



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Date: June 27, 2019

Contact: 608-313-4509

## **Rep. Mark Spreitzer Statement on Supreme Court Decisions in Partisan Gerrymandering Cases**

MADISON — Today, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down decisions in *Rucho v. Common Cause* and *Lamone v. Benisek*, two cases related to partisan gerrymandering. The Court held that the U.S. Constitution provides no standard for determining when partisan gerrymandering is unconstitutional, and therefore partisan gerrymandering challenges cannot be decided by the federal courts. In response, State Rep. Mark Spreitzer (D-Beloit) made the following statement:

“I am extremely disappointed that the Court rejected efforts to rein in unfair, partisan gerrymandering. Non-partisan studies have shown that Wisconsin has some of the most gerrymandered maps in the country. These rigged maps were drawn by the Republican majority explicitly to create and protect their political advantage. In the 2018 election, Democrats running for State Assembly won 54% of the vote, but only won 36% of seats.

“Wisconsin’s redistricting system is broken, as it is in states around the country. Today’s cases, from Maryland and North Carolina, showed that extreme partisan gerrymandering is done by both parties, yet the Supreme Court abdicated its responsibility to step in and protect our democracy by addressing it. Rather than voters choosing their elected officials, our system has allowed politicians to choose their voters. It is irresponsible for the Supreme Court to think these same politicians will fix this issue.

“While the Supreme Court effectively sided with Wisconsin Republicans’ efforts to rig our district maps, the Wisconsin legislature and governor still have the power to make our state’s legislative districts fair. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting common-sense, nonpartisan redistricting reform and that Governor Evers will veto any future gerrymandered maps after the next census. Enough is enough – we need fair maps in Wisconsin.

“Today’s 5-4 party-line Supreme Court decision also underscores the need to fight for a fair judiciary that will uphold the basic principles needed for democratic government to function. Justice Elena Kagan, dissenting from today’s decision, captured these principles beautifully.”

### **Pertinent selections from the dissenting opinion of Justice Elena Kagan:**

*“Election day—next year, and two years later, and two years after that—is what links the people to their representatives, and gives the people their sovereign power. That day is the foundation of democratic governance.”*

*“By substantially diluting the votes of citizens favoring their rivals, the politicians of one party had succeeded in entrenching themselves in office. They had beat democracy.”*

*“The partisan gerrymanders in these cases deprived citizens of the most fundamental of their constitutional rights: the rights to participate equally in the political process, to join with others to advance political beliefs, and to choose their political*

*representatives. In so doing, the partisan gerrymanders here debased and dishonored our democracy, turning upside-down the core American idea that all governmental power derives from the people."*

*"I think it important to underscore that fact: The majority disputes none of what I have said (or will say) about how gerrymanders undermine democracy. Indeed, the majority concedes (really, how could it not?) that gerrymandering is "incompatible with democratic principles."*

*"Of all times to abandon the Court's duty to declare the law, this was not the one. The practices challenged in these cases imperil our system of government. Part of the Court's role in that system is to defend its foundations. None is more important than free and fair elections. With respect but deep sadness, I dissent. "*

###