

1 GEN. PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ., Solicitor General,
2 Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
3 the United States, as amicus curiae, supporting the
4 Respondents.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	C O N T E N T S	
1		
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	PAUL M. SMITH, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	4
5	THOMAS M. FISHER, ESQ.	
6	On behalf of the Respondents	31
7	GEN. PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ.	
8	On behalf of the United States,	
9	supporting the Respondents	51
10	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
11	PAUL M. SMITH, ESQ.	
12	On behalf of the Petitioners	63
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(10:04 a.m.)

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument first today in Case 07-21 and 07-25, Crawford v. Marion County Election Board and Indiana Democratic Party v. Secretary Rokita.

Mr. Smith.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL M. SMITH

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the Court:

This case involves a law that directly burdens our most fundamental right, the right to vote. Those Indiana voters who lack the identification now required by the new photo ID law must overcome substantial practical and financial burdens before they can continue to exercise their constitutional right. Now, the State says that those burdens are justified by the need to stamp out the scourge of voter impersonation fraud at the polls, but this Court has made clear many times that such a justification should not just be accepted at face value, but instead it should be scrutinized to assure that the claimed State interest is both real and sufficiently weighty to justify the burden being imposed on constitutional rights.

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: Before -- before we get to
2 that, can we talk about standing a little? Who are
3 the -- who are the complainants here?

4 MR. SMITH: There are many plaintiffs, Your
5 Honor, including the ones that the courts below found
6 have standing, the Democratic Party.

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: Courts below are sometimes
8 wrong.

9 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor, absolutely, and
10 especially when I'm a petitioner I agree with you on
11 that. But in this case, Your Honor, the Democratic
12 Party was found to have standing correctly, I believe,
13 on at least two grounds, associational standing as well
14 as what you might call haven standing, the
15 organizational interest being impaired by virtue of this
16 law.

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, they still have to
18 identify individuals who are members. Now, what does it
19 take to be a member of the Democratic Party here?

20 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, in Indiana you
21 become a member of the Democratic Party by participating
22 in party affairs. They did identify members who are
23 activists, who are poll workers, and that's why the
24 district court said that as, as to the equal protection
25 claim those people were sufficient to satisfy

1 associational standing.

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: I thought -- I thought they
3 took the position that anybody who voted or intended to
4 vote Democratic is a member of the Democratic Party.

5 MR. SMITH: Well, there are different
6 degrees of membership, different ways to become a
7 member, as this Court has recognized in Tashjian --

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Is there any way in which
9 you can say -- and I thought this is the theory of
10 associational standing -- that this individual has
11 voluntarily given this organization the right to
12 represent that person for particular purposes?

13 MR. SMITH: There is no formal method of
14 induction as you would have in the Elk's Club or
15 something, Your Honor. But there clearly are methods by
16 which you become a participant in the affairs of the
17 party. For example, to vote in the primary you have to
18 aver that you have either supported Democratic
19 candidates in the last election or intend to in a future
20 election.

21 JUSTICE SCALIA: But that doesn't mean that
22 I'm willing to have the Democratic Party represent me
23 for all sorts of purposes. And these people can bring
24 their own individual challenges. I mean, I'm not
25 questioning their ability to do it. But, but why is the

1 Democratic Party their representative?

2 MR. SMITH: Because they have -- the
3 Democratic Party is an association of people joined
4 together to elect candidates of a particular kind and
5 those people include many people who are burdened by
6 this law. This seems to be the absolutely
7 quintessential case for associational standing, Your
8 Honor.

9 JUSTICE SOUTER: As I understand it, though,
10 Mr. Smith, the trial court didn't rely on, simply on the
11 associational standing of the Democratic Party, did it?

12 MR. SMITH: No, that's correct, Your Honor.
13 Well, the court of appeals relied as well on Havens
14 Realty and said that the organizational interests of the
15 party are being impaired by virtue of the fact that this
16 is putting a burden on them achieving their goal, the
17 Democratic Party's goal, of electing its candidates.

18 JUSTICE SOUTER: And it is doing so by
19 forcing them to get people properly identified.

20 MR. SMITH: Extend resources getting people,
21 get their identification. It's very much like the
22 Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority case which we
23 cite in our brief, which involved a nonprofit
24 organization aimed at trying to keep the noise level
25 down at National Airport that was impaired by an

1 unconstitutional statute in that case as well.

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: That organization had
3 members. I mean, you did join that organization.

4 MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, I'd note --

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: And they identified members
6 who would be, who would be annoyed by the noise.

7 MR. SMITH: I'd note, Your Honor, that in
8 the Hunt case itself there were no members. The Court
9 said it doesn't really matter because the State agency
10 that had associational standing in Hunt functioned for
11 all purposes as the representatives of those, of those
12 apple farmers, but there was no formal membership
13 organization, no members per se at all. But the Court
14 said that shouldn't make a difference because there's
15 really no actual functional difference between the two
16 situations. I would certainly submit --

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I just think it's hard to
18 confine your rationale if you say that any association
19 can sue, if it says, you know, there are people that
20 if they knew what we were doing, if they knew this
21 problem they would really want us to sue on their
22 behalf, I don't know if I'm going to confine your
23 rationale.

24 MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, the thing that
25 confines the rationale is it has to be something that

1 relates as well to the purpose of the organization, of
2 the association, the reason why these people are bound
3 together as a group, and that is of course to get people
4 to vote and vote to support -- support the goals of the
5 organization, support the candidates, the nominees of
6 the organization.

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We can limit your
8 standing argument to -- I guess it's based on the
9 affidavits of Ms. Holland and Ms. Smith, the one who is
10 a clerk for the Democratic Party and the other who is a
11 judge for the Democratic Party. We don't have to agree
12 with you that anybody who votes, might vote Democratic,
13 is enough to give you standing.

14 MR. SMITH: But we also have other people in
15 the record, Your Honor -- for example, Theresa Clemente,
16 others who are active poll workers, activists in the
17 party, who -- had been polled and found that they didn't
18 have IDs and that they would be burdened by the
19 difficulty of getting IDs. So that that -- there is
20 specific standing evidence in there of specific people
21 who, much more than just your average voter, are active
22 in party affairs. They may not have a -- be
23 card-carrying members of the Democratic Party, but they
24 are as much a part of the Democratic Party as anybody
25 possibly could be, who were identified in response to

1 interrogatories, about 9 or 10 of them, and were found
2 to be satisfactory for purposes of standing by the
3 district court on the equal protection claim.

4 Now, in addition I would note as I suggested
5 to Justice Souter, you don't have to go to the
6 associational standing because the Democratic Party
7 clearly is injured in its own right as an organization.

8 Now, if I could turn to the merits then, the
9 --

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Excuse me. Even in its own
11 right, it has to identify somebody that's a member or
12 not.

13 MR. SMITH: No. When it's in its own right
14 the association, the organization, is injured, Your
15 Honor. Now, the question -- if what you're suggesting,
16 is there enough evidence here that people are actually
17 being prevented from voting?

18 JUSTICE SCALIA: Exactly, Democrats in
19 particular, I suppose.

20 MR. SMITH: A great deal of evidence in the
21 record of the burdens that are imposed on people who try
22 to comply with this law and continue exercising their
23 constitutional right to vote.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I understood
25 Judge Barker to say that you had not come up with a

1 single instance of somebody who was denied the right to
2 vote because they didn't have a photo ID.

3 MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, the record in
4 this case was made when an election had not yet
5 happened. So that comment, while it was certainly made,
6 I don't quite understand its significance. This case
7 was brought to try to prevent an irreparable loss of
8 constitutional rights in advance of the implementation
9 of this law. I think it had been used in two little
10 towns in '05, Montezuma, Indiana, but other than that --

11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So elections were
12 conducted under this law?

13 MR. SMITH: I'm not even -- there were a
14 couple of hundred people that had voted under the law,
15 but nobody else had yet, at that point. Now, the --

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, did you have anybody
17 who said, I don't have a voter ID?

18 MR. SMITH: Yes, we did, Your Honor.

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: I plan to come in this next
20 election, I plan to vote, and I don't have a voter ID
21 card?

22 MR. SMITH: Yes, we did, Your Honor. That's
23 the 9 or 10 people who came from the poll worker survey.
24 There was also a considerable amount of testimony about
25 other people who said they wanted to vote, who spoke to

1 many of the other plaintiffs, Mr. Crawford, the NAACP
2 chapter. There's a lot of other plaintiffs who also
3 submitted evidence of people saying: I don't have an
4 ID, I'm not going to be able to get one, I'm not going
5 to be able to vote.

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But why -- and
7 they're not going to be able to get one even though the
8 State will provide them with one if they don't have one,
9 subject to some identification?

10 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. But what the
11 State did in 2002 was it ratcheted up the difficulty of
12 getting one by requiring for the first time that you
13 have an original certified birth certificate that you
14 paid for and that -- and then you have to go through the
15 hoops of what kind of identification you need for that.

16 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, is it your position
17 that a State can't require any form of identification
18 and can only require a signature, or would some lesser
19 form of identification than Indiana has required be
20 constitutional?

21 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, it may well be
22 possible that there's certain situations that it could
23 require it. Each case is a balancing test. As the
24 Court said in Timmons, you have to make hard judgments
25 on the specific facts of each case and identify both the

1 State interest being served, the incremental State
2 interest being served, and the degree of the burdens.

3 JUSTICE ALITO: What was the answer to my
4 question? Is any form of voter identification beyond a
5 signature permissible or not?

6 MR. SMITH: If it's readily available and
7 not especially burdensome and there is some reason to
8 think that it is preventing a fraud of some sort,
9 serving some --

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, here record
11 establishes --

12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You answer all of those
13 questions that you've just posed, that you've just
14 responded with, "no". So then your answer to Justice
15 Alito should be no.

16 MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, it is true --

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Although that leads to the
18 next question, is whether or not there are ways in which
19 the -- the central purpose of this law can be preserved
20 but it could be less stringent. But I'd like you to
21 respond to both of those things.

22 MR. SMITH: Well, it is certainly true that,
23 in fact, there is no evidence in this record of any
24 significant amount of fraud that is still occurring with
25 the existing system of voter identification.

1 JUSTICE KENNEDY: That wasn't -- that wasn't
2 the problem I had with your answer to that question.
3 You posed a number of questions to Justice Alito, or a
4 number of responses, but to each one of those your own
5 answer in the brief was no, and therefore your question
6 -- the answer to Justice Alito's question should be no,
7 there is no system that you know of that can impose a
8 photo ID.

9 MR. SMITH: I think -- I think that the
10 current system works just fine. So if there's any
11 degree of burden being imposed on the voter by some
12 additional identification requirement, then I would say
13 it's unconstitutional.

14 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Smith --

15 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Your answer is no.

16 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.

17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- suppose at the time of
18 registration there was a photograph taken right in the
19 registration place and on the spot they gave you an ID
20 with that photo, and everybody who registers would get
21 one and there isn't any question of paying money to get
22 a birth certificate. Would that be satisfactory? If
23 that -- if you could make a photographic ID universally
24 available, you would still have the problem of the
25 religious objectors, but wouldn't everybody else be

1 covered?

2 MR. SMITH: If you had a world in which that
3 were true, Your Honor, I think that would be potentially
4 constitutional. That's a very different world than the
5 one we live in, and --

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: That would be
7 potentially constitutional?

8 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.

9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. So we should
10 ignore your religious objection argument in this case?

11 MR. SMITH: Well, I was assuming that we
12 would make some additional exemptions for particular
13 people with those kinds of problems, if people can't
14 have one. If the question is, if everybody has a photo
15 ID in their pocket is it constitutional to require them
16 to show them at the voting booth, the answer to that I
17 think is yes.

18 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, do we know that that
19 religious exemption won't be made?

20 MR. SMITH: Excuse me, Your Honor?

21 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do we know that that
22 religious exemption won't be made? Nobody's asserted
23 it.

24 MR. SMITH: No, I'm not -- I'm not --

25 JUSTICE SCALIA: No, no. I mean in this

1 case. In this case you're claiming there's a problem
2 for people who, for religious reasons, don't want to
3 have their photograph taken. Do we know that if that's
4 the reason that they assert, I can't get the photograph,
5 the State will say you can't vote?

6 MR. SMITH: I must be misunderstanding. We
7 have every reason to think that they will let them vote.
8 The only problem with that exemption, like the indigency
9 exception, is that it's kind of gratuitously burdensome
10 in that you have to go down to the county seat to vote
11 every time; you can't vote in your polling place because
12 you have to fill out this affidavit every time you vote.

13 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And you could, you could
14 do it twice. You could make the two trips, one to your
15 local place and one to the distant place.

16 MR. SMITH: Either way, your real voting
17 place is going to be the county clerk's office in the
18 county seat, forever. That's -- it's not that they
19 won't do it; it's --

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, how far away
21 is the furthest county seat for somebody in the county?

22 MR. SMITH: I don't know the --

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: County seats aren't
24 very far for people in Indiana.

25 MR. SMITH: No. If you're an indigent

1 person, Your Honor, in Lake County, in Gary, Indiana,
2 you'd have to take the bus 17 miles down to Crown Point
3 to vote every time you want to vote. And if you're
4 indigent that's a significant burden, and --

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's not a burden if you're
6 not indigent?

7 MR. SMITH: Well, it's -- it's less of a
8 burden, Your Honor, considerably less of a burden. You
9 --

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: 17 miles is 17 miles for
11 the rich and the poor.

12 MR. SMITH: -- public transportation,
13 because the person presumably has no access to an
14 automobile because they don't have a driver's license
15 and they're indigent and they're living in Gary,
16 Indiana.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We have -- the
18 record shows that fewer than 1 percent of people in
19 Indiana don't have a photo ID.

20 MR. SMITH: That is not what the record
21 shows, Your Honor, and it's not what the district court
22 said. I think it's -- it would be really a travesty if
23 this Court decided the case on that assumption. What
24 the district court said is if you compare the voting age
25 population in the census to the total number of driver's

1 licenses and IDs that have been issued, you get that
2 disparity of 43,000 or 1 percent, but what the district
3 court went on to say is this is probably not accurate
4 because the total of licenses and IDs includes all the
5 people who have died and left the State and their
6 licenses are still unexpired.

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, so do the
8 voting rolls. I thought the district court found 41 --

9 MR. SMITH: No, no. The population --

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Smith.

11 MR. SMITH: So sorry.

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- 41.4 percent of
13 the people on the voting rolls in Indiana were either
14 dead or they were duplicate entries.

15 MR. SMITH: But she wasn't looking at the
16 voting rolls. She was comparing population in the
17 census as of 2005 with the driver's license records.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Do you take issue
19 with the 41.4 percent figure for bad entries on the
20 voting registration rolls?

21 MR. SMITH: No, I have no reason to -- it
22 may have gotten better now. They apparently have
23 instituted a lot of efforts in the last 3 years to make
24 it better, but --

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And this is one of

1 them, I suppose, requiring a photo ID?

2 MR. SMITH: No, I was referring to actually
3 cleaning up the voter rolls in compliance with the
4 consent decree they signed with the United States.

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, don't you
6 think if you have the voter rolls with a significant
7 number of bad registrants, either dead or duplicates,
8 that that presents a significant potential for fraud?

9 MR. SMITH: I suppose. I don't know if I
10 can say significant. The situation has existed for now
11 a number of years, and the salient fact here is that
12 there's not a single recorded example of voter
13 impersonation fraud.

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, that's because
15 it's less of an issue. If somebody wins an election by
16 500,000 votes, you may not be terribly worried if some
17 percentage were cast by fraud, but you might look to the
18 future and realize there could be a closer election and
19 there -- it's a type of fraud that, because it's fraud,
20 it's hard to detect.

21 MR. SMITH: No, it's actually not, Your
22 Honor. It's the type of fraud, as the Election
23 Assistance Commission said -- found is unlikely, the
24 most unlikely, because it's not that hard to detect.
25 When you're going into the polls and saying, I'm Joe

1 Smith, you're dealing with a neighborhood person who
2 knows a lot of people who are there, you have to match
3 that person's signature. And if that person shows up
4 later on to vote --

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But the problem with
6 the duplicate entries is there may be two entries for
7 John Smith because John Smith has moved and the voter
8 registration hasn't been updated. So all you need is
9 somebody else to go in and say: I'm John Smith, this is
10 my address. And later in the day somebody else comes in
11 and says: I'm John Smith and this is my address. And
12 because they're duplicates it's really difficult to
13 check.

14 MR. SMITH: Well, the duplicates,
15 presumably, are in two different places, right. So they
16 would vote in two different places.

17 But if -- what the -- the fraudfeasor
18 doesn't know is where the real John Smith is going to
19 vote. So if he goes in and votes in one place and says,
20 well, I'm going to -- I expect he's going to go in the
21 other place, sooner or later, if you had any significant
22 amount of this kind of fraud occurring, people would be
23 coming in and saying I can't vote. Somebody says I
24 already voted.

25 It's not happening and, indeed, every single

1 indication in this record is that the evidence of this
2 kind of fraud occurring, to call it scant is to
3 overstate it.

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: The people who are dead or
5 have moved away would certainly not be objecting.

6 MR. SMITH: No, Your Honor. I was talking
7 about the disparity between the number of people in the
8 voting-age population and the number of licenses and
9 saying you can't assume it's only a one percent
10 differential. It's actually more like an eight or nine
11 percent differential.

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: I wasn't talking about
13 that. I was talking about whether there is a genuine
14 threat of fraud which the State is moving to eliminate
15 --

16 MR. SMITH: The question ultimately --

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- and your assertion that,
18 you know, it's not much of a problem because the person
19 whom you're impersonating would find out about it. I
20 mean -- but that's certainly not the case for people who
21 have moved away or people, you know, the people in the
22 graveyards that are still on the rolls.

23 MR. SMITH: It's certainly possible that
24 someone could commit this kind of a crime.

25 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'd say likely.

1 MR. SMITH: Well, one of the things that
2 makes it less likely is if you try to actually affect an
3 election you need to sway a lot of votes. And in order
4 to do that this way you'd have to have 100 or 200 or 500
5 co-conspirators, each of them assigned an identity,
6 learning the signature of that person, and --

7 JUSTICE BREYER: You don't really -- I mean,
8 that's what I wonder if there is no such evidence. How
9 could you get evidence? It used to be common maybe
10 urban legends, but of political bosses voting whole
11 graveyards of dead people. All right. Now, that would
12 be almost impossible to catch, I think. Someone walks
13 in, saying: I'm Joe Smith. He doesn't say: I'm Joe
14 Smith dead. He says, I'm Joe Smith, and he signs
15 something. And the poll worker looks at it and the
16 signature looks very weird.

17 Well, what's the poll worker supposed to do?
18 He's not going to go disrupt the election. And is there
19 going to be a policeman there to follow this person
20 home? Of course not.

21 So that's their claim. Their claim is that
22 we have a lot of anecdotes and there is a certain kind
23 of fraud that you really just can't catch at the poll.

24 MR. SMITH: Your Honor --

25 JUSTICE BREYER: Now, what's your response

1 to that? Because that's their argument on the other
2 side.

3 MR. SMITH: First of all, on the point of
4 the anecdotes, I would encourage you to look at the
5 Brennan Center/Demos brief.

6 JUSTICE BREYER: I know there are arguments
7 on both sides. But at the heart of this is what was
8 Judge Posner's claim and others that this isn't the kind
9 of fraud that you can just dismiss and say it never
10 happens because the person would walk into the poll
11 later and try to vote. What they are talking about is
12 what Justice Scalia was talking about, and I'm simply
13 trying to focus your answer on that part of the
14 question.

15 MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, many kinds of
16 fraud do get caught, and they are no more easily
17 detected than this kind of fraud to be detected. But
18 this kind of fraud is not being caught. No one has been
19 punished for this kind of fraud in living memory in this
20 country. This is not --

21 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, they say that's
22 because you can't catch it.

23 MR. SMITH: Well, but Your Honor --

24 JUSTICE BREYER: How would you catch it,
25 which is my question.

1 MR. SMITH: First of all -- first of all,
2 you talk about deterring it. You deter it by the
3 signature match, by having to have the same age, by
4 having to get past people who know a lot of the people
5 in the precinct, and by having very severe criminal
6 penalties. And then you have --

7 JUSTICE ALITO: If this is not a problem at
8 all, how do you account for the fact that the Commission
9 on Federal Election Reform that was co-chaired by former
10 President Carter and former Secretary of State Baker
11 recommended a voter ID requirement, and many other
12 countries around the world have voter ID requirements?

13 MR. SMITH: What they recommended, Your
14 Honor, is exactly what Justice Ginsburg anticipated,
15 which is get everybody the cards, and then we'll be like
16 Europe, and everything will work really fine, and it'll
17 actually help the poor to have these IDs for a lot of
18 other purposes.

19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: As I understand, they
20 were going to have some years in between when their
21 proposal was enacted, and they were going to have a
22 mobile unit going around to all the neighborhoods, lots
23 of advertising, because a premise of that Carter-Baker
24 report was that everybody would easily and costlessly
25 get this photo ID.

1 MR. SMITH: I would encourage the Court to
2 refer to the Democratic Party Exhibit 18, which is an
3 article by Carter, President Carter, and Secretary
4 Baker, following on their report, saying, look, there's
5 a problem here; there's 12 percent of the voting age
6 population of this country doesn't have a license; we
7 did not recommend this being a mandatory thing until we
8 get those licenses in those people's hands.

9 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, why would they even
10 require that if it's not any problem at all? Doesn't it
11 at least show that it is a problem of some dimension,
12 maybe not as severe as Indiana claims, but there would
13 be no need for any sort of photo ID problem,
14 requirement, if there were no problem whatsoever. Isn't
15 that true?

16 MR. SMITH: Some States don't have signature
17 matches. There may have been a minimal amount of
18 additional benefit in some States from having that
19 added. That was a decision they ultimately made, with
20 some dissents.

21 The reality, though, is if you do it not
22 their way, but the Indiana way, which is to say you need
23 an ID, we're not going to help you get it, in fact we're
24 going to ratchet up the requirements for making you get
25 it, and we're going to charge you money for it, then

1 what you have is a very different system. Then you have
2 --

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: They help you get
4 it. They say if you don't have an ID we'll give you
5 one. If you don't have a photo ID, come in and we'll
6 give you one.

7 MR. SMITH: But what the record shows is
8 that 60 percent of the time, when people go in and ask
9 for one, they get sent home, because they don't have the
10 right documentation because the rules --

11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What documentation
12 did President Carter and Secretary Baker propose to
13 require for their photo IDs?

14 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I think they were
15 very strong on having this birth certificate
16 requirement, as well. So they -- they were talking
17 about the real ID law and that sort of thing. So I'm
18 not specific about what the report says on that, but
19 they certainly thought there should be -- obviously, in
20 the wake of 9/11 there is some concern about giving out
21 these things too readily. So I'm reasonably sure they
22 supported a birth certificate requirement as well.

23 JUSTICE ALITO: And if you concede that
24 some kind of voter ID requirement is appropriate, the
25 problem that I have is where do you draw the line on a

1 record like this where there's nothing to quantify in
2 any way the extent of the problem or the extent of the
3 burden, how many people will actually be prevented from
4 voting or significantly burdened from voting as a result
5 of the requirement? How do we tell whether this is on
6 one side of the line or the other side of the line?

7 MR. SMITH: Well, it is a difficult area of
8 the law for you for that reason, Justice Alito. But if
9 you like at Timmons what it says is there's no litmus
10 test, there's no escaping the hard judgments. This is
11 the area where the courts have to be not too deferential
12 even though there are hard judgment calls about matters
13 of degree, because this is an area where the concern is
14 that the legislative branch and the executive branch are
15 going to abuse their power to regulate the electoral
16 process to find subtle ways to skew the outcome on
17 election day.

18 As John Hart Ely said, this is an area where
19 judicial review is the most important, the most
20 legitimate. And so you can't shy away from that even
21 though there are difficult matters of balancing involved
22 and --

23 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, you're telling us
24 that, you know, we've got to be careful and it's
25 difficult. But Justice Alito's question is: What are

1 we supposed to look at, how are we supposed to do it?

2 MR. SMITH: You are supposed to look at how
3 difficult it is to get the ID, what assistance is being
4 provided or not being provided, how much it costs.

5 JUSTICE SOUTER: Let's get down -- let's get
6 down to the question of quantification, which is one of
7 the issues that he raised. What's your response to the
8 issue that there is no quantification of the actual
9 burden measured by the number of voters who are going to
10 be adversely affected? What's the answer to that?

11 MR. SMITH: The answer is that there's
12 plenty of evidence in the record about the number of
13 people in this country who don't have IDs.

14 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, let's talk about
15 Indiana. What have you got -- what is -- what is your
16 best argument for Indiana?

17 MR. SMITH: The best argument for Indiana is
18 if you take the district court's 43,000 figure and you
19 adjust it for the two factors, death and departure, that
20 I mentioned before, the number becomes more like 400,000
21 people in the State of Indiana who lack IDs and are of
22 voting age, eligible -- voting age population people.

23 JUSTICE SOUTER: And how many of them are
24 going to suffer from an unreasonable denial of an
25 opportunity to get the ID which the State will provide

1 through the Bureau of Motor Vehicles? How do we
2 quantify that?

3 MR. SMITH: It is obviously for each person
4 a different matter of degree. The burdens here are
5 along a whole spectrum because some people don't have a
6 birth certificate, some people have -- don't have a
7 birth certificate, but they have money. Some people
8 don't have a birth certificate and they don't have
9 money.

10 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, I know that. That's
11 why it's a tough issue. But how do -- how are we going
12 to -- how is a court going to arrive at some kind of a
13 bottom line judgment on this issue?

14 MR. SMITH: Well, because you -- you
15 basically have to take into account all of those
16 factors: How many people are potentially affected; how
17 difficult it is; how similar it is to, say, a poll tax,
18 for example, and say -- and then look at what purpose is
19 being served here. Is there any real incremental
20 benefit to anything by --

21 JUSTICE SOUTER: Okay, that's on -- that's
22 on the other side of the issue.

23 MR. SMITH: Right.

24 JUSTICE SOUTER: But walk -- walk us through
25 -- if you were writing the opinion and what you wanted

1 to put in the opinion was a reasonable estimate of the
2 number of people who are going to be substantially
3 burdened in having -- who do not now have the
4 identification, substantially burdened in getting it.
5 What approximate number would you arrive at and how
6 would you -- how would you get to it?

7 MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, I would say of
8 that 400,000 voting age people, probably about half of
9 them are registered voters. It stands to reason that
10 most of them are lower income people, and that
11 therefore, the burden even of having to pay for the
12 birth certificate is a significant one. That -- so that
13 a very substantial portion of that 200,000 people in
14 order --

15 JUSTICE STEVENS: Mr. Smith, is there
16 anything in the record about the extent to which the
17 political parties help people get their IDs, as they
18 sometimes drive them to the polls for voting and so
19 forth, the part they play in this process?

20 MR. SMITH: I'm not aware of anything, Your
21 Honor. This is a fairly new law at the time this record
22 was being put together in 2005. But certainly, the
23 parties --

24 JUSTICE STEVENS: Isn't it fair to presume
25 that the parties would play a role in helping people get

1 registered and getting to the polls?

2 MR. SMITH: But, you know, what there is in
3 the record, Your Honor, is the testimony from the
4 Lafayette Urban Ministry, which helps the needy in
5 Lafayette, Indiana. They had 150 people come to them
6 and say: We want your help to get IDs. A year later,
7 less than 75 had succeeded because they found themselves
8 caught in this catch-22, where they went to get a birth
9 certificate, they didn't have a driver's license, they
10 didn't have the other kinds of very narrowly specified
11 IDs they needed, and so they were basically in this
12 bureaucratic maze, and they couldn't get out of it even
13 with the kind of assistance you're imagining, Your
14 Honor.

15 If I might reserve the balance of my time
16 for rebuttal.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
18 Mr. Smith.

19 Mr. Fisher.

20 ORAL ARGUMENT OF THOMAS M. FISHER

21 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS

22 MR. FISHER: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
23 please the Court:

24 There is no evidence in the record of any
25 kind suggesting that 400,000 people in Indiana lack this

1 form of identification. The only evidence in the
2 record --

3 JUSTICE SOUTER: I take it you accept the
4 figure of, what, about 50,000, to be further discounted
5 by those who might vote absentee and so on?

6 MR. FISHER: We've never had a problem. In
7 fact, that data was submitted by the plaintiffs. It
8 came from the Bureau of Motor Vehicles and was matched
9 against census data.

10 I don't think there's ever been any dispute
11 about the accuracy of the record. Now, the judge did
12 acknowledge that there might be some outliers one
13 direction or another, but those cannot possibly account
14 for 10 times the number.

15 JUSTICE SOUTER: No, I just want to -- I
16 just want to know what your figure -- Mr. Smith was
17 starting with 400 and then getting it down to 2 and so
18 on. And my recollection in the red brief is that you
19 said, all right, let's take the 43,000 figure. I forget
20 what you discounted it for, but it got it down to
21 25,000. Some of those would be able to vote absentee,
22 but this -- I take it you're conceding that, at least
23 subject to some discount, there are probably about
24 25,000 people who may be affected by this adversely. Is
25 that fair?

1 MR. FISHER: Well, I think we would say that
2 that's the number -- that's the number that could
3 conceivably be inconvenienced by this law. Now, to put
4 that in perspective, I think you have to compare it, for
5 example, to the number of people who are not registered
6 to vote, because there again that's an incidental
7 burden. That is something that inconveniences some
8 people.

9 And we're talking about 35 times more -- in
10 terms of a percentage, we're talking about 66.8 percent
11 or so of the population that reports being registered to
12 vote, far short of the percentage based on the
13 calculations of the district court or anything in the
14 ballpark of that that don't have photo identification.
15 So we're talking about an infinitesimal portion of the
16 electorate that could even be, conceivably be burdened
17 by this.

18 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, isn't that a little
19 bit of a stretch, too, when you say "infinitesimal"? I
20 mean, if you take your two-thirds figure and so on,
21 isn't it fair to say that you're probably going to get
22 down to something like 10,000 people or 10,000 plus who
23 are going to be affected in the sense that they're going
24 to have to scurry around if, if they're going to get the
25 appropriate ID?

1 MR. FISHER: And at that level, you're
2 talking about less than a half a percent of the total
3 electorate. This is -- this is --

4 JUSTICE SOUTER: Okay. But 10 -- isn't the
5 concern over 10,000 voters a sufficiently substantial
6 concern to -- to be considered as something more than
7 merely de minimis and is something that should count in
8 a facial challenge?

9 MR. FISHER: Well, if that's going to be the
10 case, then you're going to have a big problem with voter
11 registration, which is a far bigger problem for more
12 voters. That is a procedure that the Court has long
13 accepted, has endorsed multiple times, and yet continues
14 --

15 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, we haven't
16 endorsed -- I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, but we
17 haven't endorsed a registration procedure that would
18 require as much documentation and as much travel as --
19 as the -- as this voter ID procedure would, have we?

20 MR. FISHER: The point I'm making is that if
21 we're going to look at the percent conceivably burdened
22 by the law, then voter registration is called into
23 question. And I don't think that the Democratic Party
24 argues against that. I think in their reply brief they
25 accept that that's a possible response.

1 Now, it's also terribly significant that we
2 don't have anybody in front of this Court in this case
3 who's injured by this law.

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: And why, why can't the
5 people injured by this law appear themselves and say the
6 law can't be applied to us? You seem to accept that a
7 facial challenge is appropriate here. Why is -- some
8 different kind of a facial challenge. I thought in the
9 usual facial challenge you have to show that there is no
10 situation in which the law cannot be constitutionally
11 applied.

12 MR. FISHER: I agree with that. I don't
13 think that that -- that we take any issue with that
14 notion.

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: Then why are we arguing
16 about whether there is one half of one percent of the
17 electorate who may be adversely affected and as to whom
18 it might be unconstitutional? That one half of one
19 percent, if and when it is sought to be applied to them,
20 have a cause of action to say you can't apply it to me.
21 But why -- what precedent is there for knocking down
22 this entire law on a facial challenge when I think
23 everybody agrees that in the vast majority of cases it
24 doesn't impose a significant hardship?

25 MR. FISHER: None. I think that that's

1 exactly the point. That's why we argue there's no
2 standing.

3 JUSTICE SOUTER: You agree that if you're
4 going to take the -- if this Court takes the Salerno
5 standard, there can never be a facial challenge to a
6 registration requirement, a voter ID requirement. In
7 other words, it's not merely that this facial challenge
8 would be knocked out; there never could be one.

9 MR. FISHER: Well, I'm not sure that's the
10 case. And if you look back at Marston, the voter
11 registration --

12 JUSTICE SOUTER: Salerno says unless there
13 are no cases, the facial challenge is inappropriate.
14 And that -- in the real world that will never be true
15 with respect to a -- a voter ID law, will it?

16 MR. FISHER: Well, I hope not. But I think
17 that the Court has shown --

18 JUSTICE SOUTER: It never will be true, will
19 it?

20 MR. FISHER: Right.

21 JUSTICE SOUTER: So there will never be --
22 if that's going to be the standard, there will never be
23 a facial challenge.

24 MR. FISHER: I'm not sure that that's
25 terribly significant, because if you have an as-applied

1 challenge --

2 JUSTICE SOUTER: But there never will be one,
3 will there?

4 MR. FISHER: As to an as-applied challenge?
5 I don't know why not.

6 JUSTICE SOUTER: No, as to a pre-enforcement
7 facial challenge to a law like this.

8 MR. FISHER: I think it could be
9 pre-enforcement and as-applied in a way that could have
10 ultimately --

11 JUSTICE SOUTER: Yes, but I want you to
12 answer my question.

13 MR. FISHER: I'm sorry. Yes, I think that's
14 true.

15 JUSTICE SOUTER: We're not going to have
16 facial challenges here, are we?

17 MR. FISHER: Right.

18 JUSTICE SOUTER: Okay.

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Does that scare you,
20 Mr. Fisher, that there can't be a facial challenge?

21 MR. FISHER: No.

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: I mean, every facial
23 challenge is an immense dictum on the part of this
24 Court, isn't it?

25 MR. FISHER: I think that's right.

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: This Court is sitting back
2 and looking at the ceiling and saying, oh, we can
3 envision not the case before us, but other cases. Maybe
4 it's one half of one percent or maybe it's 45 percent,
5 who knows. But we can imagine cases in which this law
6 could be unconstitutional, and therefore, the whole law
7 is unconstitutional. That's not ordinarily the way
8 courts behave, is it?

9 MR. FISHER: I should hope not.

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Now, we've done that in the
11 First Amendment area.

12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That is not the case that
13 you are confronting.

14 JUSTICE SOUTER: That's right.

15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: I mean, the reason they
16 are bringing a facial challenge is because the horse is
17 going to be out of the barn. They will have the
18 election, and just what they are afraid of could happen,
19 that the result will be skewed in favor of the opposite
20 party, because there are people who have not been able
21 to vote. So, if you're going to talk about what is the
22 impact of this, they are in this bind after the
23 election -- well -- they've always -- already lost that
24 one.

25 Now, there is something in the briefs that

1 happened after this case was instituted, but we know
2 from Marion County that there were 34 people who were
3 not able to have a vote counted. And of those 34, only
4 two ended up qualifying after the fact. So, we know
5 that in that one particular county, most of the people
6 who were unable to satisfy the requirement initially
7 ended up not satisfying it.

8 Is that -- I mean that's not hypothetical.
9 That's real. But it does give you some confirmation
10 that it isn't mere speculation that there are going to
11 be many people who will not -- whose vote will not
12 count.

13 MR. FISHER: With respect, Your Honor, for
14 all we know, those may have been fraudulent ballots. It
15 may well be the case that all 32 who did not show up to
16 validate their votes are fraudulent.

17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: It's the same board that
18 said in all our experience, in all of our memory, there
19 has never been an impersonator.

20 MR. FISHER: And that goes back to how we
21 would know, because without an ID check, it's impossible
22 to detect this kind of fraud.

23 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, if you're worried
24 about fraud --

25 MR. FISHER: I'm sorry.

1 JUSTICE BREYER: If you're worried about
2 fraud, what I don't understand, and I'd like to track it
3 through with you, is the registration system. As I read
4 the Indiana voter registration application, all a person
5 has to do to register is to write in, enclose a utility
6 bill that has his name and address, and if he doesn't
7 have a photo ID, he can write the four numbers of his
8 Social Security; and if he doesn't have that either he
9 doesn't have to do anything, and they will give him a
10 number -- and you mail it in. And you're registered.

11 So all a person would have to do if he wants
12 to be fraudulent is make out a fraud one of those, and
13 he has a photo ID; he can go to the polls. So my
14 question to you is this: given that system of
15 registration, focusing on the issue before us, why don't
16 you just say and we'll give to you -- you put on -- if
17 you don't have a photo ID, we'll give you one. Now
18 there it would not stand as an obstacle; that apparently
19 is what Georgia has done. And it doesn't require people
20 to go out and spend \$10 or \$5 or something digging up
21 their birth certificate, which if you tried to do, is
22 quite a job for many people.

23 And therefore, you'd have all the things you
24 want. All you would do is with the 43,000 people who
25 don't have the IDs, you'd say we'll get you one. No big

1 deal. You have a photo machine there when they come in
2 to register; they have to go down; you take a picture of
3 them and you hand it to them. And I would think that
4 that less restrictive way would satisfy your anti-fraud
5 interests far better than the way you've chosen, but I
6 leave my judgment out of it. I just would like you to
7 talk through why that isn't a less restrictive way,
8 which is far better in achieving your anti-fraud
9 interests, or at least as good.

10 MR. FISHER: Well, because I think we want
11 to have an ID that has some integrity to it. I mean,
12 this is a balancing test that the legislature itself
13 went through, which is to say they wanted to adopt a
14 form of identification that might be effective and has
15 been proven effective and has been accepted the world
16 over as the standard form of identification. And --

17 JUSTICE BREYER: We are going to give -- all
18 we are doing is, we will give you the photo. It has
19 nothing to do with validity. That photo proves that
20 Mr. Smith who comes in and asks for it is the same
21 Mr. Smith who registered to vote. And that's all your
22 system does in the first place. So what is the answer
23 to that?

24 MR. FISHER: I think again that we, on the
25 front end part of it is we are hamstrung on how we can

1 regulate voter registration, in part by the National
2 Voter Registration Act. Let me just make that part of
3 it clear.

4 JUSTICE BREYER: I'm not arguing about that.
5 I'm saying your whole -- I'll repeat it once more. I'm
6 saying your whole system is a system designed to assure
7 that the person at the voting booth is the same as the
8 person who registers. I accept that, absolutely right.
9 And I'm simply saying given that, why didn't you say
10 Mr. Proto -- Mr. Likely, like to register: "Come in.
11 If you don't have a photo ID, we will give you one."
12 Now, what's the objection to that?

13 MR. FISHER: I think in part it's the
14 administrative apparatus. I mean, we are buying into --
15 right now into a system that already exists, and in fact
16 with voter registration at the BMV as it's required, in
17 many ways, that is what we have. You go to the BMV
18 anyway for other things.

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Suppose you -- you have
20 your photograph taken when you register. You're really
21 an out-of-State person, you go in and register, you make
22 up an address, you come in, you have your photograph
23 taken; it proves that you were the person that
24 registers. It doesn't prove that you were the person
25 that lives at that address, or that you are of such and

1 such an age and whatnot, which the -- the means of
2 identification that you require would show, wouldn't it?

3 JUSTICE STEVENS: But you don't -- you don't
4 have a photo identification required at registration,
5 do you?

6 MR. FISHER: No, we don't. That's right.

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: You can't, can you?

8 MR. FISHER: I don't think we can. I think
9 there are problems with that. That -- that was a
10 different battle --

11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And even so, is there
12 anything that prohibits the State from confirming the
13 validity of the registration at the polling place?

14 MR. FISHER: No. I think that's the main
15 point here, which is it's at that point where the ballot
16 is being cast, which is where we want to know the
17 identification, and where we want to --

18 JUSTICE STEVENS: Why wouldn't you have the
19 same interest in being sure the registration is correct?
20 I don't understand that.

21 MR. FISHER: Well, we -- well, I think we
22 may very well, but I think the policy --

23 JUSTICE STEVENS: Why wouldn't you require
24 photo ID then?

25 MR. FISHER: Well, I think the policy struck

1 nationally, under motor voter, is to have an easy
2 registration system, so that it may be problematic to
3 introduce additional limits.

4 JUSTICE STEVENS: Is it the policy to have
5 it tougher to vote than to register? That doesn't make
6 sense to me.

7 MR. FISHER: Well, I think the theory is
8 easy --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think the national
10 policy is to make it both easy to register and easy
11 to vote.

12 MR. FISHER: Well, and tough to cheat,
13 hopefully, is the backside of that, which is what the
14 idea is trying to do.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Fisher, you make
16 -- rely on the argument that 40 percent of the
17 registrants -- or not registrants, the people on the --
18 yes, registrants -- on the voter list are -- are not
19 accurate. That argument is a little difficult to -- to
20 take because what you're saying is we do such a lousy
21 job on registration that we should be able to do a --
22 have a more stringent voting requirement. Why do you do
23 such a lousy job on registration?

24 MR. FISHER: Well, I think that -- that part
25 of the responsibility there does lie again with the

1 National Voter Registration Act which limits how we may
2 maintain those lists. The problem has grown since --

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I thought you were
4 sued by the Federal Government because you did such a
5 bad job.

6 MR. FISHER: There may be -- there's part of
7 it is the responsibility on our end, but part of it is
8 also the -- the hoops we have to jump through pursuant
9 to the National Voter Registration Act, and we've got a
10 situation unfortunately where with inflated voter lists,
11 with reports of fraud around the country, the General
12 Assembly is legitimately concerned about voter confidence
13 and the legitimacy of elections, and that's precisely
14 what this law is trying to target. Trying to reassure
15 voters --

16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: How does Indiana stack up
17 against other States in the inflation of the voter
18 rolls?

19 MR. FISHER: We are among the most inflated.
20 I can't give you precise ranking but the expert that we
21 brought forward said we are among the most inflated.

22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And you are under a
23 consent decree to do something about that?

24 MR. FISHER: That's right, and we are taking
25 those steps. Now I think it's important to bear in mind

1 that -- that the parties to the consent decree at the
2 State level, while they can identify individuals who
3 have -- have dormant registrations, and they can send
4 those names, names that can be canceled to the local
5 authorities, the local authorities are under no -- no
6 responsibility under the consent decree or otherwise to
7 -- to cancel those. And in fact the expert report that
8 we had indicated that there were a number -- in 1998, I
9 think -- a number of duplicates and decedent
10 registrations that were sent to the local authorities,
11 only 30 percent of which were canceled.

12 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, are you making the
13 argument that you can place a heavier burden on voters
14 to identify themselves because your State officials
15 refuse to follow the law?

16 MR. FISHER: Well, I think it's part of it,
17 is --

18 JUSTICE SOUTER: I think that's the argument
19 you were just making.

20 MR. FISHER: Well --

21 JUSTICE SOUTER: Even when we identify the
22 duplicates, the local officials are still leaving them
23 in the polls. I mean, surely you're not going to rest
24 your case on that, are you?

25 MR. FISHER: Well, I think the larger point

1 is that when we've got a situation where there is an
2 obvious gap in security at the polls, where the public
3 expects to show ID -- and -- as they would in any
4 ordinary, everyday situation -- that is going to create
5 a lack of confidence, particularly when combined with
6 what we have ended up with.

7 JUSTICE SOUTER: But you're still making the
8 argument that there's a lack of confidence because our
9 local officials won't cull the rolls of dead voters.

10 MR. FISHER: Not exclusively. That is true;
11 that's part of the argument, but the other part is that
12 there is a reasonable and obvious step that the State
13 can take to ensure that there is no fraud at the polls.

14 JUSTICE SOUTER: Maybe there is a
15 reasonable, obvious step you can take to make your
16 officials obey the law when you tell them how to do it.

17 MR. FISHER: Well, we are limited even at
18 that by the NVRA.

19 JUSTICE SOUTER: Now wait a minute. Are you
20 telling me that you are limited by some Federal statute
21 from preventing local officials -- I'm sorry, from
22 forcing local officials to take the action to cull the
23 rolls of dead voters, when you have identified those
24 dead voters for them?

25 MR. FISHER: No, I'm not saying that, but I

1 am saying --

2 JUSTICE SOUTER: Then -- then it's Indiana's
3 responsibility to cull those rolls. Right?

4 MR. FISHER: Consistent with the NVRA, yes.

5 JUSTICE SOUTER: It's not a legitimate
6 argument to say we can put a heavier burden on
7 identifying -- on voters to identify themselves because
8 our officials are being contumacious. You don't rest on
9 that argument?

10 MR. FISHER: No, not at all.

11 JUSTICE SOUTER: Okay, good. I thought you
12 were.

13 MR. FISHER: No, that's not my theory. But
14 --

15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: One aspect of your system
16 -- I know your time is about to expire -- but it seems
17 to me that every indigent person in -- who doesn't have
18 a photo ID is put to a burden that the mass of voters
19 are not put to -- that is either the two-step process
20 and not going to my local precinct, but having to go to
21 the county courthouse. That burden is on every indigent
22 person who doesn't have a photo ID, so we are not
23 speculating about numbers. That would be true for every
24 indigent person who doesn't have photo ID, right?

25 MR. FISHER: Who -- right, and who would

1 have to pay a fee to get -- to get the ID.

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: And for nonindigent people.
3 I mean, there may be --

4 MR. FISHER: Well, that's right. Anybody
5 who --

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Some very well-to-do
7 elderly, who don't drive, and they are in the same
8 position, no?

9 MR. FISHER: Well, and who can also vote
10 absentee without ID. But anybody who forgets their
11 identification on election day, for example, would have
12 to go through the same process, where they would cast a
13 provisional ballot and then have to return to the clerk
14 within 10 days.

15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, they can go home
16 and get the identification and go back to their
17 precinct; that's what the indigent can't do.

18 MR. FISHER: Or a nonindigent person who
19 doesn't have ID but then needs to go to the BMV.

20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: If we thought that the
21 birth certificate requirement for indigent people was --
22 was burdensome, are there any States where they have
23 alternates to birth certificates? Do neighbors come in
24 and testify that this is the person? And I was going to
25 ask the Petitioners' counsel if there's some areas where

1 this statute -- where the central purpose and the
2 central function of this statute can be preserved but
3 there can be some reasonable alternatives for people who
4 have difficulty?

5 MR. FISHER: Well, let me do point out one
6 category where there are some reasonable alternatives.
7 With respect -- in Indiana -- with respect to the
8 elderly who can swear that they were never issued a
9 birth certificate, there is an alternate means of
10 identification, but that's the only category.

11 The other thing we run into is the REAL ID
12 Act. If Indiana wants to have an identification card
13 that can be acceptable in Federal facilities, it's going
14 to have to have minimal criteria for issuing those photo
15 identifications. And so I think with respect to that,
16 it would not be permissible to get around a birth
17 certificate, which is kind of a foundational document.
18 I mean there are alternatives, such as a passport, but I
19 don't -- you know, I don't mean to suggest that that's
20 necessarily going to be easier than it is to get a birth
21 certificate. It's just that --

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Don't you need a birth
23 certificate to get a passport?

24 MR. FISHER: Well, that's what I mean.

25 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes. So maybe that's

1 unconstitutional too.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. FISHER: Yes. And it -- it's worth
4 bearing in mind that this form of identification is
5 necessary to do so many everyday activities, and it's
6 not as if the State of Indiana went out and created an
7 entirely new system to impose on the entire electorate,
8 that everybody would have to start from square one. The
9 vast majority of voters are already in compliance with
10 this law, and the decision of the General Assembly, that
11 it is a reasonable step to take for a measure of
12 election security to bring the State's voting system
13 into the 21st century and to require the same photo
14 identification that you have to show typically to get on
15 an airplane, to get into many Federal courthouses, is a
16 reasonable step in the right direction to preserve voter
17 confidence.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
19 Mr. Fisher.

20 MR. FISHER: Thank you.

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: General Clement.

22 ORAL ARGUMENT OF GEN. PAUL D. CLEMENT

23 ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES,

24 AS AMICUS CURIAE,

25 SUPPORTING THE RESPONDENTS

1 GENERAL CLEMENT: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
2 it please the Court:

3 Any system of voting that involves
4 registrations or precincts will necessarily require some
5 mechanism for ascertaining a voter's identity.
6 Accordingly Petitioners cannot take issue with the
7 constitutionality of some mechanism for ascertaining
8 voter ID. And I take it from today's argument that they
9 would concede the constitutionality of a signature match
10 requirement. Likewise, nobody can really dispute the
11 proposition that a government-issued photo ID is an
12 awfully good way of verifying someone's identity.

13 So the dispute really boils down to, in a
14 system where the States can legitimately ask for some
15 kind of basis to ascertain ID, can they insist on a
16 particularly good one, the photo ID? And we would
17 suggest that there's nothing in the First or Fourteenth
18 Amendments that precludes that from happening.

19 Now, with respect to the nature of this
20 challenge, I think one thing that's very evident from
21 the questions is this was a challenge that was brought
22 to the statute on its face and was brought before there
23 was any enforcement of the statute or any significant
24 enforcement of the statute. Now, I would respectfully
25 suggest that there's a better way to test the

1 constitutional of these statutes.

2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Before you do that,
3 General Clement, I'd like to you to concentrate on the
4 one group of people where I think you can make a facial
5 challenge and you're not off speculating, and that's the
6 indigent people who can't get -- don't have the photo
7 ID. They don't drive, and they can't get up the money
8 to get the birth certificate or whatever else. They do
9 have a burden that, it seems to me, the State could
10 easily eliminate if they want those people to vote, and
11 that is to say okay, do the affidavit, the whole thing
12 in your local precinct; we'll make it easy for you and
13 not send you away, send you off to the county courthouse
14 to get it validated. Why -- why, if you really wanted
15 people to vote, wouldn't you do it that way?

16 GENERAL CLEMENT: Well, Justice Ginsburg, I
17 mean I can understand that you're concerned with that
18 aspect of the statute and the fact that you can't
19 execute an indigency affidavit in the polling place. I
20 don't know why that's a basis for a facial challenge
21 though. In particular, I think if you look at the
22 plaintiffs, the individual members, if they are members
23 of the Indiana party that have been identified, they've
24 certainly identified people who do not have the ID
25 currently. I'm not sure that they were specific as to

1 whether they were indigent or not. I'm not sure the
2 individuals, the nine individuals, were really parsed
3 out that way. And I would think the far better way to
4 go about dealing with that issue is to take as a
5 starting point -- I mean you pointed out that there were
6 32 provisional ballots cast in the Marion County
7 election. Now, I gather from the State that's something
8 like 0.02 percent of the ballots cast. So it suggests
9 that this is not a monumental problem, but those 32
10 provisional ballots seem to me to be 32 possible
11 plaintiffs with a much more concrete case --

12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But I'm concentrating --

13 GENERAL CLEMENT: -- than anything we have
14 before us.

15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- just on -- just on
16 that one class of people.

17 GENERAL CLEMENT: Sure.

18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And that's not going to
19 change after the election. I mean here is a group of
20 people who are being put to a burden of going someplace
21 else. And my only question is, why couldn't the system
22 make it easy for them if we really want to help America
23 to vote, all Americans, and say we'll do it in the local
24 precinct, somebody will be there to help you fill out
25 the affidavit, instead of doing it in a way that's

1 really going to discourage people from voting?

2 GENERAL CLEMENT: And, Justice Ginsburg, I
3 mean I see your concern, and I think if we had an
4 as-applied challenge that wasn't this kind of grab bag
5 challenge that looks at all the various different
6 classes of people that might be adversely affected, if
7 we had a challenge that focused on that particular
8 issue, I would imagine -- I don't know for sure -- I
9 would imagine that the State would probably put on some
10 evidence that says, look, there's a reason we did it
11 that way; we piggybacked on the general provisional
12 ballot provisions and what we decided is that, if we had
13 people executing indigency affidavits at the polling
14 place, it would add to the lines at the polls.

15 JUSTICE SOUTER: The State didn't make that
16 argument now. I mean we don't have to wait until after
17 an election to hear that, any more than we have to wait
18 until after an election to identify the voters that
19 Justice Ginsburg has.

20 GENERAL CLEMENT: But with respect, Justice
21 Souter, I mean that's not the way this challenge
22 proceeded. I mean there was a challenge to everything
23 under the sun, to the whole sort of -- this statute ab
24 initio, and it wasn't something that really put the
25 State on notice that that was the nub of the dispute and

1 would put evidence in the record that might join the
2 issue.

3 And again I would say, of course, if there
4 were that kind of as-applied challenge, one of the
5 virtues of it would be that the remedy at the end of the
6 day would not be to strike the statute down on its face,
7 but it would be an injunction consistent with the
8 teaching of this Court in Ayotte that said, look, you
9 need to have -- you need to be enjoined to offer the
10 affidavits at the polling place --

11 JUSTICE SOUTER: That would be a --

12 GENERAL CLEMENT: -- because --

13 JUSTICE SOUTER: That would be a virtue, but
14 one of the vices would be that it would be after the
15 election and the entire matter would be academic for
16 another 2 years, until another 2 years had passed.

17 GENERAL CLEMENT: Well, I don't think so. I
18 mean, at this point, like I said -- I mean we have these
19 32 potential plaintiffs.

20 JUSTICE SCALIA: The provisional ballots
21 would be counted, I assume.

22 GENERAL CLEMENT: What's that?

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: The provisional ballots
24 would be counted. The ones that were unconstitutionally
25 prevented from voting, those ballots would be counted.

1 GENERAL CLEMENT: Well, if the claim could
2 be brought in sufficient time, I suppose it would.

3 JUSTICE SOUTER: And if we assume that
4 everyone who has a decent claim under this Act went
5 through the hoops to get the provisional ballot at the
6 -- whatever the county office is and --

7 GENERAL CLEMENT: Sure.

8 JUSTICE SOUTER: -- that's an assumption
9 which need not necessarily be made.

10 GENERAL CLEMENT: But, conversely, nowhere
11 is it -- nowhere is it a rational assumption that all 32
12 of these individuals has a great claim. It may be that
13 some of them are people who just forgot their ID --

14 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, I'm not
15 concentrating --

16 GENERAL CLEMENT: -- and for those people I
17 don't think they have much of a claim.

18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: I was trying to deal with
19 this one category of person, and the State -- it was
20 addressed, and the State said, well, we can't do it that
21 way because that will lead to congestion at the polling
22 place. But it seems to me that that is powerfully hard
23 to reconcile with the claim that there are so few of
24 these people it's not really a problem. If there are so
25 few of them, then I don't understand why they should be

1 put to the burden of going someplace other than the
2 polling place.

3 GENERAL CLEMENT: Well, Justice Ginsburg, I
4 mean I think there's a rational justification for that
5 which is that, you know, if -- especially if there are
6 only a handful of these people, is do you really want to
7 instruct every poll worker at every precinct on how to
8 deal with this unusual situation or do you want to say,
9 you know, that's sort of an outlying situation, let's
10 instruct one poll worker at the county elections office
11 how to deal with it?

12 Now, at the end of the day, you may not be
13 persuaded that that's the way to do it. I think that's
14 a reasonable argument, but an as-applied challenge could
15 focus like a laser beam on those particular voters and
16 those challenges. You could have particular indigent
17 voters in front of you.

18 And it seems to me that that's the
19 preferable way to adjudicate these kind of claims, and I
20 think what this Court could do is this Court could
21 reject the facial challenge that is before it here, but
22 leave open the possibility of that as-applied challenge,
23 or one could certainly imagine a veteran who has a
24 Federal photo ID without an expiration date who comes
25 into court and says, look, it's irrational to make me go

1 get a different form of ID. That as-applied challenge
2 could go forward.

3 JUSTICE KENNEDY: If we did that, I assume
4 challenges could be made in advance of the election.

5 GENERAL CLEMENT: I don't see any reason why
6 they couldn't be. I mean it might depend a little bit
7 on the nature of the challenge.

8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And presumably the
9 challenges could be adjudicated. You have 10 days to go
10 down to the courthouse when you file a provisional
11 ballot, and if it turns out the election was decided by
12 three votes and there are 30 provisional ballots,
13 presumably the challenge can be brought at that point as
14 well.

15 GENERAL CLEMENT: That is true, and there is
16 a provision for judicial review under Indiana law, of
17 the provisional ballots, if there's an ongoing dispute.
18 But I also take the point that some of this could be
19 taken care of well in advance of the election, which is
20 actually, I think, a very healthy way to deal with
21 election disputes. And so my hypothetical veteran with
22 the card, he has got the card in his wallet right now,
23 or her wallet right now. They can go get --

24 JUSTICE STEVENS: Is it not unrealistic to
25 assume it would be easier to file a lawsuit and go all

1 through the burden of litigation rather than go back to
2 get the second affidavit? If you're challenging two
3 affidavits, you know, to have a Federal case over it
4 seems a little bit improbable.

5 GENERAL CLEMENT: You know, it may be,
6 Justice Stevens, that it's easier to get somebody to
7 help you out with the Federal case than it is with the
8 second -- with the second affidavit. I don't know. I
9 mean, you know, I think if you look around where there
10 have been these laws --

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Things called class
12 actions, right?

13 GENERAL CLEMENT: Yes. I think, if you look
14 where there have been these laws, there have been -- the
15 one observed phenomenon there definitely is is litigation.

16 So I do think that these claims will be
17 brought. I just really think that in choosing the mode
18 of litigation, you know, Justice Kennedy for the Court
19 in the partial-birth case said that as-applied
20 challenges are the basic building block of adjudication.

21 And this seems like a particularly
22 appropriate case to apply that lesson, because I can
23 imagine there --

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Do you think there
25 is standing in this case to bring the facial challenge?

1 GENERAL CLEMENT: I think it's a close
2 question, Mr. Chief Justice. I would say that I think
3 there is standing. I think the standing that exists
4 here is the standing to represent the nine or so
5 individuals that are addressed specifically on pages 49a
6 and 51a of the district court opinion. Those are
7 individuals who do not have photo IDs.

8 I think that as to the membership issue,
9 boy, if the Indiana Democratic Party has any members,
10 its probably these individuals, because they are poll
11 workers and active in the parties.

12 And what I would say about those
13 individuals, though, is that it is telling that the only
14 individuals they have been able to identify who don't
15 have photo IDs also happen to be elderly individuals who
16 can, by right, vote by absentee ballot.

17 Now, that's not to say -- and I would -- I
18 would concede there is a legally protected interest in
19 voting in person sufficient to cross the Article III
20 threshold. But I think, when you are looking for the
21 real world impact, it is telling that the people they
22 have been able to identify do have a ready mechanism
23 available to them.

24 JUSTICE STEVENS: General Clement, if you
25 look at the real world impact and you ask whether the

1 Democratic Party has standing to challenge the law, is
2 it relevant that the State legislature is split entirely
3 on party lines?

4 GENERAL CLEMENT: May I answer the question?
5 You know, I don't think that's relevant in this -- I
6 would hate to think that a party line vote would
7 necessarily give the other party standing as a general
8 rule.

9 I don't think that you would adopt that, and
10 this goes out of the record, of course, to a recent
11 study. But the one study that's been done actually
12 shows that the Democratic Party did well in the 2006
13 elections, and turnout went up a little bit.

14 JUSTICE STEVENS: But don't you think it's
15 fair to infer that this law does have an adverse impact
16 on the Democrats that is different from its impact on
17 the Republicans?

18 GENERAL CLEMENT: Well, again, if I could
19 answer, I mean I would just say that, you know, if this
20 was a cleverly designed mechanism by the Republican
21 Party to disadvantage the Democratic Party, at least in
22 2006 it looks like it went pretty far awry from their
23 perspective.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, General
25 Clement. Mr. Smith, three minutes.

1 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL M. SMITH
2 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS

3 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 Let me start by addressing the question of
5 what reasonable alternatives there are to the strict law
6 that we are dealing with here. This is the most strict
7 law in the country. And what you have when you look at
8 the range of laws that are out there in other States is
9 a very different set of responses that occur when a
10 voter shows up without an ID in hand.

11 In Michigan and several other States, for
12 example, the response is to say: All right, we are
13 going to make you fill out an affidavit attesting to who
14 you are, and that you are a registered voter; that you
15 live in this precinct; and we'll let you go ahead and
16 vote a regular ballot.

17 That in those States they -- they consider
18 that a sufficient safeguard while looking at the IDs of
19 all the people who have the IDs.

20 In Florida they have a different approach,
21 which is to let you vote a provisional ballot, and then
22 what they do is they judge your signature match later on
23 in exactly the same process that's used for absentee
24 ballots.

25 We have a lot of information in this record

1 about why it's okay to have absentee ballots allowed
2 without an ID in Indiana, and they say, well, we have
3 these specialized committees that know how to do
4 signature matches; and they are trained; and so we get
5 thousands of these absentee ballots in. But we can very
6 carefully scrutinize them.

7 You could very easily do exactly the same
8 thing with respect to the provisional ballots cast by
9 people who show up without their ID without --

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Who do you do with
11 illiterates who don't have a signature? Do you match
12 "Xs," or what?

13 MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor --

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Aren't there going to be
15 problems under any system you imagine?

16 MR. SMITH: Yes, there are; and it's this
17 Court's job under the Burdick line of cases to weigh the
18 benefits and the burdens and come out with the
19 appropriate decision about whether the legislature went
20 too hard -- far.

21 Let me talk a little bit about this facial
22 versus as-applied approach. To paraphrase King Lear:
23 That way lies madness, Your Honor. This Court has never
24 looked at these issues on an as-applied basis.

25 The Burdick test, in its very nature, is

1 about facial weighing of systemic benefits and burdens
2 from the particular rule. And there is a reason for
3 that, because the concern is systemic; that the burdens
4 that are being imposed, a whole range of them depending
5 on the kind of people involved and their particular
6 circumstances, will have an effect on the outcome of the
7 election overall.

8 Imagine, if you will, what it would be like
9 to try to have all these class actions being brought,
10 some by the people who don't have IDs, some by the
11 people who have IDs but don't have enough money. You
12 would have to figure out exactly how much money people
13 are allowed to have in order to be in this exempt class.

14 The courts would then be creating exempt
15 classes, trying to decide whether the legislature would
16 have wanted an exemption drawn or not. The whole thing
17 would be a complete and utter morass. And, ultimately,
18 even if you did carve out an exemption for indigent
19 people or for some other group of people, you ultimately
20 would leave untouched the real problem, which is the
21 concern that even for people who are relatively --
22 suffer relatively minor inconvenience, maybe one percent
23 of them are not going to show up and vote.

24 And that's exactly what the legislature may
25 have been trying to accomplish here. So that is not the

1 way the jurisprudence in this area ever looks at it.
2 Nobody applied the poll -- nobody challenged the poll
3 tax as-applied.

4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You want us to invalidate
5 a statute on the ground that it's a minor inconvenience
6 to a small percentage of voters?

7 MR. SMITH: That it imposes a range of
8 burdens on people from quite severe to less severe, and
9 those burdens vastly outweigh the -- any incremental
10 State interest that is being served, Your Honor.

11 That's our -- our analysis, and I think it's
12 certainly completely consistent with every decision
13 right up through *Clingman* a couple of years ago. That's
14 the test that this Court applies.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You said it serves
16 no purpose. What if we determine that it does serve a
17 purpose in preventing fraud? How are we supposed to
18 weigh that against your asserted burden on the right to
19 vote?

20 MR. SMITH: Well, you have to make some
21 judgment about the incremental, additional benefit above
22 what's already been in place for decades, and it worked
23 extremely effectively, Your Honor. And, obviously, you
24 do the balancing. I'm just the advocate here. But it
25 seems to me you have to say is there any real benefit

1 here compared to these burdens?

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, if you want to talk
3 about increments, why shouldn't we also ask whether our
4 judgment does more harm than good; whether -- whether
5 the remedy for -- for the inconvenience to a small
6 number of people is to wash away the whole statute,
7 which in most of its applications is perfectly okay?
8 Why don't we do that weighing of benefits and burdens of
9 increments versus needs?

10 MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, I think the
11 number of people who are adversely affected is part of
12 the analysis. But if you come in and you come to the
13 conclusion that there is essentially no real,
14 significant benefit from making all of these other
15 people who have IDs show them, then the balance comes
16 out that you throw the law out. That's the way the
17 analysis works.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
19 Mr. Smith. The case is submitted.

20 (Whereupon, at 11:07 a.m., the case in the
21 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

22

23

24

25

A				
ab 55:23	add 55:14	agree 5:10 9:11	41:8	arrive 29:12
ability 6:25	added 25:19	35:12 36:3	anybody 6:3	30:5
able 12:4,5,7	addition 10:4	agrees 35:23	9:12,24 11:16	article 25:3
32:21 38:20	additional 14:12	ahead 63:15	35:2 49:4,10	61:19
39:3 44:21	15:12 25:18	aimed 7:24	anyway 42:18	ascertain 52:15
61:14,22	44:3 66:21	airplane 51:15	apparatus 42:14	ascertaining
above-entitled	address 20:10	Airport 7:25	apparently	52:5,7
1:18 67:21	20:11 40:6	Airports 7:22	18:22 40:18	asks 41:20
absentee 32:5,21	42:22,25	AL 1:3,7,10,14	appeals 7:13	aspect 48:15
49:10 61:16	addressed 57:20	Alito 12:16 13:3	appear 35:5	53:18
63:23 64:1,5	61:5	13:15 14:3	APPEARAN...	Assembly 45:12
absolutely 5:9	addressing 63:4	24:7 25:9	1:21	51:10
7:6 42:8	adjudicate	26:23 27:8	apple 8:12	assert 16:4
abuse 27:15	58:19	Alito's 14:6	application 40:4	asserted 15:22
academic 56:15	adjudicated	27:25	applications	66:18
accept 32:3	59:9	allowed 64:1	67:7	assertion 21:17
34:25 35:6	adjudication	65:13	applied 35:6,11	assigned 22:5
42:8	60:20	alternate 50:9	35:19 66:2	assistance 19:23
acceptable	adjust 28:19	alternates 49:23	applies 66:14	28:3 31:13
50:13	administrative	alternatives	apply 35:20	association 7:3
accepted 4:22	42:14	50:3,6,18 63:5	60:22	8:18 9:2 10:14
34:13 41:15	adopt 41:13	Amendment	approach 63:20	associational
access 17:13	62:9	38:11	64:22	5:13 6:1,10 7:7
accomplish	advance 11:8	Amendments	appropriate	7:11 8:10 10:6
65:25	59:4,19	52:18	26:24 33:25	assume 21:9
account 24:8	adverse 62:15	America 54:22	35:7 60:22	56:21 57:3
29:15 32:13	adversely 28:10	Americans	64:19	59:3,25
accuracy 32:11	32:24 35:17	54:23	approximate	assuming 15:11
accurate 18:3	55:6 67:11	amicus 2:3	30:5	assumption
44:19	advertising	51:24	area 27:7,11,13	17:23 57:8,11
achieving 7:16	24:23	amount 11:24	27:18 38:11	assure 4:23 42:6
41:8	advocate 66:24	13:24 20:22	66:1	as-applied 36:25
acknowledge	affairs 5:22 6:16	25:17	areas 49:25	37:4,9 55:4
32:12	9:22	analysis 66:11	argue 36:1	56:4 58:14,22
Act 42:2 45:1,9	affect 22:2	67:12,17	argues 34:24	59:1 60:19
50:12 57:4	affidavit 16:12	anecdotes 22:22	arguing 35:15	64:22,24 66:3
action 35:20	53:11,19 54:25	23:4	42:4	attesting 63:13
47:22	60:2,8 63:13	annoyed 8:6	argument 1:19	authorities 46:5
actions 60:12	affidavits 9:9	answer 13:3,12	3:2,10 4:3,8	46:5,10
65:9	55:13 56:10	13:14 14:2,5,6	9:8 15:10 23:1	Authority 7:22
active 9:16,21	60:3	14:15 15:16	28:16,17 31:20	automobile
61:11	afraid 38:18	23:13 28:10,11	44:16,19 46:13	17:14
activists 5:23	age 17:24 24:3	37:12 41:22	46:18 47:8,11	available 13:6
9:16	25:5 28:22,22	62:4,19	48:6,9 51:22	14:24 61:23
activities 51:5	30:8 43:1	anticipated	52:8 55:16	aver 6:18
actual 8:15 28:8	agency 8:9	24:14	58:14 63:1	average 9:21
	ago 66:13	anti-fraud 41:4	arguments 23:6	aware 30:20

awfully 52:12	behave 38:8	34:24	calls 27:12	Center/Demos
awry 62:22	believe 5:12	briefs 38:25	cancel 46:7	23:5
Ayotte 56:8	benefit 25:18	bring 6:23 51:12	canceled 46:4,11	central 13:19
a.m 1:20 4:2	29:20 66:21,25	60:25	candidates 6:19	50:1,2
67:20	67:14	bringing 38:16	7:4,17 9:5	century 51:13
B	benefits 64:18	brought 11:7	card 11:21	certain 12:22
back 36:10 38:1	65:1 67:8	45:21 52:21,22	50:12 59:22,22	22:22
39:20 49:16	best 28:16,17	57:2 59:13	cards 24:15	certainly 8:16
60:1	better 18:22,24	60:17 65:9	card-carrying	11:5 13:22
backside 44:13	41:5,8 52:25	building 60:20	9:23	21:5,20,23
bad 18:19 19:7	54:3	burden 4:24	care 59:19	26:19 30:22
45:5	beyond 13:4	7:16 14:11	careful 27:24	53:24 58:23
bag 55:4	big 34:10 40:25	17:4,5,8,8 27:3	carefully 64:6	66:12
Baker 24:10	bigger 34:11	28:9 30:11	Carter 24:10	certificate 12:13
25:4 26:12	bill 40:6	33:7 46:13	25:3,3 26:12	14:22 26:15,22
balance 31:15	bind 38:22	48:6,18,21	Carter-Baker	29:6,7,8 30:12
67:15	birth 12:13	53:9 54:20	24:23	31:9 40:21
balancing 12:23	14:22 26:15,22	58:1 60:1	carve 65:18	49:21 50:9,17
27:21 41:12	29:6,7,8 30:12	66:18	case 4:4,12 5:11	50:21,23 53:8
66:24	31:8 40:21	burdened 7:5	7:7,22 8:1,8	certificates
ballot 43:15	49:21,23 50:9	9:18 27:4 30:3	11:4,6 12:23	49:23
49:13 55:12	50:16,20,22	30:4 33:16	12:25 15:10	certified 12:13
57:5 59:11	53:8	34:21	16:1,1 17:23	challenge 34:8
61:16 63:16,21	bit 33:19 59:6	burdens 4:13,16	21:20 34:10	35:7,8,9,22
ballots 39:14	60:4 62:13	4:18 10:21	35:2 36:10	36:5,7,13,23
54:6,8,10	64:21	13:2 29:4	38:3,12 39:1	37:1,4,7,20,23
56:20,23,25	block 60:20	64:18 65:1,3	39:15 46:24	38:16 52:20,21
59:12,17 63:24	BMV 42:16,17	66:8,9 67:1,8	54:11 60:3,7	53:5,20 55:4,5
64:1,5,8	49:19	burdensome	60:19,22,25	55:7,21,22
ballpark 33:14	board 1:7 4:5	13:7 16:9	67:19,20	56:4 58:14,21
Barker 10:25	39:17	49:22	cases 35:23	58:22 59:1,7
barn 38:17	boils 52:13	Burdick 64:17	36:13 38:3,5	59:13 60:25
based 9:8 33:12	booth 15:16	64:25	64:17	62:1
basic 60:20	42:7	Bureau 29:1	cast 19:17 43:16	challenged 66:2
basically 29:15	bosses 22:10	32:8	49:12 54:6,8	challenges 6:24
31:11	bottom 29:13	bureaucratic	64:8	37:16 58:16
basis 52:15	bound 9:2	31:12	catch 22:12,23	59:4,9 60:20
53:20 64:24	boy 61:9	bus 17:2	23:22,24	challenging 60:2
battle 43:10	branch 27:14,14	buying 42:14	catch-22 31:8	change 54:19
beam 58:15	Brennan 23:5	C	category 50:6,10	chapter 12:2
bear 45:25	BREYER 22:7	C 3:1 4:1	57:19	charge 25:25
bearing 51:4	22:25 23:6,21	calculations	caught 23:16,18	39:21
behalf 1:22,25	23:24 39:23	33:13	31:8	Chief 4:3,10 9:7
2:2 3:4,6,8,12	40:1 41:17	call 5:14 21:2	cause 35:20	10:24 11:11
4:9 8:22 31:21	42:4	called 34:22	ceiling 38:2	12:6 13:10
51:23 63:2	brief 7:23 14:5	60:11	census 17:25	
	23:5 32:18		18:17 32:9	

<p>15:6,9 16:20 16:23 17:17 18:7,10,12,18 18:25 19:5,14 20:5 26:3,11 31:17,22 44:15 45:3 51:18,21 52:1 59:8 60:24 61:2 62:24 66:15 67:18 choosing 60:17 chosen 41:5 circumstances 65:6 cite 7:23 claim 5:25 10:3 22:21,21 23:8 57:1,4,12,17 57:23 claimed 4:23 claiming 16:1 claims 25:12 58:19 60:16 class 54:16 60:11 65:9,13 classes 55:6 65:15 cleaning 19:3 clear 4:20 42:3 clearly 6:15 10:7 Clement 2:1 3:7 51:21,22 52:1 53:3,16 54:13 54:17 55:2,20 56:12,17,22 57:1,7,10,16 58:3 59:5,15 60:5,13 61:1 61:24 62:4,18 62:25 Clemente 9:15 clerk 9:10 49:13 clerk's 16:17 cleverly 62:20 Clingman 66:13 close 61:1</p>	<p>closer 19:18 Club 6:14 combined 47:5 come 10:25 11:19 26:5 31:5 41:1 42:10,22 49:23 64:18 67:12,12 comes 20:10 41:20 58:24 67:15 coming 20:23 comment 11:5 Commission 19:23 24:8 commit 21:24 committees 64:3 common 22:9 compare 17:24 33:4 compared 67:1 comparing 18:16 complainants 5:3 complete 65:17 completely 66:12 compliance 19:3 51:9 comply 10:22 concede 26:23 52:9 61:18 conceding 32:22 conceivably 33:3,16 34:21 concentrate 53:3 concentrating 54:12 57:15 concern 26:20 27:13 34:5,6 55:3 65:3,21 concerned 45:12 53:17 conclusion 67:13</p>	<p>concrete 54:11 conducted 11:12 confidence 45:12 47:5,8 51:17 confine 8:18,22 confines 8:25 confirmation 39:9 confirming 43:12 confronting 38:13 congestion 57:21 consent 19:4 45:23 46:1,6 consider 63:17 considerable 11:24 considerably 17:8 considered 34:6 consistent 48:4 56:7 66:12 constitutional 4:17,25 10:23 11:8 12:20 15:4,7,15 constitutionali... 52:7,9 53:1 constitutionally 35:10 continue 4:17 10:22 continues 34:13 contumacious 48:8 conversely 57:10 correct 7:12 34:16 43:19 correctly 5:12 costlessly 24:24 costs 28:4 counsel 49:25 count 34:7 39:12</p>	<p>counted 39:3 56:21,24,25 countries 24:12 country 23:20 25:6 28:13 45:11 63:7 county 1:6 4:5 16:10,17,18,21 16:21,23 17:1 39:2,5 48:21 53:13 54:6 57:6 58:10 couple 11:14 66:13 course 9:3 22:20 56:3 62:10 court 1:1,19 4:11,20 5:24 6:7 7:10,13 8:8 8:13 10:3 12:24 17:21,23 17:24 18:3,8 25:1 29:12 31:23 33:13 34:12 35:2 36:4,17 37:24 38:1 52:2 56:8 58:20,20,25 60:18 61:6 64:23 66:14 courthouse 48:21 53:13 59:10 courthouses 51:15 courts 5:5,7 27:11 38:8 65:14 court's 28:18 64:17 covered 15:1 co-chaired 24:9 co-conspirators 22:5 Crawford 1:3 4:4 12:1 create 47:4</p>	<p>created 51:6 creating 65:14 crime 21:24 criminal 24:5 criteria 50:14 cross 61:19 Crown 17:2 cull 47:9,22 48:3 curiae 2:3 51:24 current 14:10 currently 53:25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <hr/> <p>D 2:1 3:7 4:1 51:22 data 32:7,9 date 58:24 day 20:10 27:17 49:11 56:6 58:12 days 49:14 59:9 de 34:7 dead 18:14 19:7 21:4 22:11,14 47:9,23,24 deal 10:20 41:1 57:18 58:8,11 59:20 dealing 20:1 54:4 63:6 death 28:19 decades 66:22 decedent 46:9 decent 57:4 decide 65:15 decided 17:23 55:12 59:11 decision 25:19 51:10 64:19 66:12 decree 19:4 45:23 46:1,6 deferential 27:11 definitely 60:15 degree 13:2 14:11 27:13</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>29:4 degrees 6:6 Democratic 1:9 4:5 5:6,11,19 5:21 6:4,4,18 6:22 7:1,3,11 7:17 9:10,11 9:12,23,24 10:6 25:2 34:23 61:9 62:1,12,21 Democrats 10:18 62:16 denial 28:24 denied 11:1 Department 2:2 departure 28:19 depend 59:6 depending 65:4 designed 42:6 62:20 detect 19:20,24 39:22 detected 23:17 23:17 deter 24:2 determine 66:16 deterring 24:2 dictum 37:23 died 18:5 difference 8:14 8:15 different 6:5,6 15:4 20:15,16 26:1 29:4 35:8 43:10 55:5 59:1 62:16 63:9,20 differential 21:10,11 difficult 20:12 27:7,21,25 28:3 29:17 44:19 difficulty 9:19 12:11 50:4 digging 40:20</p>	<p>dimension 25:11 direction 32:13 51:16 directly 4:12 disadvantage 62:21 discount 32:23 discounted 32:4 32:20 discourage 55:1 dismiss 23:9 disparity 18:2 21:7 dispute 32:10 52:10,13 55:25 59:17 disputes 59:21 disrupt 22:18 dissents 25:20 distant 16:15 district 5:24 10:3 17:21,24 18:2,8 28:18 33:13 61:6 document 50:17 documentation 26:10,11 34:18 doing 7:18 8:20 41:18 54:25 dormant 46:3 draw 26:25 drawn 65:16 drive 30:18 49:7 53:7 driver's 17:14 17:25 18:17 31:9 duplicate 18:14 20:6 duplicates 19:7 20:12,14 46:9 46:22 D.C 1:16,22 2:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>E 3:1 4:1,1 easier 50:20</p>	<p>59:25 60:6 easily 23:16 24:24 53:10 64:7 easy 44:1,8,10 44:10 53:12 54:22 effect 65:6 effective 41:14 41:15 effectively 66:23 efforts 18:23 eight 21:10 either 6:18 16:16 18:13 19:7 40:8 48:19 elderly 49:7 50:8 61:15 elect 7:4 electing 7:17 election 1:6 4:5 6:19,20 11:4 11:20 19:15,18 19:22 22:3,18 24:9 27:17 38:18,23 49:11 51:12 54:7,19 55:17,18 56:15 59:4,11,19,21 65:7 elections 11:11 45:13 58:10 62:13 electoral 27:15 electorate 33:16 34:3 35:17 51:7 eligible 28:22 eliminate 21:14 53:10 Elk's 6:14 Ely 27:18 enacted 24:21 enclose 40:5 encourage 23:4 25:1</p>	<p>ended 39:4,7 47:6 endorsed 34:13 34:16,17 enforcement 52:23,24 enjoined 56:9 ensure 47:13 entire 35:22 51:7 56:15 entirely 51:7 62:2 entries 18:14,19 20:6,6 envision 38:3 equal 5:24 10:3 escaping 27:10 especially 5:10 13:7 58:5 ESQ 1:22,24 2:1 3:3,5,7,11 essentially 67:13 establishes 13:11 estimate 30:1 ET 1:3,7,10,14 Europe 24:16 everybody 14:20,25 15:14 24:15,24 35:23 51:8 everyday 47:4 51:5 evidence 9:20 10:16,20 12:3 13:23 21:1 22:8,9 28:12 31:24 32:1 55:10 56:1 evident 52:20 exactly 10:18 24:14 36:1 63:23 64:7 65:12,24 example 6:17 9:15 19:12 29:18 33:5</p>	<p>49:11 63:12 exception 16:9 exclusively 47:10 Excuse 10:10 15:20 execute 53:19 executing 55:13 executive 27:14 exempt 65:13,14 exemption 15:19,22 16:8 65:16,18 exemptions 15:12 exercise 4:17 exercising 10:22 Exhibit 25:2 existed 19:10 existing 13:25 exists 42:15 61:3 expect 20:20 expects 47:3 experience 39:18 expert 45:20 46:7 expiration 58:24 expire 48:16 Extend 7:20 extent 27:2,2 30:16 extremely 66:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <hr/> <p>face 4:22 52:22 56:6 facial 34:8 35:7 35:8,9,22 36:5 36:7,13,23 37:7,16,20,22 38:16 53:4,20 58:21 60:25 64:21 65:1 facilities 50:13 fact 7:15 13:23 19:11 24:8</p>
---	--	---	---	---

25:23 32:7 39:4 42:15 46:7 53:18 factors 28:19 29:16 facts 12:25 fair 30:24 32:25 33:21 62:15 fairly 30:21 far 16:20,24 33:12 34:11 41:5,8 54:3 62:22 64:20 farmers 8:12 favor 38:19 Federal 24:9 45:4 47:20 50:13 51:15 58:24 60:3,7 fee 49:1 fewer 17:18 figure 18:19 28:18 32:4,16 32:19 33:20 65:12 file 59:10,25 fill 16:12 54:24 63:13 financial 4:16 find 21:19 27:16 fine 14:10 24:16 first 4:4 12:12 23:3 24:1,1 38:11 41:22 52:17 Fisher 1:24 3:5 31:19,20,22 32:6 33:1 34:1 34:9,20 35:12 35:25 36:9,16 36:20,24 37:4 37:8,13,17,20 37:21,25 38:9 39:13,20,25 41:10,24 42:13 43:6,8,14,21 43:25 44:7,12	44:15,24 45:6 45:19,24 46:16 46:20,25 47:10 47:17,25 48:4 48:10,13,25 49:4,9,18 50:5 50:24 51:3,19 51:20 Florida 63:20 focus 23:13 58:15 focused 55:7 focusing 40:15 follow 22:19 46:15 following 25:4 forcing 7:19 47:22 forever 16:18 forget 32:19 forgets 49:10 forgot 57:13 form 12:17,19 13:4 32:1 41:14,16 51:4 59:1 formal 6:13 8:12 former 24:9,10 forth 30:19 forward 45:21 59:2 found 5:5,12 9:17 10:1 18:8 19:23 31:7 foundational 50:17 four 40:7 Fourteenth 52:17 fraud 4:20 13:8 13:24 19:8,13 19:17,19,19,22 20:22 21:2,14 22:23 23:9,16 23:17,18,19 39:22,24 40:2 40:12 45:11	47:13 66:17 fraudfeasor 20:17 fraudulent 39:14,16 40:12 front 35:2 41:25 58:17 function 50:2 functional 8:15 functioned 8:10 fundamental 4:13 further 32:4 furthest 16:21 future 6:19 19:18 <hr/> G <hr/> G 4:1 gap 47:2 Gary 17:1,15 gather 54:7 GEN 2:1 3:7 51:22 general 1:24 2:1 45:11 51:10,21 52:1 53:3,16 54:13,17 55:2 55:11,20 56:12 56:17,22 57:1 57:7,10,16 58:3 59:5,15 60:5,13 61:1 61:24 62:4,7 62:18,24 genuine 21:13 Georgia 40:19 getting 7:20 9:19 12:12 30:4 31:1 32:17 Ginsburg 14:14 14:17 16:13 24:14,19 38:12 38:15 39:17 45:16,22 48:15 49:15 53:2,16	54:12,15,18 55:2,19 57:14 57:18 58:3 give 9:13 26:4,6 39:9 40:9,16 40:17 41:17,18 42:11 45:20 62:7 given 6:11 40:14 42:9 giving 26:20 go 10:5 12:14 16:10 20:9,20 22:18 26:8 40:13,20 41:2 42:17,21 48:20 49:12,15,16,19 54:4 58:25 59:2,9,23,25 60:1 63:15 goal 7:16,17 goals 9:4 goes 20:19 39:20 62:10 going 8:22 12:4 12:4,7 16:17 19:25 20:18,20 20:20 22:18,19 24:20,21,22 25:23,24,25 27:15 28:9,24 29:11,12 30:2 33:21,23,23,24 34:9,10,21 36:4,22 37:15 38:17,21 39:10 41:17 46:23 47:4 48:20 49:24 50:13,20 54:18,20 55:1 58:1 63:13 64:14 65:23 good 41:9 48:11 52:12,16 67:4 gotten 18:22 Government 45:4	government-is... 52:11 grab 55:4 gratuitously 16:9 graveyards 21:22 22:11 great 10:20 57:12 ground 66:5 grounds 5:13 group 9:3 53:4 54:19 65:19 grown 45:2 guess 9:8 <hr/> H <hr/> half 30:8 34:2 35:16,18 38:4 hamstrung 41:25 hand 41:3 63:10 handful 58:6 hands 25:8 happen 38:18 61:15 happened 11:5 39:1 happening 20:25 52:18 happens 23:10 hard 8:17 12:24 19:20,24 27:10 27:12 57:22 64:20 hardship 35:24 harm 67:4 Hart 27:18 hate 62:6 haven 5:14 Havens 7:13 healthy 59:20 hear 4:3 55:17 heart 23:7 heavier 46:13 48:6 help 24:17 25:23
--	--	--	--	---

26:3 30:17 31:6 54:22,24 60:7 helping 30:25 helps 31:4 Holland 9:9 home 22:20 26:9 49:15 Honor 5:5,9,11 5:20 6:15 7:8 7:12 8:4,7,24 9:15 10:15 11:3,18,22 12:10,21 13:16 14:16 15:3,8 15:20 17:1,8 17:21 19:22 21:6 22:24 23:15,23 24:14 26:14 30:7,21 31:3,14 39:13 63:3 64:13,23 66:10,23 67:10 hoops 12:15 45:8 57:5 hope 36:16 38:9 hopefully 44:13 horse 38:16 hundred 11:14 Hunt 8:8,10 hypothetical 39:8 59:21	48:24 49:1,10 49:19 50:11 52:8,11,15,16 53:7,24 57:13 58:24 59:1 63:10 64:2,9 idea 44:14 identification 4:14 7:21 12:9 12:15,17,19 13:4,25 14:12 30:4 32:1 33:14 41:14,16 43:2,4,17 49:11,16 50:10 50:12 51:4,14 identifications 50:15 identified 7:19 8:5 9:25 47:23 53:23,24 identify 5:18,22 10:11 12:25 46:2,14,21 48:7 55:18 61:14,22 identifying 48:7 identity 22:5 52:5,12 IDs 9:18,19 18:1 18:4 24:17 26:13 28:13,21 30:17 31:6,11 40:25 61:7,15 63:18,19 65:10 65:11 67:15 ignore 15:10 III 61:19 illiterates 64:11 imagine 38:5 55:8,9 58:23 60:23 64:15 65:8 imagining 31:13 immense 37:23 impact 38:22 61:21,25 62:15	62:16 impaired 5:15 7:15,25 impersonating 21:19 impersonation 4:19 19:13 impersonator 39:19 implementation 11:8 important 27:19 45:25 impose 14:7 35:24 51:7 imposed 4:25 10:21 14:11 65:4 imposes 66:7 impossible 22:12 39:21 improbable 60:4 inappropriate 36:13 incidental 33:6 include 7:5 includes 18:4 including 5:5 income 30:10 inconvenience 65:22 66:5 67:5 inconvenienced 33:3 inconveniences 33:7 incremental 13:1 29:19 66:9,21 increments 67:3 67:9 Ind 1:25 Indiana 1:9,13 4:5,14 5:20 11:10 12:19 16:24 17:1,16	17:19 18:13 25:12,22 28:15 28:16,17,21 31:5,25 40:4 45:16 50:7,12 51:6 53:23 59:16 61:9 64:2 Indianapolis 1:24 Indiana's 48:2 indicated 46:8 indication 21:1 indigency 16:8 53:19 55:13 indigent 16:25 17:4,6,15 48:17,21,24 49:17,21 53:6 54:1 58:16 65:18 individual 6:10 6:24 53:22 individuals 5:18 46:2 54:2,2 57:12 61:5,7 61:10,13,14,15 induction 6:14 infer 62:15 infinitesimal 33:15,19 inflated 45:10 45:19,21 inflation 45:17 information 63:25 initially 39:6 initio 55:24 injunction 56:7 injured 10:7,14 35:3,5 insist 52:15 instance 11:1 instituted 18:23 39:1 instruct 58:7,10 integrity 41:11	intend 6:19 intended 6:3 interest 4:23 5:15 13:1,2 43:19 61:18 66:10 interests 7:14 41:5,9 interrogatories 10:1 introduce 44:3 invalidate 66:4 involved 7:23 27:21 65:5 involves 4:12 52:3 irrational 58:25 irreparable 11:7 issue 18:18 19:15 28:8 29:11,13,22 35:13 40:15 52:6 54:4 55:8 56:2 61:8 issued 18:1 50:8 issues 28:7 64:24 issuing 50:14 it'll 24:16
<hr/> J <hr/>				
ID 4:15 11:2,17 11:20 12:4 14:8,19,23 15:15 17:19 19:1 24:11,12 24:25 25:13,23 26:4,5,17,24 28:3,25 33:25 34:19 36:6,15 39:21 40:7,13 40:17 41:11 42:11 43:24 47:3 48:18,22				January 1:17 job 40:22 44:21 44:23 45:5 64:17 Joe 19:25 22:13 22:13,14 John 20:7,7,9,11 20:18 27:18 join 8:3 56:1 joined 7:3 judge 9:11 10:25 23:8 32:11 63:22 judgment 27:12 29:13 41:6 66:21 67:4

judgments 12:24 27:10	48:5,11,15 49:2,6,15,20	23:6 24:4 27:24 29:10	41:12 62:2 64:19 65:15,24	look 19:17 23:4 25:4 28:1,2
judicial 27:19 59:16	50:22,25 51:18 51:21 52:1	31:2 32:16 37:5 39:1,4,14	legitimacy 45:13 legitimate 27:20 48:5	29:18 34:21 36:10 53:21 55:10 56:8
jump 45:8	53:2,16 54:12 54:15,18 55:2	39:21 43:16 48:16 50:19	legitimately 45:12 52:14	58:25 60:9,13 61:25 63:7
jurisprudence 66:1	55:15,19,20 56:11,13,20,23	53:20 55:8 58:5,9 60:3,5,8	lesser 12:18	looked 64:24
Justice 2:2 4:3 4:10 5:1,7,17	57:3,8,14,18 58:3 59:3,8,24	60:9,18 62:5 62:19 64:3	lesson 60:22	looking 18:15 38:2 61:20 63:18
6:2,8,21 7:9,18 8:2,5,17 9:7	60:6,11,18,24 61:2,24 62:14	knows 20:2 38:5	let's 28:5,5,14 32:19 58:9	looks 22:15,16 55:5 62:22 66:1
10:5,10,18,24 11:11,16,19	62:24 64:10,14 66:4,15 67:2	<hr/> L <hr/>	level 7:24 34:1 46:2	loss 11:7
12:6,16 13:3 13:10,12,14,17	67:18	lack 4:14 28:21 31:25 47:5,8	license 17:14 18:17 25:6 31:9	lost 38:23
14:1,3,6,14,15 14:17 15:6,9	justification 4:21 58:4	Lafayette 31:4,5	licenses 18:1,4,6 21:8 25:8	lot 12:2 18:23 20:2 22:3,22 24:4,17 63:25
15:18,21,25 16:13,20,23	justified 4:18	Lake 17:1	lie 44:25	lots 24:22
17:5,10,17 18:7,10,12,18	justify 4:24	larger 46:25	lies 64:23	lousy 44:20,23
18:25 19:5,14 20:5 21:4,12	<hr/> K <hr/>	laser 58:15	Likewise 52:10	lower 30:10
21:17,25 22:7 22:25 23:6,12	keep 7:24	Laughter 51:2	limit 9:7	<hr/> M <hr/>
23:21,24 24:7 24:14,19 25:9	Kennedy 8:17 13:12,17 14:1	law 4:12,15 5:16 7:6 10:22 11:9 11:12,14 13:19	limited 47:17,20	M 1:22,24 3:3,5 3:11 4:8 31:20 63:1
26:3,11,23 27:8,23,25	14:15 43:11 49:20 59:3	26:17 27:8 30:21 33:3	limits 44:3 45:1	machine 41:1
28:5,14,23 29:10,21,24	60:18 66:4	34:22 35:3,5,6 35:10,22 36:15	line 26:25 27:6,6 29:13 62:6 64:17	madness 64:23
30:15,24 31:17 31:22 32:3,15	kind 7:4 12:15 16:9 20:22	37:7 38:5,6 45:14 46:15	lines 55:14 62:3	mail 40:10
33:18 34:4,15 35:4,15 36:3	21:2,24 22:22	47:16 51:10 59:16 62:1,15	list 44:18	main 43:14
36:12,18,21 37:2,6,11,15	23:8,17,18,19	63:5,7 67:16	lists 45:2,10	maintain 45:2
37:18,19,22 38:1,10,12,14	26:24 29:12	laws 60:10,14 63:8	litigation 60:1 60:15,18	majority 35:23 51:9
38:15 39:17,23 40:1 41:17	31:13,25 35:8	lawsuit 59:25	litmus 27:9	making 25:24 34:20 46:12,19 47:7 67:14
42:4,19 43:3,7 43:11,18,23	39:22 50:17	lead 57:21	little 5:2 11:9 33:18 44:19	mandatory 25:7
44:4,9,15 45:3 45:16,22 46:12	52:15 55:4	leads 13:17	59:6 60:4 62:13 64:21	Marion 1:6 4:4 39:2 54:6
46:18,21 47:7 47:14,19 48:2	56:4 58:19 65:5	Lear 64:22	live 15:5 63:15	Marston 36:10
	kinds 15:13 23:15 31:10	learning 22:6	lives 42:25	mass 48:18
	King 64:22	leave 41:6 58:22 65:20	living 17:15 23:19	match 20:2 24:3 52:9 63:22 64:11
	knew 8:20,20	leaving 46:22	local 16:15 46:4 46:5,10,22	matched 32:8
	knocked 36:8	left 18:5	47:9,21,22 48:20 53:12	matches 25:17
	knocking 35:21	legally 61:18	54:23	
	know 8:19,22 14:7 15:18,21	legends 22:10	long 34:12	
	16:3,22 19:9 20:18 21:18,21	legislative 27:14		
		legislature		

64:4 matter 1:18 8:9 29:4 56:15 67:21 matters 27:12 27:21 maze 31:12 mean 6:21,24 8:3 15:25 21:20 22:7 33:20 34:16 37:22 38:15 39:8 41:11 42:14 46:23 49:3 50:18,19 50:24 53:17 54:5,19 55:3 55:16,21,22 56:18,18 58:4 59:6 60:9 62:19 means 43:1 50:9 measure 51:11 measured 28:9 mechanism 52:5 52:7 61:22 62:20 member 5:19,21 6:4,7 10:11 members 5:18 5:22 8:3,5,8,13 9:23 53:22,22 61:9 membership 6:6 8:12 61:8 memory 23:19 39:18 mentioned 28:20 mere 39:10 merely 34:7 36:7 merits 10:8 method 6:13 methods 6:15 Metropolitan 7:22	Michigan 63:11 miles 17:2,10,10 mind 45:25 51:4 minimal 25:17 50:14 minimis 34:7 Ministry 31:4 minor 65:22 66:5 minute 47:19 minutes 62:25 misunderstan... 16:6 mobile 24:22 mode 60:17 money 14:21 25:25 29:7,9 53:7 65:11,12 Montezuma 11:10 monumental 54:9 morass 65:17 motor 29:1 32:8 44:1 moved 20:7 21:5 21:21 moving 21:14 multiple 34:13 <hr/> N N 3:1,1 4:1 NAACP 12:1 name 40:6 names 46:4,4 narrowly 31:10 national 7:25 42:1 44:9 45:1 45:9 nationally 44:1 nature 52:19 59:7 64:25 necessarily 50:20 52:4 57:9 62:7 necessary 51:5 need 4:19 12:15	20:8 22:3 25:13,22 50:22 56:9,9 57:9 needed 31:11 needs 49:19 67:9 needy 31:4 neighborhood 20:1 neighborhoods 24:22 neighbors 49:23 never 23:9 32:6 36:5,8,14,18 36:21,22 37:2 39:19 50:8 64:23 new 4:15 30:21 51:7 nine 21:10 54:2 61:4 Nobody's 15:22 noise 7:24 8:6 nominees 9:5 nonindigent 49:2,18 nonprofit 7:23 note 8:4,7 10:4 notice 55:25 notion 35:14 nub 55:25 number 14:3,4 17:25 19:7,11 21:7,8 28:9,12 28:20 30:2,5 32:14 33:2,2,5 40:10 46:8,9 67:6,11 numbers 40:7 48:23 NVRA 47:18 48:4 <hr/> O O 3:1 4:1 obey 47:16 objecting 21:5 objection 15:10	42:12 objectors 14:25 observed 60:15 obstacle 40:18 obvious 47:2,12 47:15 obviously 26:19 29:3 66:23 occur 63:9 occurring 13:24 20:22 21:2 offer 56:9 office 16:17 57:6 58:10 officials 46:14 46:22 47:9,16 47:21,22 48:8 oh 38:2 okay 15:9 29:21 34:4 37:18 48:11 53:11 64:1 67:7 once 42:5 ones 5:5 56:24 ongoing 59:17 open 58:22 opinion 29:25 30:1 61:6 opportunity 28:25 opposite 38:19 oral 1:18 3:2 4:8 31:20 51:22 order 22:3 30:14 65:13 ordinarily 38:7 ordinary 47:4 organization 6:11 7:24 8:2,3 8:13 9:1,5,6 10:7,14 organizational 5:15 7:14 original 12:13 outcome 27:16 65:6 outliers 32:12	outlying 58:9 outweigh 66:9 out-of-State 42:21 overall 65:7 overcome 4:15 overstate 21:3 <hr/> P P 4:1 PAGE 3:2 pages 61:5 paid 12:14 paraphrase 64:22 parsed 54:2 part 9:24 23:13 30:19 37:23 41:25 42:1,2 42:13 44:24 45:6,7 46:16 47:11,11 67:11 partial-birth 60:19 participant 6:16 participating 5:21 particular 6:12 7:4 10:19 15:12 39:5 53:21 55:7 58:15,16 65:2 65:5 particularly 47:5 52:16 60:21 parties 30:17,23 30:25 46:1 61:11 party 1:9 4:5 5:6 5:12,19,21,22 6:4,17,22 7:1,3 7:11,15 9:10 9:11,17,22,23 9:24 10:6 25:2 34:23 38:20 53:23 61:9
---	--	--	--	---

<p>62:1,3,6,7,12 62:21,21 Party's 7:17 passed 56:16 passport 50:18 50:23 PAUL 1:22 2:1 3:3,7,11 4:8 51:22 63:1 pay 30:11 49:1 paying 14:21 penalties 24:6 people 5:25 6:23 7:3,5,5,19,20 8:19 9:2,3,14 9:20 10:16,21 11:14,23,25 12:3 15:13,13 16:2,24 17:18 18:5,13 20:2 20:22 21:4,7 21:20,21,21 22:11 24:4,4 26:8 27:3 28:13,21,22 29:5,6,7,16 30:2,8,10,13 30:17,25 31:5 31:25 32:24 33:5,8,22 35:5 38:20 39:2,5 39:11 40:19,22 40:24 44:17 49:2,21 50:3 53:4,6,10,15 53:24 54:16,20 55:1,6,13 57:13,16,24 58:6 61:21 63:19 64:9 65:5,10,11,12 65:19,19,21 66:8 67:6,11 67:15 people's 25:8 percent 17:18 18:2,12,19</p>	<p>21:9,11 25:5 26:8 33:10 34:2,21 35:16 35:19 38:4,4 44:16 46:11 54:8 65:22 percentage 19:17 33:10,12 66:6 perfectly 67:7 permissible 13:5 50:16 person 6:12 17:1 17:13 20:1,3 21:18 22:6,19 23:10 29:3 40:4,11 42:7,8 42:21,23,24 48:17,22,24 49:18,24 57:19 61:19 person's 20:3 perspective 33:4 62:23 persuaded 58:13 petitioner 5:10 Petitioners 1:4 1:11,23 3:4,12 4:9 49:25 52:6 63:2 phenomenon 60:15 photo 4:15 11:2 14:8,20 15:14 17:19 19:1 24:25 25:13 26:5,13 33:14 40:7,13,17 41:1,18,19 42:11 43:4,24 48:18,22,24 50:14 51:13 52:11,16 53:6 58:24 61:7,15 photograph 14:18 16:3,4</p>	<p>42:20,22 photographic 14:23 picture 41:2 piggybacked 55:11 place 14:19 16:11,15,15,17 20:19,21 41:22 43:13 46:13 53:19 55:14 56:10 57:22 58:2 66:22 places 20:15,16 plaintiffs 5:4 12:1,2 32:7 53:22 54:11 56:19 plan 11:19,20 play 30:19,25 please 4:11 31:23 52:2 plenty 28:12 plus 33:22 pocket 15:15 point 11:15 17:2 23:3 34:20 36:1 43:15,15 46:25 50:5 54:5 56:18 59:13,18 pointed 54:5 policeman 22:19 policy 43:22,25 44:4,10 political 22:10 30:17 poll 5:23 9:16 11:23 22:15,17 22:23 23:10 29:17 58:7,10 61:10 66:2,2 polled 9:17 polling 16:11 43:13 53:19 55:13 56:10 57:21 58:2</p>	<p>polls 4:20 19:25 30:18 31:1 40:13 46:23 47:2,13 55:14 poor 17:11 24:17 population 17:25 18:9,16 21:8 25:6 28:22 33:11 portion 30:13 33:15 posed 13:13 14:3 position 6:3 12:16 49:8 Posner's 23:8 possibility 58:22 possible 12:22 21:23 34:25 54:10 possibly 9:25 32:13 potential 19:8 56:19 potentially 15:3 15:7 29:16 power 27:15 powerfully 57:22 practical 4:16 precedent 35:21 precinct 24:5 48:20 49:17 53:12 54:24 58:7 63:15 precincts 52:4 precise 45:20 precisely 45:13 precludes 52:18 preferable 58:19 premise 24:23 presents 19:8 preserve 51:16 preserved 13:19 50:2</p>	<p>President 24:10 25:3 26:12 presumably 17:13 20:15 59:8,13 presume 30:24 pretty 62:22 prevent 11:7 prevented 10:17 27:3 56:25 preventing 13:8 47:21 66:17 pre-enforcem... 37:6,9 primary 6:17 probably 18:3 30:8 32:23 33:21 55:9 61:10 problem 8:21 14:2,24 16:1,8 20:5 21:18 24:7 25:5,10 25:11,13,14 26:25 27:2 32:6 34:10,11 45:2 54:9 57:24 65:20 problematic 44:2 problems 15:13 43:9 64:15 procedure 34:12 34:17,19 proceeded 55:22 process 27:16 30:19 48:19 49:12 63:23 prohibits 43:12 properly 7:19 proposal 24:21 propose 26:12 proposition 52:11 protected 61:18 protection 5:24 10:3</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Proto 42:10	questioning	47:12,15 50:3	34:22 36:6,11	12:19 42:16
prove 42:24	6:25	50:6 51:11,16	40:3,4,15 42:1	43:4
proven 41:15	questions 13:13	58:14 63:5	42:2,16 43:4	requirement
proves 41:19	14:3 52:21	reasonably	43:13,19 44:2	14:12 24:11
42:23	quintessential	26:21	44:21,23 45:1	25:14 26:16,22
provide 12:8	7:7	reasons 16:2	45:9	26:24 27:5
28:25	quite 11:6 40:22	reassure 45:14	registrations	36:6,6 39:6
provided 28:4,4	66:8	rebuttal 3:10	46:3,10 52:4	44:22 49:21
provision 59:16	<hr/> R <hr/>	31:16 63:1	regular 63:16	52:10
provisional	R 4:1	recognized 6:7	regulate 27:15	requirements
49:13 54:6,10	raised 28:7	recollection	42:1	24:12 25:24
55:11 56:20,23	range 63:8 65:4	32:18	reject 58:21	requiring 12:12
57:5 59:10,12	66:7	recommend	relates 9:1	19:1
59:17 63:21	ranking 45:20	25:7	relatively 65:21	reserve 31:15
64:8	ratchet 25:24	recommended	65:22	resources 7:20
provisions 55:12	ratcheted 12:11	24:11,13	relevant 62:2,5	respect 36:15
public 17:12	rational 57:11	reconcile 57:23	relied 7:13	39:13 50:7,7
47:2	58:4	record 9:15	religious 14:25	50:15 52:19
punished 23:19	rationale 8:18	10:21 11:3	15:10,19,22	55:20 64:8
purpose 9:1	8:23,25	13:10,23 17:18	16:2	respectfully
13:19 29:18	read 40:3	17:20 21:1	rely 7:10 44:16	52:24
50:1 66:16,17	readily 13:6	26:7 27:1	remedy 56:5	respond 13:21
purposes 6:12	26:21	28:12 30:16,21	67:5	responded
6:23 8:11 10:2	ready 61:22	31:3,24 32:2	repeat 42:5	13:14
24:18	real 4:24 16:16	32:11 56:1	reply 34:24	Respondents
pursuant 45:8	20:18 26:17	62:10 63:25	report 24:24	1:25 2:4 3:6,9
put 30:1,22 33:3	29:19 36:14	recorded 19:12	25:4 26:18	31:21 51:25
40:16 48:6,18	39:9 50:11	records 18:17	46:7	response 9:25
48:19 54:20	61:21,25 65:20	red 32:18	reports 33:11	22:25 28:7
55:9,24 56:1	66:25 67:13	refer 25:2	45:11	34:25 63:12
58:1	reality 25:21	referring 19:2	represent 6:12	responses 14:4
putting 7:16	realize 19:18	Reform 24:9	6:22 61:4	63:9
<hr/> Q <hr/>	really 8:9,15,21	refuse 46:15	representative	responsibility
qualifying 39:4	17:22 20:12	register 40:5	7:1	44:25 45:7
quantification	22:7,23 24:16	41:2 42:10,20	representatives	46:6 48:3
28:6,8	42:20 52:10,13	42:21 44:5,10	8:11	rest 46:23 48:8
quantify 27:1	53:14 54:2,22	registered 30:9	Republican	restrictive 41:4
29:2	55:1,24 57:24	31:1 33:5,11	62:20	41:7
question 10:15	58:6 60:17	40:10 41:21	Republicans	result 27:4
13:4,18 14:2,5	58:6 60:17	63:14	62:17	38:19
14:6,21 15:14	Realty 7:14	registers 14:20	require 12:17,18	return 49:13
21:16 23:14,25	reason 9:2 13:7	42:8,24	12:23 15:15	review 27:19
27:25 28:6	16:4,7 18:21	registrants 19:7	25:10 26:13	59:16
34:23 37:12	27:8 30:9	44:17,17,18	34:18 40:19	rich 17:11
40:14 54:21	38:15 55:10	registration	43:2,23 51:13	right 4:13,13,17
61:2 62:4 63:4	59:5 65:2	14:18,19 18:20	52:4	6:11 10:7,11
	reasonable 30:1	20:8 34:11,17	required 4:15	10:13,23 11:1

14:18 20:15 22:11 26:10 29:23 32:19 36:20 37:17,25 38:14 42:8,15 43:6 45:24 48:3,24,25 49:4 51:16 59:22,23 60:12 61:16 63:12 66:13,18 rights 4:25 11:8 ROBERTS 4:3 9:7 10:24 11:11 12:6 13:10 15:6,9 16:20,23 17:17 18:7,10,12,18 18:25 19:5,14 20:5 26:3,11 31:17 44:15 45:3 51:18,21 59:8 60:24 62:24 66:15 67:18 Rokita 1:13 4:6 role 30:25 rolls 18:8,13,16 18:20 19:3,6 21:22 45:18 47:9,23 48:3 rule 62:8 65:2 rules 26:10 run 50:11	21:9 22:13 25:4 38:2 42:5 42:6,9 44:20 47:25 48:1 says 4:18 8:19 20:11,19,23 22:14 26:18 27:9 36:12 55:10 58:25 Scalia 5:1,7,17 6:2,8,21 8:2,5 10:10,18 11:16 11:19 15:18,21 15:25 17:5,10 21:4,12,17,25 23:12 35:4,15 37:19,22 38:1 38:10 42:19 43:7 44:9 49:2 49:6 50:22,25 56:20,23 60:11 64:10,14 67:2 scant 21:2 scare 37:19 scourge 4:19 scrutinize 64:6 scrutinized 4:23 scurry 33:24 se 8:13 seat 16:10,18,21 seats 16:23 second 60:2,8,8 Secretary 1:14 4:6 24:10 25:3 26:12 security 40:8 47:2 51:12 see 55:3 59:5 send 46:3 53:13 53:13 sense 33:23 44:6 sent 26:9 46:10 serve 66:16 served 13:1,2 29:19 66:10 serves 66:15 serving 13:9	set 63:9 severe 24:5 25:12 66:8,8 short 33:12 show 15:16 25:11 35:9 39:15 43:2 47:3 51:14 64:9 65:23 67:15 shown 36:17 shows 17:18,21 20:3 26:7 62:12 63:10 shy 27:20 side 23:2 27:6,6 29:22 sides 23:7 signature 12:18 13:5 20:3 22:6 22:16 24:3 25:16 52:9 63:22 64:4,11 signed 19:4 significance 11:6 significant 13:24 17:4 19:6,8,10 20:21 30:12 35:1,24 36:25 52:23 67:14 significantly 27:4 signs 22:14 similar 29:17 simply 7:10 23:12 42:9 single 11:1 19:12 20:25 sitting 38:1 situation 19:10 35:10 45:10 47:1,4 58:8,9 situations 8:16 12:22 skew 27:16	skewed 38:19 small 66:6 67:5 Smith 1:22 3:3 3:11 4:7,8,10 5:4,9,20 6:5,13 7:2,10,12,20 8:4,7,24 9:9,14 10:13,20 11:3 11:13,18,22 12:10,21 13:6 13:16,22 14:9 14:14,16 15:2 15:8,11,20,24 16:6,16,22,25 17:7,12,20 18:9,10,11,15 18:21 19:2,9 19:21 20:1,7,7 20:9,11,14,18 21:6,16,23 22:1,13,14,14 22:24 23:3,15 23:23 24:1,13 25:1,16 26:7 26:14 27:7 28:2,11,17 29:3,14,23 30:7,15,20 31:2,18 32:16 41:20,21 62:25 63:1,3 64:13 64:16 66:7,20 67:10,19 Social 40:8 Solicitor 1:24 2:1 somebody 10:11 11:1 16:21 19:15 20:9,10 20:23 54:24 60:6 someone's 52:12 someplace 54:20 58:1 sooner 20:21 sorry 18:11 37:13 39:25	47:21 sort 13:8 25:13 26:17 55:23 58:9 sorts 6:23 sought 35:19 Souter 7:9,18 10:5 27:23 28:5,14,23 29:10,21,24 32:3,15 33:18 34:4,15 36:3 36:12,18,21 37:2,6,11,15 37:18 38:14 46:12,18,21 47:7,14,19 48:2,5,11 55:15,21 56:11 56:13 57:3,8 specialized 64:3 specific 9:20,20 12:25 26:18 53:25 specifically 61:5 specified 31:10 spectrum 29:5 speculating 48:23 53:5 speculation 39:10 spend 40:20 split 62:2 spoke 11:25 spot 14:19 square 51:8 stack 45:16 stamp 4:19 stand 40:18 standard 36:5 36:22 41:16 standing 5:2,6 5:12,13,14 6:1 6:10 7:7,11 8:10 9:8,13,20 10:2,6 36:2 60:25 61:3,3,4
S				
S 3:1 4:1 safeguard 63:18 Salerno 36:4,12 salient 19:11 satisfactory 10:2 14:22 satisfy 5:25 39:6 41:4 satisfying 39:7 saying 12:3 19:25 20:23				

<p>62:1,7 stands 30:9 start 51:8 63:4 starting 32:17 54:5 State 1:14 4:18 4:23 8:9 12:8 12:11,17 13:1 13:1 16:5 18:5 21:14 24:10 28:21,25 43:12 46:2,14 47:12 51:6 53:9 54:7 55:9,15,25 57:19,20 62:2 66:10 States 1:1,19 2:3 3:8 19:4 25:16 25:18 45:17 49:22 51:23 52:14 63:8,11 63:17 State's 51:12 statute 8:1 47:20 50:1,2 52:22 52:23,24 53:18 55:23 56:6 66:5 67:6 statutes 53:1 step 47:12,15 51:11,16 steps 45:25 Stevens 30:15 30:24 43:3,18 43:23 44:4 59:24 60:6 61:24 62:14 stretch 33:19 strict 63:5,6 strike 56:6 stringent 13:20 44:22 strong 26:15 struck 43:25 study 62:11,11 subject 12:9 32:23</p>	<p>submit 8:16 submitted 12:3 32:7 67:19,21 substantial 4:16 30:13 34:5 substantially 30:2,4 subtle 27:16 succeeded 31:7 sue 8:19,21 sued 45:4 suffer 28:24 65:22 sufficient 5:25 57:2 61:19 63:18 sufficiently 4:24 34:5 suggest 50:19 52:17,25 suggested 10:4 suggesting 10:15 31:25 suggests 54:8 sun 55:23 support 9:4,4,5 supported 6:18 26:22 supporting 2:3 3:9 51:25 suppose 10:19 14:17 19:1,9 42:19 57:2 supposed 22:17 28:1,1,2 66:17 Supreme 1:1,19 sure 26:21 36:9 36:24 43:19 53:25 54:1,17 55:8 57:7 surely 46:23 survey 11:23 sway 22:3 swear 50:8 system 13:25 14:7,10 26:1 40:3,14 41:22</p>	<p>42:6,6,15 44:2 48:15 51:7,12 52:3,14 54:21 64:15 systemic 65:1,3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>T 3:1,1 take 5:19 17:2 18:18 28:18 29:15 32:3,19 32:22 33:20 35:13 36:4 41:2 44:20 47:13,15,22 51:11 52:6,8 54:4 59:18 taken 14:18 16:3 42:20,23 59:19 takes 36:4 talk 5:2 24:2 28:14 38:21 41:7 64:21 67:2 talking 21:6,12 21:13 23:11,12 26:16 33:9,10 33:15 34:2 target 45:14 Tashjian 6:7 tax 29:17 66:3 teaching 56:8 tell 27:5 47:16 telling 27:23 47:20 61:13,21 terms 33:10 terribly 19:16 35:1 36:25 test 12:23 27:10 41:12 52:25 64:25 66:14 testify 49:24 testimony 11:24 31:3 Thank 31:17 51:18,20 62:24 63:3 67:18</p>	<p>theory 6:9 44:7 48:13 Theresa 9:15 thing 8:24 25:7 26:17 50:11 52:20 53:11 64:8 65:16 things 13:21 22:1 26:21 40:23 42:18 60:11 think 8:17 11:9 13:8 14:9,9 15:3,17 16:7 17:22 19:6 22:12 26:14 32:10 33:1,4 34:23,24 35:13 35:22,25 36:16 37:8,13,25 41:3,10,24 42:13 43:8,8 43:14,21,22,25 44:7,9,24 45:25 46:9,16 46:18,25 50:15 52:20 53:4,21 54:3 55:3 56:17 57:17 58:4,13,20 59:20 60:9,13 60:16,17,24 61:1,2,3,8,20 62:5,6,9,14 66:11 67:10 THOMAS 1:24 3:5 31:20 thought 6:2,2,9 18:8 26:19 35:8 45:3 48:11 49:20 thousands 64:5 threat 21:14 three 59:12 62:25 threshold 61:20 throw 67:16</p>	<p>time 12:12 14:17 16:11,12 17:3 26:8 30:21 31:15 48:16 57:2 times 4:21 32:14 33:9 34:13 Timmons 12:24 27:9 today 4:4 today's 52:8 TODD 1:13 total 17:25 18:4 34:2 tough 29:11 44:12 tougher 44:5 towns 11:10 track 40:2 trained 64:4 transportation 17:12 travel 34:18 travesty 17:22 trial 7:10 tried 40:21 trips 16:14 true 13:16,22 15:3 25:15 36:14,18 37:14 47:10 48:23 59:15 try 10:21 11:7 22:2 23:11 65:9 trying 7:24 23:13 44:14 45:14,14 57:18 65:15,25 turn 10:8 turnout 62:13 turns 59:11 twice 16:14 two 5:13 8:15 11:9 16:14 20:6,15,16 28:19 39:4</p>
---	--	--	--	--

60:2 two-step 48:19 two-thirds 33:20 type 19:19,22 typically 51:14	<hr/> V <hr/> v 1:5,12 4:4,5 validate 39:16 validated 53:14 validity 41:19 43:13 value 4:22 various 55:5 vast 35:23 51:9 vastly 66:9 Vehicles 29:1 32:8 verifying 52:12 versus 64:22 67:9 veteran 58:23 59:21 vices 56:14 virtue 5:15 7:15 56:13 virtues 56:5 voluntarily 6:11 vote 4:13 6:4,17 9:4,4,12 10:23 11:2,20,25 12:5 16:5,7,10 16:11,12 17:3 17:3 20:4,16 20:19,23 23:11 32:5,21 33:6 33:12 38:21 39:3,11 41:21 44:5,11 49:9 53:10,15 54:23 61:16 62:6 63:16,21 65:23 66:19 voted 6:3 11:14 20:24 voter 4:19 9:21 11:17,20 13:4 13:25 14:11 19:3,6,12 20:7 24:11,12 26:24 34:10,19,22 36:6,10,15 40:4 42:1,2,16	44:1,18 45:1,9 45:10,12,17 51:16 52:8 63:10,14 voters 4:14 28:9 30:9 34:5,12 45:15 46:13 47:9,23,24 48:7,18 51:9 55:18 58:15,17 66:6 voter's 52:5 votes 9:12 19:16 20:19 22:3 39:16 59:12 voting 10:17 15:16 16:16 17:24 18:8,13 18:16,20 22:10 25:5 27:4,4 28:22,22 30:8 30:18 42:7 44:22 51:12 52:3 55:1 56:25 61:19 voting-age 21:8	<hr/> W <hr/> wait 47:19 55:16 55:17 wake 26:20 walk 23:10 29:24,24 walks 22:12 wallet 59:22,23 want 8:21 16:2 17:3 31:6 32:15,16 37:11 40:24 41:10 43:16,17 53:10 54:22 58:6,8 66:4 67:2 wanted 11:25 29:25 41:13 53:14 65:16 wants 40:11 50:12	wash 67:6 Washington 1:16,22 2:2 7:22 wasn't 14:1,1 18:15 21:12 55:4,24 way 6:8 16:16 22:4 25:22,22 27:2 37:9 38:7 41:4,5,7 52:12 52:25 53:15 54:3,3,25 55:11,21 57:21 58:13,19 59:20 64:23 66:1 67:16 ways 6:6 13:18 27:16 42:17 Wednesday 1:17 weigh 64:17 66:18 weighing 65:1 67:8 weighty 4:24 weird 22:16 well-to-do 49:6 went 18:3 31:8 41:13 51:6 57:4 62:13,22 64:19 we'll 4:3 24:15 26:4,5 40:16 40:17,25 53:12 54:23 63:15 we're 25:23,23 25:25 33:9,10 33:15 34:21 37:15 we've 27:24 32:6 38:10 45:9 47:1 whatnot 43:1 whatsoever 25:14 WILLIAM 1:3	willing 6:22 wins 19:15 wonder 22:8 words 36:7 work 24:16 worked 66:22 worker 11:23 22:15,17 58:7 58:10 workers 5:23 9:16 61:11 works 14:10 67:17 world 15:2,4 24:12 36:14 41:15 61:21,25 worried 19:16 39:23 40:1 worth 51:3 wouldn't 14:25 43:2,18,23 53:15 write 40:5,7 writing 29:25 wrong 5:8 34:16
				<hr/> X <hr/> x 1:2,15 Xs 64:12	
				<hr/> Y <hr/> year 31:6 years 18:23 19:11 24:20 56:16,16 66:13	
				<hr/> \$ <hr/> \$10 40:20 \$5 40:20	
				<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0.02 54:8 05 11:10 07-21 1:5 4:4 07-25 1:12 4:4	
				<hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 17:18 18:2	

<p>10 10:1 11:23 32:14 34:4 49:14 59:9 10,000 33:22,22 34:5 10:04 1:20 4:2 100 22:4 11:07 67:20 12 25:5 150 31:5 17 17:2,10,10 18 25:2 1998 46:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <hr/> <p>2 32:17 56:16,16 200 22:4 200,000 30:13 2002 12:11 2005 18:17 30:22 2006 62:12,22 2008 1:17 21st 51:13 25,000 32:21,24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <hr/> <p>3 18:23 30 46:11 59:12 31 3:6 32 39:15 54:6,9 54:10 56:19 57:11 34 39:2,3 35 33:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <hr/> <p>4 3:4 40 44:16 400 32:17 400,000 28:20 30:8 31:25 41 18:8 41.4 18:12,19 43,000 18:2 28:18 32:19 40:24 45 38:4</p>	<p>49a 61:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <hr/> <p>50,000 32:4 500 22:4 500,000 19:16 51 3:9 51a 61:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <hr/> <p>60 26:8 63 3:12 66.8 33:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <hr/> <p>75 31:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <hr/> <p>9 1:17 10:1 11:23 9/11 26:20</p>			
---	--	--	--	--