

No. 19-10011

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL.,
Plaintiffs – Appellees,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.,
Defendants – Appellants,

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ET AL.,
Intervenor Defendants – Appellants.

On Appeal From the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division
Case No. 4:18-cv-167

**BRIEF FOR FIRST FOCUS AND THE CHILDREN'S PARTNERSHIP
AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF
INTERVENOR DEFENDANTS – APPELLANTS**

Stuart F. Delery
Counsel of Record
Andrew J. Wilhelm
D. William Lawrence
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-8500

Counsel for *Amici Curiae*

STATEMENT OF INTERESTED PARTIES¹

The undersigned counsel of record certifies that the following listed persons and entities as described in the fourth sentence of Rule 28.2.1 have an interest in the outcome of this case. These representations are made in order that the judges of this court may evaluate possible disqualification or recusal.

The number and style of this case is No. 19-10011, *Texas v. United States*. *Amici* have no parent corporations, and no publicly held company owns 10% or more of the stock of any one of them.

Amici Curiae	Current and Former Counsel for Amici Curiae
First Focus The Children's Partnership	Stuart F. Delery Andrew J. Wilhelm D. William Lawrence GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER
Plaintiffs-Appellees	Current and Former Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellees
[Various States] Neill Hurley and John Nantz	Kyle Douglas Hawkins Andrew Bray Davis OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL, TEXAS

¹ Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, all parties have consented to the filing of this brief. No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part. No party, counsel for a party, or any person other than *amici curiae* and their counsel made a monetary contribution to the preparation or submission of this brief.

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS (cont'd)

	<p>Matthew Hamilton Frederick Eric A. White OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS</p> <p>David J. Hacker Darren Lee McCarty OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS</p> <p>Corey Francis Finkelmeyer WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</p> <p>Robert E. Henneke TEXAS PUBLIC POLICY FOUNDATION</p>
<p>Intervenor Defendants-Appellants</p>	<p>Current and Former Counsel for Intervenor Defendants-Appellants</p>
<p>[<i>Various States</i>]</p>	<p>Xavier Becerra Edward C. Dumont Michael L. Newman Michael J. Mongan Samuel Siegel Kathleen Boergers Nimrod Elias Neli N. Palma CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</p> <p>William Tong Joseph Rubin OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT</p>

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS (cont'd)

	<p>Karl A. Racine Loren L. AliKhan Caroline Van Zile ATTORNEYS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</p> <p>Kathleen Jennings Ilona Kirshon Jessica M. Willey David J. Lyons DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</p> <p>Clare E. Connors Robert Tadao Nakatsuji OFFICE OF THE ATTORNY GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF HAWAII</p> <p>Kwame Raoul David F. Buysse Matthew Chimienti Bridget DiBattista ILLINOIS ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE</p> <p>Andy Beshear La Tasha Buckner S. Travis Mayo Taylor Payne ATTORNEYS FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY</p> <p>Maura Healey Stephen B. Vogel OFFICE OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ATTORNEY GENERAL</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS (cont'd)

	<p>Keith Ellison Scott Ikeda ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA</p> <p>Gurbir S. Grewal Matthew Joseph Berns Kimberly Cahall NEW JERSEY OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL</p> <p>Letitia James Barbara D. Underwood Steven C. Wu Lisa Landau Elizabeth Chesler ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK</p> <p>Joshua H. Stein Sripriya Narasimhan ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA</p> <p>Ellen Rosenblum Henry Kantor Scott Kaplan ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF OREGON</p> <p>Peter F. Neronha Michael W. Field Maria Rose Lenz RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL</p> <p>Thomas J. Donovan, Jr. Benjamin Battles OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS (cont'd)

	<p>Mark R. Herring Toby J. Heytens Matthew Robert McGuire</p> <p>ATTORNEYS FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA</p> <p>Robert W. Ferguson Jeffrey G. Rupert Jeffrey T. Sprung</p> <p>STATE OF WASHINGTON, ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE</p>
Defendants-Appellants	Current and Former Counsel for Defendant-Appellants
<i>[Various Entities of the Federal Government]</i>	<p>Joseph H. Hunt Brett Shumate Martin Vincent Totaro</p> <p>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</p>
Intervenors	Current and Former Counsel for Intervenors
<i>[Entity of Congress]</i>	<p>Douglas Neal Letter Todd Barry Tatelman Kristin Ann Shapiro Brooks M. Hanner</p> <p>U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL</p> <p>Elizabeth Bonnie Wydra Brienne Gorod Brian Rene Frazelle Ashwin Pradyumna Phatak</p> <p>CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER</p> <p>Donald B. Verrilli, Jr. Elaine Goldenberg Ginger Anders</p>

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS (cont'd)

	Jonathan Meltzer Rachel Miller-Ziegler Jeremy Kreisberg MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON, L.L.P.
State Intervenors	Current and Former Counsel for State Intervenors
[<i>Various States</i>]	Eric Olson OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, COLORADO Nathanael Blake OFFICE OF THE IOWA ATTORNEY GENERAL Fadwa A. Hammond MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL Heidi Parry Stern OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA

/s/ Stuart F. Delery

 Stuart F. Delery
Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	2
ARGUMENT	5
I. The ACA Has Transformed Healthcare For Millions Of Children And Their Families.....	5
A. The ACA Provides Millions Of American Children Access To Health Insurance.....	6
(1) More Covered Parents Results In More Covered Children.....	7
(2) Children Can Now Remain On Their Parents’ Health Insurance Until Age 26	10
B. The ACA Increases The Quality Of Children’s Health Insurance And Healthcare	13
(1) Children With Preexisting Conditions Now Obtain Meaningful Insurance Coverage.....	13
(2) Children No Longer Face Benefits Limits	18
(3) Better Health Insurance Means Better Healthcare Outcomes.....	20
II. By Eliminating The Tax Penalty, Congress Did Not Intend To Invalidate The Entire ACA	23
A. Statutory Provisions Are Presumptively Severable Absent Clearly Contrary Congressional Intent.....	24
B. Congress Has Repeatedly Maintained The ACA’s Benefits To Children And Their Families	25
CONCLUSION.....	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
 Cases	
<i>Alaska Airlines, Inc. v. Brock</i> , 480 U.S. 678 (1987).....	24
<i>Ayotte v. Planned Parenthood of N. New England</i> , 546 U.S. 320 (2006).....	4, 24, 25
<i>Champlin Ref. Co. v. Corp. Comm’n of Okla.</i> , 286 U.S. 210 (1932).....	25
<i>Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010).....	24
<i>King v. Burwell</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2480 (2015).....	27
<i>Legal Servs. Corp. v. Velazquez</i> , 531 U.S. 533 (2001).....	27
<i>Med. Ctr. Pharm. v. Mukasey</i> , 536 F.3d 383 (5th Cir. 2008)	25
<i>Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius</i> , 567 U.S. 519 (2012).....	3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 24, 25
<i>United States v. Booker</i> , 543 U.S. 220 (2005).....	24
 Statutes	
26 U.S.C. § 36B	9, 27
42 U.S.C. § 300gg.....	27
42 U.S.C. § 300gg–1	27
42 U.S.C. § 300gg–3.....	16, 27
42 U.S.C. § 300gg–4.....	27

42 U.S.C. § 300gg–6.....16

42 U.S.C. § 300gg–1119

42 U.S.C. § 300gg–14(a)10, 27

42 U.S.C. § 71121

42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(IX).....11

42 U.S.C. § 1802220

Pub. L. 111-148, § 5000A, 124 Stat. 244,3

Pub. L. 115-97, § 11051, 131 Stat. 2089 (2017)27

Pub. L. 115-97, §§ 11081, 12001, 131 Stat. 2092 (2017)3, 27

Pub. L. 115-97, § 13305, 131 Stat. 2126 (2017)27

Regulations

42 C.F.R. § 435.119(c).....9

Other Authorities

115 CONG. REC. H2411 (daily ed. Mar. 24, 2017)
 (statement of Rep. Carbajal)26

115 CONG. REC. S4171 (daily ed. July 25, 2017)
 (statement of Sen. Nelson).....26

115 CONG. REC. S4233 (daily ed. July 26, 2017)
 (statement of Sen. Murphy)26

115 CONG. REC. S4242 (daily ed. July 26, 2017)
 (statement of Sen. Donnelly)27

163 CONG. REC. S7672 (daily ed. Dec. 1, 2017)28

Am. Cancer Soc’y, *Health Care Law: How It Can Help People With
 Cancer & Their Families* (July 2013),
<https://tinyurl.com/y6zkv8dh>.....17

Am. Health Care Act, H.R. 1628, 115th Cong. (2017)25

Amy Burke and Adelle Simmons, *Increased Coverage of Preventive Services with Zero Cost Sharing Under the Affordable Care Act*, Dep’t Health & Hum. Servs. (June 27, 2014), <http://tinyurl.com/yyju5x15>21

Center for Consumer Information & Insurance Oversight, *At Risk: Pre-Existing Conditions Could Affect 1 in 2 Americans: 129 Million People Could Be Denied Affordable Coverage Without Health Reform*, <https://tinyurl.com/yba2dzcv>14

Charlotte Alter & Haley Sweetland Edwards, *United Patients of Am.*, Time (July 13, 2017), <https://tinyurl.com/y2955clr>17

Chintan B. Bhatt & Consuelo M. Beck-Sagué, *Medicaid Expansion & Infant Mortality in the United States*, 108(4) Am. J. Pub. Health (Apr. 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y3yswz7o>22

Cong. Research Serv., *Medicaid Coverage for Former Foster Youth Up to Age 26* (Oct. 26, 2018), <https://tinyurl.com/y4kzk9wa>11

Ctr. for Disease Control & Prevention, *Preterm Birth* (Mar. 18, 2019), <http://tinyurl.com/kp36q3c>17

David Murphey, *Health Insurance Coverage Improves Child Well-Being*, Child Trends (May 2017), <http://tinyurl.com/y2y9xmwf>22

Dep’t of Health & Human Servs., *Health Insurance Coverage for Americans with Pre-Existing Conditions, The Impact of the Affordable Care Act* (Jan. 5, 2017), <http://tinyurl.com/ybkaxxmk>.....14

Dep’t of Health & Human Servs., *Lifetime & Annual Limits*, <http://tinyurl.com/yxtk5v4o>19

The Economic Case for Health Reform Before the H. Comm. On the Budget, 111th Cong. (2009) (statement of Christina D. Romer, Chair, Council of Economic Advisors)15

Emilie Stoltzfus, *et al.*, *Child Welfare: Health Care Needs of Children in Foster Care & Related Federal Issues*, Cong. Research Serv. (Nov. 19, 2014), <https://tinyurl.com/yxjpe8lq>11

Georgetown Univ. Health Policy Inst. Center for Children & Families,
Medicaid Expansion: Good for Parents and Children (Jan. 2014),
<http://tinyurl.com/y6pyg8eb>9

Health Res. & Servs. Admin., Maternal & Child Health, *Home
 Visiting* (Apr. 2018), <https://tinyurl.com/yx8hoo53>22

Henry J. Kaiser Family Found., *Community Health Centers: Growing
 Importance in a Changing Health Care System* (Mar. 9, 2018),
<https://tinyurl.com/y3gnzn6o>21

Henry J. Kaiser Family Found., *Health Insurance Coverage of the
 Total Population* (2017), <https://tinyurl.com/y8q9m8q4> 19

Henry J. Kaiser Family Found., *Key Facts about the Uninsured
 Population* (Dec. 7, 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y79q6mp8>6, 12, 21

Jaime Rosenberg, *Medicaid Expansion Linked to Lower Maternal
 Mortality Rates*, Am. J. of Managed Care (Feb. 6, 2019),
<http://tinyurl.com/y28hdmlu>22

Judith S. Palfrey, *Health Reform Law & Children with Pre-Existing
 Conditions*, Am. Academy of Pediatrics (Mar. 29, 2010),
<https://tinyurl.com/ytxok25>.....17

Julie L. Hudson & Asako S. Moriya, *Medicaid Expansion for Adults
 had Measurable ‘Welcome Mat’ Effects on their Children*, 36:9
 Health Affairs (2017).....9

Kendall Brown, *Open Letter to Lawmakers: The Human Cost*,
 OKC.net (Sept. 30, 2013), <https://tinyurl.com/k2fh8d3>12

Kevin Quinn, *et al.*, *On Their Own: Young Adults Living Without
 Health Insurance*, Commonwealth Fund (May 2000),
<https://tinyurl.com/yysnah4u>10

Leighton Ku & Matt Broaddus, *Coverage of Parents Helps Children,
 Too*, Center on Budget & Policy Priorities (Oct. 20, 2006),
<http://tinyurl.com/y32kwoma>8

Ltr. from Dep’t of Justice to Clerk of Court, Mar. 25, 20194

Medicaid & CHIP Payment & Access Comm’n, *MACStats: Medicaid & CHIP Data Book* (Dec. 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y6lhgelz>6, 8

Namrata Uberoi, *et al.*, *Health Insurance Coverage & the Affordable Care Act, 2010-2016*, Dep’t of Health & Human Servs. (Mar. 3, 2016), <https://tinyurl.com/kboqlcd>12

Nicholas Bakalar, *Nearly 20 Million Have Gained Health Insurance Since 2010*, N.Y. Times (May 22, 2017).....10

Nitin S. Damle, *Letter to Congressional Leaders*, Am. Coll. of Physicians (Mar. 7, 2017), <https://tinyurl.com/y3m7t3gy>.....17

Rebecca Anhang Price, *et al.*, *Healthcare Cost & Utilization Project*, Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality (May 2012), <http://tinyurl.com/y44xqq5g>19

Robin Marty, *Six Stories of Obamacare Already Making a Difference*, Rolling Stone (Oct. 16, 2013).....12

Sarah Kliff, *The Little Lobbyist: A 6-Year-Old, Whose Life Depends on ACA, Heads to Capitol Hill*, Vox (June 21, 2017), <http://tinyurl.com/y62opvqv>20

Sofija Rak & Janis Coffin, *Affordable Care Act*, J. of Med. Prac. Mgmt. 317, <http://tinyurl.com/y2fckzc2>.....18

Susan R. Todd & Benjamin D. Sommers, *Overview of the Uninsured in the United States: A Summary of the 2012 Current Population Survey Report*, Dep’t of Health & Human Servs. (Sept. 12, 2012), <https://tinyurl.com/y6b36oal>.....12

U.S. Gov’t Accountability Off., GAO-11-264, *Medicaid & CHIP: Given the Association Between Parent & Child Insurance Status, New Expansion May Benefit Families* (Feb. 2011), <http://tinyurl.com/y5umkmth>.....7

Weiwei Chen, *Young Adults’ Selection and Use of Dependent Coverage under the Affordable Care Act*, 6 Frontier Pub. Health (Jan. 31, 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y3o9m3b9>10

INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*

Amici curiae are First Focus and The Children’s Partnership.

First Focus is a national bipartisan children’s advocacy organization dedicated to making children and families the priority in federal policy and budget decisions related to healthcare. First Focus leads a comprehensive advocacy strategy to identify and implement real-world solutions to improve the lives of children and families.

The Children’s Partnership (“TCP”) is a California-based nonprofit child advocacy organization working to ensure every child, no matter their background, has the resources and opportunities they need for a bright and healthy future. TCP improves the lives of underserved children where they live, learn, and play with breakthrough solutions at the intersection of community engagement, research, and policy.

First Focus and TCP are committed to supporting the benefits the Affordable Care Act extended to America’s children and young adults. First Focus and TCP both have a strong interest in defending the vast improvement to the nation’s healthcare system under the ACA and ensuring that children across America obtain quality health insurance coverage and healthcare.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The Affordable Care Act (“ACA”) revolutionized the healthcare system for every American, especially the millions of children and their families who without its protections would be excluded from the health insurance market or receive inferior care. One of the ACA’s primary achievements was improving children’s access to and quality of healthcare—which benefitted not only children but their families and communities. This brief highlights several of the ACA’s principal successes, such as protecting children with preexisting conditions, extending dependent coverage, and eliminating annual and lifetime limits on benefits. These protections are not simply one-off minor improvements that helped a few sick children get better. The ACA allows children across the country to lead healthy, productive lives by giving them early access to effective healthcare at affordable prices, often saving them and their families from financial ruin. These benefits are real, and they have been transformative.

As it debated the legislation relevant to this appeal, Congress heard the stories of many children who are alive and healthy today thanks to access to quality healthcare they received through the ACA. Some of these stories are described below. But these accounts are merely representative—all told, *tens of millions* of American children and young adults today have access to quality healthcare because of the ACA.

As part of its reform of the individual health insurance market, the ACA included what is commonly known as the Individual Mandate: the requirement that most Americans either obtain health insurance or pay a “shared responsibility payment.” Pub. L. 111-148, 124 Stat. 244, § 5000A (2010). In 2012, the Supreme Court upheld the Individual Mandate against a constitutional challenge as an exercise of Congress’s taxing power. *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519, 588 (2012) (“*NFIB*”). It also concluded that, although certain mandatory Medicaid expansion requirements exceeded Congress’s authority, states could expand Medicaid on a voluntary basis. *Id.* In its sole severability determination concerning the ACA, the Court wrote that it was “confident that Congress would have wanted to preserve the rest of the Act” even absent the mandatory Medicaid expansion. *Id.* at 587.

In the years since *NFIB* was decided, Congress has repeatedly considered whether to repeal the ACA in its entirety, but it has always voted to *maintain* the ACA and its protections for millions of Americans. Then, in December 2017, Congress passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (“TCJA”). True to its name, the vast majority of the TCJA concerned amendments to the Tax Code. The TCJA never mentioned the ACA by name, but it did reduce the ACA’s shared responsibility payment to zero. *See* Pub. L. 115-97, 131 Stat. 2092, § 11081 (2017). Based on that reduction, Plaintiffs-Appellees contend in this action that the Individual Mandate is

(a) unconstitutional because Congress no longer collects a tax through the shared responsibility payment and (b) as a result, the entire ACA should be invalidated. The district agreed on both counts and thus struck down the whole statute. ROA.2611–2665. The Department of Justice apparently now agrees that the entire ACA should be invalidated, despite the chaos that would cause for the nation’s healthcare system and the harm that would flow to children and families across the country. Ltr. from Dep’t of Justice to Clerk of Court (Mar. 25, 2019) at 1.

The district court’s order is fundamentally wrong. It must be reversed, even assuming, *arguendo*, the district court was correct about the impact of the TCJA on the Individual Mandate. *Cf.* U.S. House of Representatives’ Opening Br. 35 (arguing that the Individual Mandate remains constitutional); State Def.’s Opening Br. 27 (same). The “touchstone for any decision about [a severability] remedy is legislative intent,” *NFIB*, 567 U.S. at 587 (quoting *Ayotte v. Planned Parenthood of N. New England*, 546 U.S. 320, 330 (2006)), and Congress most definitely did not intend to eliminate the ACA—a once-in-a-generation piece of landmark legislation that has insured 20 million Americans and improved quality of care for many more—if any one aspect were excised. On the contrary, Congress demonstrated its unequivocal intent to maintain the ACA even without the Individual Mandate. The simple answer is provided by what Congress actually did: In 2017, Congress voted

to reduce the shared responsibility payment to zero in the TCJA but left the rest of the ACA intact. That ends the Court’s inquiry.

It is no surprise that Congress consistently has retained the ACA despite the repeated efforts to repeal it. For several years, millions of children have received life-changing (and, in many cases, life-saving) health insurance coverage and substantive protections to ensure the quality of the services and care they receive. Make no mistake about what is at stake here: adopting the position of the district court and the Department of Justice would wreak grievous harm on children and families by eliminating these bedrock ACA provisions.

ARGUMENT

I. The ACA Has Transformed Healthcare For Millions Of Children And Their Families

Congress enacted the ACA to provide “Quality, Affordable Health Care for All Americans,” Pub. L. 111-148, 124 Stat. 130 (2010), and critically “to increase the number of Americans covered by health insurance and decrease the cost of health care,” *NFIB*, 567 U.S. at 538. It expanded coverage to millions of children and young adults. It increased the quality of children’s health care by ensuring that patients cannot be denied insurance or be charged higher premiums because they have preexisting conditions—in other words, because they are already sick and need healthcare. And it provided financial security to millions of families with very sick children by eliminating annual and lifetime limits on insurance benefits. In these

and many other ways, the ACA has been resoundingly successful, and has become essential for the health and well-being of children and their families across the country.

A. The ACA Provides Millions Of American Children Access To Health Insurance

Prior to the ACA, 44 million nonelderly Americans lacked health insurance. HENRY J. KAISER FAMILY FOUND., *Key Facts about the Uninsured Population* (Dec. 7, 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y79q6mp8>. Being uninsured can have dire consequences: the uninsured are less likely to receive preventive care, more likely to go without necessary care due to cost, and more likely to be hospitalized for otherwise avoidable conditions. *Id.* Avoidable conditions are often much more expensive to treat than to prevent, severely straining healthcare providers, and even leading to hospital closures. *Id.* Hospitals are required by law to provide a minimum level of care regardless of a patient’s ability to pay. *NFIB*, 567 U.S. at 547. To recoup these losses, hospitals pass the cost to insurers, which in turn raise premiums on policyholders. *Id.*

The ACA alleviates these risks for millions of children and young adults. As a result of the ACA’s Medicaid expansion, 5.5 million previously uninsured children now receive coverage. MEDICAID & CHIP PAYMENT & ACCESS COMM’N, *MACStats: Medicaid & CHIP Data Book* 94 (Dec. 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y6lhgelz> (“*MACStats*”). Still more children receive coverage

because their parents obtained private insurance through a health exchange that included dependent coverage. And the ACA allows young adults to retain their childhood insurance until age 26, extending coverage to a largely un- or under-insured population.

(1) More Covered Parents Results In More Covered Children

Health insurance plans often have dependent child options under which children can receive coverage from their parents' insurance. In light of this, children and parents very often have the same insurance status—if the parent is insured, then so is their child, and if the parent is uninsured, their child is too. As of 2011, 84% of children shared the insurance status of their parents. U.S. GOV'T ACCOUNTABILITY OFF., GAO-11-264, *Medicaid & CHIP: Given the Association Between Parent & Child Insurance Status, New Expansion May Benefit Families* 8 (Feb. 2011), <http://tinyurl.com/y5umkmth>. Further, children were *eight times* more likely to have public insurance if their parents also had public insurance, as compared to children of parents who were uninsured. *Id.* at 9. Study after study reinforced this correlation. *Id.* at 10 (“All 13 articles we reviewed that examined a parent’s and a child’s insurance status identified significant associations.”).

Coverage discrepancies between parents and their children arise, however, when children are eligible for public health insurance (through Medicaid or the Children’s Health Insurance Program (“CHIP”)) but their parents are not. Parents

who are not eligible for public health insurance often are unaware of their children's eligibility and thus fail to enroll their eligible children. Leighton Ku & Matt Broaddus, *Coverage of Parents Helps Children, Too*, CENTER ON BUDGET & POLICY PRIORITIES 4 (Oct. 20, 2006), <http://tinyurl.com/y32kwoma>. The greater the discrepancy between parent and child income eligibility, the greater the chance that ineligible parents fail to insure otherwise eligible children.

Income eligibility cut-offs between adults and children—and the resulting potential for eligible children to remain uninsured—can be stark. For example, as of April 2018, parents of dependent children in Alabama, a state that did not adopt the Medicaid expansion option from the ACA, were only eligible for Medicaid if they earned up to 13% of the Federal Poverty Line (“FPL”). *MACStats* 106. Children, on the other hand, were eligible for Medicaid if their family made up to 141% of the FPL and eligible for CHIP if their family made up to 312% of the FPL. *Id.* at 103. This meant that Alabaman parents of a family of four who made more than \$3,263 but less than \$78,312 were not eligible for public health insurance even though their children were eligible. *Id.* at 112.

By 2014, roughly 70% of uninsured children were eligible for, but not enrolled in, public health insurance. GEORGETOWN UNIV. HEALTH POLICY INST. CENTER FOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES, *Medicaid Expansion: Good for Parents and Children* (Jan. 2014), <http://tinyurl.com/y6pyg8eb>. This provided the ACA with a huge

opportunity to expand children’s health insurance coverage. Research shows that the ACA’s expansion of coverage for parents provided a “welcome mat” for their children: increases in public health insurance *eligibility* for parents lead to increased *coverage* for their children, even when the children were already eligible. Julie L. Hudson & Asako S. Moriya, *Medicaid Expansion for Adults had Measurable ‘Welcome Mat’ Effects on their Children*, 36:9 HEALTH AFFAIRS 1643, 1643 (2017), <https://tinyurl.com/yxqp79fv> (“*Welcome Mat*”). The expansion of Medicaid to low-income adults earning up to 138% of the FPL created a pathway for enrolling already eligible uninsured children. Additionally, the ACA requires Medicaid-eligible parents to enroll their children as a prerequisite to receiving coverage themselves. 42 C.F.R. § 435.119(c). In total, **over 700,000** low-income children obtained coverage through these “welcome mat” effects thanks to the ACA. *Welcome Mat* 1643.

In addition to expanding Medicaid, the ACA also expanded access to the private health insurance market through exchanges by granting tax credits to purchase health insurance for those between 100% and 400% of the FPL. 26 U.S.C. § 36B. Individuals who do not meet the income restrictions for Medicaid can, thanks to the ACA, purchase insurance policies through the federal or state exchanges. Parents can buy dependent coverage policies that cover their children as well. In 2016, 11.6 million people received their healthcare policies through an individual

market exchange created by the ACA, many of them children. Nicholas Bakalar, *Nearly 20 Million Have Gained Health Insurance Since 2010*, N.Y. TIMES, (May 22, 2017), <http://tinyurl.com/kmgodck>.

(2) Children Can Now Remain On Their Parents' Health Insurance Until Age 26

Historically, young adults were almost twice as likely to forego health insurance as children or older adults. Kevin Quinn, *et al.*, *On Their Own: Young Adults Living Without Health Insurance*, COMMONWEALTH FUND 1 (May 2000), <https://tinyurl.com/yysnah4u>. This was due to a variety of reasons, including working low-wage jobs that do not provide insurance, recently coming off of their parents' health insurance and not knowing how to obtain coverage for themselves, and forgoing expensive insurance under the belief that they would remain healthy and not need care for the foreseeable future. *Id.* at 1, 8.

To increase the number of insured young adults, the ACA allows young adults to remain on their parents' health insurance policies until they turn 26. 42 U.S.C. § 300gg-14(a). The expansion of dependent coverage was “one of the earliest and most popular provisions in the [ACA].” Weiwei Chen, *Young Adults' Selection and Use of Dependent Coverage under the Affordable Care Act*, 6 FRONTIER PUB. HEALTH 3 (Jan. 31, 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y3o9m3b9>.

Similarly, the ACA allows former foster care youth—an especially vulnerable population—to keep their public health insurance (usually Medicaid) until they turn

26. 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(IX). One study found that one- to two-thirds of foster children “have at least one chronic or acute physical health condition that needs treatment,” and up to “three-fourths show behavioral or social competency problems that may warrant mental health services.” Emilie Stoltzfus, *et al.*, *Child Welfare: Health Care Needs of Children in Foster Care & Related Federal Issues*, CONG. RESEARCH SERV. 2 (Nov. 19, 2014), <https://tinyurl.com/yxjpe8lq>. In addition, over half of adopted foster care children have “special health care needs,” defined as “one or more conditions (expected to last 12 months or more) that require[] ongoing need for more medical, mental health, or educational services than is usual for most children of the same age.” *Id.* at 7. For the roughly 250,000 American children who leave foster care each year, continued health insurance coverage as a result of the ACA provides much-needed security and stability in what can be an otherwise tumultuous situation. CONG. RESEARCH SERV., *Medicaid Coverage for Former Foster Youth Up to Age 26* (Oct. 26, 2018), <https://tinyurl.com/y4kzk9wa>.

The effects of the dependent care expansion has been dramatic. In 2010, about 30% of young adults aged 19 to 25 went without health insurance. Susan R. Todd & Benjamin D. Sommers, *Overview of the Uninsured in the United States: A Summary of the 2012 Current Population Survey Report*, DEP’T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS. 1 (Sept. 12, 2012), <https://tinyurl.com/y6b36oal>. Just one year after

the ACA, 500,000 previously uninsured young adults obtained coverage, *id.*, and by early 2016, **over 6 million** young adults gained health insurance as a result of the ACA, Namrata Uberoi, *et al.*, *Health Insurance Coverage & the Affordable Care Act, 2010-2016*, DEP'T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS. 2 (Mar. 3, 2016), <https://tinyurl.com/kboqlcd>. Young adults constitute over 25% of nonelderly adults who gained coverage under the ACA between 2010 and 2016. *Id.* In the past decade, the uninsured rate for young adults halved, from 30% to 14.8%. HENRY J. KAISER FAMILY FOUND., *Key Facts about the Uninsured Population* (Dec. 7, 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y79q6mp8>.

Allowing young adults to stay on their parents' health insurance both saves lives and allows young adults to be productive members of society. Kendall Brown, the executive director of a nonprofit in Oklahoma, was diagnosed with Crohn's Disease in elementary school. Robin Marty, *Six Stories of Obamacare Already Making a Difference*, ROLLING STONE (Oct. 16, 2013), <https://tinyurl.com/y5mjwhe4>; Kendall Brown, *Open Letter to Lawmakers: The Human Cost*, OKC.net (Sept. 30, 2013) ("*Open Letter*"), <https://tinyurl.com/k2fh8d3>. Kendall's parents' insurance covered her through childhood, but she experienced a lapse in coverage in college, resulting in thousands of dollars in medical bills. *Open Letter*. Thanks to the ACA, Kendall went back on her parents' insurance until her 26th birthday. *Id.* This allowed her to pay for

necessary intestinal surgery. *Id.* As Kendall wrote to members of Congress, “Without ... the Affordable Care Act, I could not have gotten the surgery. And without the surgery, I would have died.” *Id.*

B. The ACA Increases The Quality Of Children’s Health Insurance And Healthcare

Beyond allowing more children to *access* health insurance, the ACA improved the *quality* of coverage. Childhood can be a particularly vulnerable time, both for the health of the child and the financial well-being of the parents. Better healthcare protects children and their families from potentially catastrophic loss and helps ensure healthy development.

(1) Children With Preexisting Conditions Now Obtain Meaningful Insurance Coverage

“In the Affordable Care Act, Congress addressed the problem of those who cannot obtain insurance coverage because of preexisting conditions or other health issues” through “‘guaranteed issue’ and ‘community-rating’ provisions.” *NFIB*, 567 U.S. at 547–48. Preexisting conditions are “health condition[s] that predate a person applying for or enrolling in a new health insurance policy.” DEP’T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., *Health Insurance Coverage for Americans with Pre-Existing Conditions, The Impact of the Affordable Care Act 2* (Jan. 5, 2017) (“*Health Insurance Coverage*”), <http://tinyurl.com/ybkaxxmk>. Those with preexisting conditions who could not obtain employment that offered coverage were

“desperately in need of insurance” but often could not acquire it. *NFIB*, 567 U.S. at 596 (Ginsburg, J., concurring in part, concurring in the judgment, and dissenting in part).

Prior to the ACA, Americans with preexisting conditions were often uninsurable. *Id.* at 597. Insurance policies that covered routine care or unexpected conditions often did not cover preexisting conditions. Moreover, insurers were permitted to define for themselves what constituted a preexisting condition; in addition to serious but less-common conditions such as cancer and diabetes, insurers included commonplace conditions such as asthma, depression, and high blood pressure. *Health Insurance Coverage* at 2. As many as one in two Americans could have a preexisting condition. *See* ROA.1131, 1149-1183, 1210, 1278–1284 (133 million Americans); *see also* CENTER FOR CONSUMER INFORMATION & INSURANCE OVERSIGHT, *At Risk: Pre-Existing Conditions Could Affect 1 in 2 Americans: 129 Million People Could Be Denied Affordable Coverage Without Health Reform (“At Risk”)*, <https://tinyurl.com/yba2dzcv> (129 million Americans). More than **80 million** Americans with employer-based insurance have a preexisting condition. *See At Risk*.

Americans with preexisting conditions lucky enough to find insurance often paid exorbitant rates. From 2006–2009, **12.6 million** adults were either denied coverage or charged a higher premium due to a preexisting condition. *NFIB*, 567

U.S. at 597 (Ginsburg, J., concurring in part, concurring in the judgment, and dissenting in part). Prior to the ACA, “[i]ndividuals with these conditions would at least get charged a higher premium.” *At Risk*. And families needing and able to obtain coverage for a preexisting condition were often locked into their current jobs, unable to pursue new opportunities or make changes to address personal circumstances for fear of losing health-protecting or life-saving insurance. “Without the [ACA], such conditions limit the ability to obtain affordable health insurance if they become self-employed, take a job with a company that does not offer coverage, or experience a change in life circumstance, such as divorce, retirement, or moving to a different state.” *Id.*; see also *The Economic Case for Health Reform: Hearing Before the H. Comm. On the Budget*, 111th Cong. 12 (2009) (statement of Christina D. Romer, Chair, Council of Economic Advisors), <https://tinyurl.com/y6avfzp8> (“Expanding coverage and eliminating restrictions on preexisting conditions could end the phenomenon of job lock, where worries about health insurance cause workers to stay in jobs even when there are ones that pay better or are a better match available.”).

The bar to meaningful health insurance for those with preexisting conditions was not limited to adults. Before the ACA, children with the misfortune of having asthma or diabetes would find obtaining health insurance as an adult exceedingly difficult due to their medical history. It is estimated that *over 17 million* children

have a preexisting condition. *Health Insurance Coverage* at 13. That amounts to roughly 25% of American children who, without the ACA, would be subject to denial of coverage based on preexisting conditions.

The ACA changed the landscape by requiring that comprehensive insurance plans be offered at standard rates to all patients, regardless of medical history. 42 U.S.C. § 300gg–6; 42 U.S.C. § 300gg–3(a) Thanks to the ACA, children born with preexisting conditions need no longer fear the day they age out of their parents’ insurance policies because they are able to purchase insurance on the same terms as everyone else. And parents of those children have the security of knowing that they can buy insurance to cover the necessary care, as well as the freedom to change jobs without fear of jeopardizing their children’s coverage.

Many leading medical organizations—including the American Cancer Society, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American College of Physicians—supported the ACA explicitly because of its protections for children with preexisting conditions. AM. CANCER SOC’Y, *Health Care Law: How It Can Help People With Cancer & Their Families* 6 (July 2013), <https://tinyurl.com/y6zkv8dh> (“Insurance companies can no longer deny coverage to children with pre-existing conditions such as cancer or diabetes.”); Judith S. Palfrey, *Health Reform Law & Children with Pre-Existing Conditions*, AM. ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS, (Mar. 29, 2010), <https://tinyurl.com/yytok25> (“No child

should be denied coverage for a pre-existing condition.”); Nitin S. Damle, *Letter to Congressional Leaders*, AM. COLL. OF PHYSICIANS 3 (Mar. 7, 2017), <https://tinyurl.com/y3m7t3gy> (“Current law ensures that children, adolescents and adults with preexisting conditions cannot be denied coverage, be charged higher premiums, or be subject to cancellation.”).

The ACA’s requirement that insurance policies cover preexisting conditions will protect generations of children from the perils of going without healthcare. The issue cuts across geographic, income, and political lines, uniting parents in support of their sick children. For example, two mothers in Louisiana, one Democrat, the other Republican, developed a friendship after spending hours in a neonatal intensive care unit caring for their sons. Charlotte Alter & Haley Sweetland Edwards, *United Patients of Am.*, TIME (July 13, 2017) (“*United Patients*”), <https://tinyurl.com/y2955clr>. Angéla Lorio’s son John Paul and Jessica Michot’s son Gabriel were born premature. Premature births are not uncommon: one in ten births occur prior to a full gestation period. CTR. FOR DISEASE CONTROL & PREVENTION, *Preterm Birth* (Mar. 18, 2019), <http://tinyurl.com/kp36q3c>. Children born premature are not just at risk from the early birth; they also have higher rates of death and disability. *Id.* John Paul and Gabriel had serious medical problems resulting from their early births, including developmental disabilities, needing a feeding tube to eat, and using a tracheotomy to breathe. *United Patients*. Lorio and

Michot launched a group called “Trach Mommas of Louisiana,” which traveled to Washington, D.C. to protest the 2017 attempted repeal of the ACA. *Id.* With the legislation intact, the ACA allows John Paul and Gabriel to access private health insurance now and through adulthood, despite suffering from preexisting conditions.

(2) Children No Longer Face Benefits Limits

Beyond leaving children with preexisting conditions vulnerable to denials of coverage or exorbitant rates, federal law before the ACA allowed limits on the total amount of benefits any one person could receive. Thus, if a child developed a condition requiring extensive medical care after enrolling in a policy, the insurer would only be responsible for paying a certain amount, both annually and over the child’s lifetime. Any additional medical expenses would fall completely on the child’s parents. Sofija Rak & Janis Coffin, *Affordable Care Act*, J. OF MED. PRAC. MGMT. 317, 318, <http://tinyurl.com/y2fckzc2>. These limits applied to both individual market policies and employer-based insurance plans. U.S. CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES, *Ending Lifetime & Yearly Limits*, (last accessed Mar. 31, 2019), <https://tinyurl.com/y5x845ah>. In 2017, 54% of those who have health insurance received coverage through their employer. HENRY J. KAISER FAMILY FOUND., *Health Insurance Coverage of the Total Population* (2017), <https://tinyurl.com/y8q9m8q4>.

Certain pediatric conditions, such as cancer, may exhaust both annual and lifetime limits in a matter of months. In 2009, the average cost of a hospital stay for a child with cancer was \$40,400 per visit, at \$3,900 per day. Rebecca Anhang Price, *et al.*, *Healthcare Cost & Utilization Project*, AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH & QUALITY 2 (May 2012), <http://tinyurl.com/y44xqq5g>. The average pediatric cancer diagnosis occurs at just eight years old, leaving parents of uninsured children with almost a decade of hospital bills to pay out of pocket. *Id.* at 1–2. Of course, adults with serious illnesses faced limits as well.

The ACA abolished annual and lifetime limits. 42 U.S.C. § 300gg–11; DEP’T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., *Lifetime & Annual Limits*, <http://tinyurl.com/yxtk5v4o>. As a result, children can now receive much-needed healthcare without fear that they or their parents will fall into bankruptcy as a result of enormous medical bills.

Timmy Morrison’s life illustrates the ACA’s profound impact on families whose children have a complex pediatric illness. Timmy was born seven weeks premature with a rare genetic disease; he spent his first six months in a hospital. Sarah Kliff, *The Little Lobbyist: A 6-Year-Old, Whose Life Depends on ACA, Heads to Capitol Hill*, VOX (June 21, 2017), <http://tinyurl.com/y62opvqv>. That inaugural hospital visit amounted to more than \$2 million in medical bills, far eclipsing the previous standard lifetime limit of \$1 million. *Id.* The visit turned out to be the first

of many. Timmy frequents hospitals because of his rare genetic disease, and he has undergone under anesthesia more than 45 times in his young life. *Id.* Without the ACA’s prohibition on annual and lifetime limits, Timmy’s parents would be in financial ruin. Timmy personally shared his story with legislators in the days before the vote to repeal the ACA in 2017, and he provided Congress with stories of over 100 other children whose health depended on the ACA. *Id.* Congress listened, and in rejecting repeal it reaffirmed that Timmy and millions of other children deserve affordable, quality healthcare.

(3) **Better Health Insurance Means Better Healthcare Outcomes**

Access to quality health insurance improves healthcare outcomes for children in several ways.

First, the ACA requires a minimum package of benefits for each insurance plan sold on the exchanges. 42 U.S.C. § 18022. Included in that package are “[m]aternity and newborn care” and “[p]ediatric services, including oral and vision care.” *Id.* § 18022(b)(1). These services are integral to the growth and development of the estimated **18.6 million children** whose insurance now covers preventive services due to the ACA. Amy Burke and Adelle Simmons, *Increased Coverage of Preventive Services with Zero Cost Sharing Under the Affordable Care Act*, DEP’T HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., (June 27, 2014), <http://tinyurl.com/yyju5xl5>.

Second, the ACA injected more funding into Community Health Centers (“CHCs”), which act as primary healthcare providers for under-served and low-income communities. In 2016, over 10,000 CHCs provided care to more than **25 million Americans**. HENRY J. KAISER FAMILY FOUND., *Community Health Centers: Growing Importance in a Changing Health Care System* (Mar. 9, 2018), <https://tinyurl.com/y3gnzn6o>. **Over 8 million children** receive healthcare at CHCs, and they account for nearly one-third of CHC patients. Preventive care can drastically reduce overall healthcare expenditures by treating avoidable conditions earlier, before the patient must resort to the emergency room. HENRY J. KAISER FAMILY FOUND., *Key Facts about the Uninsured Population* (Dec. 7, 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y79q6mp8>.

Third, the ACA prioritized prenatal and early childhood care by establishing Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Programs (“MIECHV”), which fund home visits to at-risk pregnant mothers and those with young children. 42 U.S.C. § 711. In 2017, MIECHV provided care to 156,000 parents and children with nearly **one million** home visits. HEALTH RES. & SERVS. ADMIN., MATERNAL & CHILD HEALTH, *Home Visiting* (Apr. 2018), <https://tinyurl.com/yx8hoo53>. MIECHV visits include healthcare, social services, and child development professionals providing instruction and care to mothers and parents on a wide range

of topics, including preventive health and prenatal practices, child development, and positive parenting. *Id.*

These changes have improved outcomes substantially. A recent study showed that the ACA accelerated the decline of infant mortality rates in states that opted for the Medicaid expansion compared to states not opting for the expansion. Chintan B. Bhatt & Consuelo M. Beck-Sagué, *Medicaid Expansion & Infant Mortality in the United States*, 108(4) AM. J. PUB. HEALTH 565 (Apr. 2018), <http://tinyurl.com/y3yswz7o>. An additional study found that the states receiving the Medicaid expansion from the ACA saw lower rates of maternal mortality than their sister states. Jaime Rosenberg, *Medicaid Expansion Linked to Lower Maternal Mortality Rates*, AM. J. OF MANAGED CARE, (Feb. 6, 2019), <http://tinyurl.com/y28hdmlu>. Still more studies demonstrate the straightforward conclusion: when children have health insurance, they are more likely to experience better health outcomes. David Murphey, *Health Insurance Coverage Improves Child Well-Being*, CHILD TRENDS, (May 2017), <http://tinyurl.com/y2y9xmwf>.

* * *

The ACA increased the quality of health insurance coverage for millions of children and their families, including those with preexisting conditions. With the ACA, children are obtaining better health insurance, receiving better healthcare, and thus achieving better health outcomes.

II. By Eliminating The Tax Penalty, Congress Did Not Intend To Invalidate The Entire ACA

The district court here concluded that Congress would not have enacted the ACA without the Individual Mandate. ROA.2660. But, as explained below, the Individual Mandate is severable from the rest of the comprehensive law because Congress has shown no intent or willingness to repeal the whole ACA and its life-saving provisions. Quite the opposite. The district court's order must therefore be reversed.

The Supreme Court has held that courts must presume that invalid statutory provisions are severable from the otherwise valid, operative provisions. The standard for overcoming this presumption is demanding: Courts must uphold the remainder of the statute absent "evident" congressional intent to allow the entire statute to fall along with the invalid provision. *NFIB*, 567 U.S. at 586.

Here, the Court does not have to guess about what Congress would have wanted now that the ACA has revolutionized the healthcare system. Instead, it can look to what Congress actually did. Congress zeroed out the tax penalty for failure to comply with the Individual Mandate but left the rest of the ACA in place. In passing the TCJA, Congress answered the question before the Court: yes, the tax payments could now be eliminated, but the Act's other guarantees, including protections for people with pre-existing conditions, elimination of lifetime benefit limits, and extending benefit coverage, must remain in place. Indeed, Congress has

rejected dozens of efforts to do what the Plaintiff States and the Department of Justice ask this Court to do: abolish the ACA and eliminate its enormous positive impact on the healthcare of the nation. That position has no basis in law or fact.

A. Statutory Provisions Are Presumptively Severable Absent Clearly Contrary Congressional Intent

Well-established law requires severability rather than (as the district court did here) striking down entire pieces of comprehensive legislation. Even where a court finds a statutory provision to be unconstitutional, it must “seek to determine what Congress would have intended in light of the Court’s constitutional holding” and “refrain from invalidating more of the statute than is necessary.” *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220, 246, 258 (2005) (quotation marks omitted). “Generally speaking, when confronting a constitutional flaw in a statute, [courts] try to limit the solution to the problem,’ severing any ‘problematic portions while leaving the remainder intact.’” *Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.*, 561 U.S. 477, 508 (2010) (quoting *Ayotte*, 546 U.S. at 328–29). The Court’s “duty” is “to maintain the act in so far as it is valid,” *Alaska Airlines, Inc. v. Brock*, 480 U.S. 678, 684 (1987) (quotation marks omitted), because a “ruling of unconstitutionality frustrates the intent of the elected representatives of the people,” *Ayotte*, 546 U.S. at 329 (quotation marks omitted); *id.* at 330 (“[A] court cannot use its remedial powers to circumvent the intent of the legislature”) (quotation marks omitted). Thus, the Court presumes that valid statutory provisions are severable “[u]nless it is evident

that the Legislature would not have enacted those provisions” without the invalid one. *Free Enter.*, 561 U.S. at 509.

The touchstone of severability is Congressional intent—whether Congress “[would] have preferred what is left of its statute to no statute at all.” *Ayotte*, 546 U.S. at 330. Here, as in *NFIB*, the core question is “whether Congress would have wanted the rest of the [ACA] to stand, had it known” that an important part of the law would be struck down. 567 U.S. at 587. “Unless it is ‘evident’ that the answer is no, we must leave the rest of the [ACA] intact.” *Id.* (quoting *Champlin Ref. Co. v. Corp. Comm’n of Okla.*, 286 U.S. 210, 234 (1932)). “Inconclusive” evidence cannot overcome the presumption of severability. *Med. Ctr. Pharm. v. Mukasey*, 536 F.3d 383, 405 (5th Cir. 2008).

B. Congress Has Repeatedly Maintained The ACA’s Benefits To Children And Their Families

Months before passing the TCJA in 2017, Congress rejected a repeal of the ACA. *See* Am. Health Care Act, H.R. 1628, 115th Cong. (2017). During extensive debate, as they had many times before, members of Congress highlighted the many harms to the healthcare of millions of American children if various provisions of the ACA were repealed. Some painted vivid pictures of the despair facing parents who could not afford life-saving treatment for their children. As Senator Murphy stated, “when . . . your child has an expensive disease and you lose insurance, you can’t pay for it. You can sell your house, you can sell your car, and you can exhaust your

savings. For some families, that will cover 6 months' worth of expenses for their sick child. At some point, the patient dies if they don't have access to healthcare." 115 CONG. REC. S4233 (daily ed. July 26, 2017) (statement of Sen. Murphy). Others underscored the importance of access to coverage for those below and just above the federal poverty line. 115 CONG. REC. S4171 (daily ed. July 25, 2017) (statement of Sen. Nelson) ("How about some of the children's programs on Medicaid? If you start cutting that back to the tune of about \$800 billion over a decade, you are going to knock out a lot of these people."); 115 CONG. REC. H2411 (daily ed. Mar. 24, 2017) (statement of Rep. Carbajal) ("The Affordable Care Act meant [that a mother] could open her small business and afford insurance coverage for her two children. . . . Repealing legislation that has improved the quality of life . . . for the over 20 million Americans who have gained health insurance under the Affordable Care Act[] would be callous, cruel, and irresponsible."). Still others emphasized that they "cannot support a bill that takes away care from these families" of children with preexisting conditions who previously found it "impossible . . . to get coverage." 115 CONG. REC. S4242 (daily ed. July 26, 2017) (statement of Sen. Donnelly).

After refusing to repeal the ACA, Congress passed the TCJA. The TCJA's statutory language confirms Congress intended to maintain the ACA. The TCJA is

full of provisions “repeal[ing]” various Tax Code provisions.² By contrast, the TCJA “amend[ed]” the shared responsibility payment—taking care not to characterize its action as a “repeal” or mention the ACA by name. *See* Pub. L. No. 115-87, § 11081, 131 Stat. 2092 (2017). And it left untouched the other portions of the ACA, including tax credits to access insurance on exchanges, 26 U.S.C. § 36B, parental coverage of young adults, 42 U.S.C. § 300gg–14, and guaranteed coverage for those with preexisting conditions, *id.* §§ 300gg, 300gg–1, 300gg–3, 300gg–4. If Congress had wanted to repeal the ACA, “[i]t would not have used such a winding path of connect-the-dots” via the TCJA. *King v. Burwell*, 135 S. Ct. 2480, 2495 (2015). “One determines what Congress would have done by examining what it did.” *Legal Servs. Corp. v. Velazquez*, 531 U.S. 533, 560 (2001) (Scalia, J., dissenting). As Senator Toomey said, Congress’s amendment to the shared responsibility payment was not “chang[ing] any of the subsidies. They are all available to anyone who wants to participate. We don’t change the rules. We don’t change eligibility. We don’t change anything else.” 163 CONG. REC. S7672 (daily ed. Dec. 1, 2017).

² *See, e.g.*, TCJA, Pub. L. No. 115-97, § 11051, 131 Stat. 2089 (“Repeal of Deduction for Alimony Payments.”); *id.* at § 12001, 131 Stat. 2092 (“Repeal of Tax for Corporations.”); *id.* at § 13305, 131 Stat. 2126 (“Repeal of Deduction for Income Attributable to Domestic Production Activities.”).

The ACA indisputably benefits millions of children, young adults, and their families. Infants born with complex medical issues can receive care without fear of annual or lifetime limits; young adults navigating their first jobs or higher education have the protection of their parents' insurance; other children receive care through Community Health Centers and home visits. Given that Congress did not repeal these provisions or countless others, there is no basis to conclude that it would want the courts to strike them down—particularly given the millions of American children whose lives have been changed (and saved) because of the ACA, and given how deeply the ACA is now woven into the fabric of the nation's healthcare system and economy. This Court has no basis to eliminate those protections when Congress has not, and to do so would exceed the lawful role of the judiciary.

CONCLUSION

Congress has made clear again and again that it intends to improve children's access to healthcare, not destroy it, by maintaining the ACA. The district court's December 14, 2018 order should be reversed.

Date: April 1, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Stuart F. Delery

Stuart F. Delery
Counsel of Record
Andrew J. Wilhelm
D. William Lawrence
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-8500

Counsel for Amici Curiae

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On April 1, 2019, this document was served via CM/ECF on all registered counsel and transmitted to the Clerk of the Court.

I further certify that: (1) any required privacy redactions have been made in compliance with Fifth Circuit Rule 25.2.13; and (2) the electronic submission is an exact copy of the paper document in compliance with Fifth Circuit Rule 25.2.1.

/s/ Stuart F. Delery

Stuart F. Delery

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 32(g)(1) and Fifth Circuit Rule 32.3, I hereby certify the following:

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitations set forth in Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(5) and 32(a)(7)(B) because it contains 6,131 words, exclusive of exempted portions.
2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2016 in 14 point Times New Roman font.

/s/ Stuart F. Delery

Stuart F. Delery