33:17 47:13	39:10
43:25 46:2,5,6	synonymous	39:22 40:22	52:15	validly 10:24
46:9 48:2,19	25:3	41:3 48:2 49:1	two-part 32:21	12:22
49:6,8 50:3,25	system 3:10 5:13	thinking 31:15	type 19:11 32:25	value 5:2
51:7 52:8,17	23:2 24:7	thinks 18:19	33:3,12,22	variety 42:16
52:18 53:4	37:16,19	19:23	types 28:16	veil 51:24 52:2,6
subsidiary 4:6,9	S&Ls 28:13	third 32:2	typically 51:8	view 38:1 41:4
4:14,16,19 5:8		thought 7:13,17		vision 49:13
6:2,9,22 7:1,23	T	13:25 31:1,6	U	visit 5:20 9:11
8:8,25 9:19	T 2:1,1	33:13 38:16	unanimous 29:5	visitation 12:21
12:22 13:15	take 8:10,17	52:4	underlying	13:17 48:16,17
14:19 15:3	9:10,12 18:20	thrifts 28:13	43:23,23 44:3	visiting 44:10
18:18 23:5,15	19:16 20:17,18	39:24	understand 9:5	45:13
23:25 24:5	37:21 38:24	thrown 30:25	14:8,11 15:20	visitorial 5:16
25:22 26:25	45:9 51:18	time 12:25 24:20	16:22 25:17	5:20,23 9:3
27:4,7,21 28:8	talking 5:14 9:7	33:22 44:18	26:5,12 38:2	10:10 32:24
28:21 30:1,12	9:18 12:11	49:11,21 52:17	39:25 40:22	33:1,6 43:16
30:13 31:13	16:15 17:5	times 52:20	42:7	43:20,21 44:11
33:9 34:12,23	48:6	title 10:12	understanding	45:6 49:3,5,20
34:23,24 37:14	tell 11:16 21:16	tool 28:17	8:16,23 12:17	50:4,9,12
40:4,9,17	37:23	top 34:12	understood	voting 42:20
41:15 43:7	term 49:10	traditional 27:1	16:19 38:14	
44:3,6,9,17,21	terms 26:1	traditionally	undertake 35:10	W
45:11 46:15,24	29:10 34:5,15	34:21	undisputed 28:3	Wachovia 1:9
47:10,14 48:3	35:11,21 36:4	transactions	37:10 46:22	3:4,17 4:4,4,11
48:5,10 49:15	36:15 40:13	15:16	unequivocally	5:17,17 14:19
50:6,12 51:15	42:7 43:16	treated 7:24 8:6	24:25	15:2,4 17:11
51:18 52:1	45:9 52:23	22:9	unfriendly	26:5 40:24
subsidiary's	Thank 25:6	trouble 4:16	37:20	41:1,8,13
48:9	41:22 42:2	troubles 48:13	unit 12:18 20:23	Wait 16:10
substantive	52:10,11 53:6	true 29:3 43:15	United 1:1,15,24	walking 36:13
29:18 43:23,24	they'd 4:20	44:7	2:10 37:18	want 6:6,10,11
44:3	thing 12:24	truly 39:3	41:25	6:12,19 13:14
sued 42:25	18:13 21:15	trying 8:13	unmistakably	14:1 26:5
sufficient 46:1,8	things 5:2 10:11	18:10 20:5	11:24	30:13 51:18
				wanted 21:16
			•	

49:17	T 7	41 2:11	
wants 4:17	Y	48 28:6 45:18	
10:14 15:13	yeah 20:22	481 25:1 43:15	
War 33:4	year 9:8 23:16	52:16,19	
	yearly 17:2	484 25:2 32:22	
Washington 1:11,20,23	years 3:12,13,17	33:4 35:4	
wasn't 9:20	21:17 33:5		
44:21 46:15	41:14	52:16,19	
53:1	\$	484(a) 28:6	
Watters 1:3 3:4		43:15 49:2 488 52:21	
	\$10 16:6	400 32.21	
way 15:7 19:16	0	5	
23:11 41:19 45:3 46:17	0CC's 36:1	5.34 36:3	
	05-1342 1:8 3:4	50 28:13 49:24	
50:16,20	UJ-1J -1 2 1.0 J.4	52:8	
ways 31:20	1	52 2:14	
Wednesday 1:12	11:04 1:16 3:2		
	12 6:12 43:14	6	
We'll 3:3 we're 6:5 17:4	12A 34:17,19	6 3:17 41:14	
	12c 18:4		
17:13,14 18:5	12:03 53:8	7	
21:22 22:4	140 3:12	7.40006 3:21	
48:4	1980s 52:19	7.4006 18:4 36:1	
we've 3:11 21:17	1999 33:18 35:5	36:6,11,22	
21:19			
win 38:22	2	8	
window 19:10	2A 33:21 34:1	8 16:8	
wipe 17:15,16	2003 3:18		
word 5:20 19:1	2006 1:12		
52:20	24 30:8		
words 5:4 14:14	24A 34:2		
31:3	24(a) 36:13		
work 19:16	24-7 36:12 37:9		
worked 36:25	247 25:21		
works 27:8	25 2:7		
38:16	29 1:12		
world 29:10			
39:24 40:1	3		
worlds 13:9	3 2:4		
worried 11:16	3A 34:8		
worst 13:8	34.F 53:3		
wouldn't 6:14	34.4(a)(B) 36:23		
11:9 30:12	34.4.ab 31:1		
wrong 10:10	35 3:13		
11:14,15 18:15	36 26:10		
X			
	4		
x 1:2,10	4A 34:9,12		
L			