

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Public Liaison
Series/Staff Member: Alexis Herman/Ruby Moy
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 5914
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Statement by POTUS-Georgia Redistricting Case

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	30	1	3	1

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

June 29, 1995

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am disappointed by the Supreme Court decision in the Georgia congressional redistricting case. The decision is a setback in the struggle to ensure that all Americans participate fully in the electoral process and it threatens to undermine the promise of the Voting Rights Act.

My Administration remains firmly committed to full enforcement of the Voting Rights Act. We will continue working to ensure that minority citizens in racially polarized areas have an effective remedy against the unlawful dilution of their votes and against impairment of their ability to participate in the electoral process. Congress, on a bipartisan basis, passed the Voting Rights Act to fulfill the Constitutional guarantees of full political rights for all citizens, regardless of race. The Justice Department will continue its vigorous enforcement of the law.

We have travelled a long road to fulfill the promise of political rights for all citizens. Today is a difficult day on that journey, but the road does not end here. While the ruling in the Georgia case is unfortunate, I am gratified that the Court's statements and actions make clear that race properly may be considered in the drawing of legislative districts.

Despite today's setback, we will not let this decision turn back the clock. We will not abandon those citizens who look to the Voting Rights Act to protect their constitutional rights.

PM-Scotus-NC Redistricting,390

Court Will Review North Carolina Remap Plan

By RICHARD CARELLI= Associated Press Writer=

WASHINGTON (AP) The Supreme Court today revived a legal challenge to a North Carolina redistricting plan that created two majority-black districts and resulted in sending the first blacks to Congress from that state since 1901.

The justices, hours after issuing a decision in a Georgia redistricting dispute, said they will review for the second time North Carolina's reapportionment plan.

The North Carolina plan is under attack for allegedly discriminating against white voters.

The court's decision in the Georgia case would make it more difficult to defend the North Carolina plan.

The high court had used the North Carolina dispute to rule in 1993 that election districts designed to benefit racial minorities may violate white voters' rights a decision that sent shock waves through the voting rights movement.

The court in 1993 said such districts, even when drawn by state legislatures to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act and approved by the Justice Department, are subject to constitutional attacks.

After its 1993 ruling, the high court sent the North Carolina case back to a three-judge court for further study.

That court ruled last August that the challenged redistricting plan was constitutional that it was narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest.

The dispute dates back to a 1992 lawsuit filed by five white voters from Durham County.

Based on the 1990 census, North Carolina increased its congressional delegation, from 11 to 12 seats, in the House.

The state Legislature in 1991 drew a reapportionment plan that included one black-majority district but that plan was rejected by the Justice Department as insufficient in a state where 22 percent of the population is black.

Under the Voting Rights Act of 1965, changes in North Carolina's congressional redistricting plan have to be ``precleared'' by the Justice Department.

To win that approval, state legislators drew a new plan in 1992 to create two black-majority districts, the First and the 12th. And Eva Clayton and Mel Watt, who are black, were elected from those districts in 1992.

The cases are Shaw vs. Hunt, 94-923, and Pope vs. Hunt, 94-924.

**** filed by:APE(--) on 06/29/95 at 14:54EDT ****

**** printed by:WHPR(FNEW) on 06/29/95 at 14:57EDT ****

From Kevin O'Keefe

AA Callers

POTUS

VPOTUS

George Stephanopoulos

Harold Ickes

Leon Panetta

John Schmidt

Deval Patrick

Chris Edley

Tom Williamson

Alexis Herman

Targets

Congressional Black Caucus

Carol Mosley Braun

Barbara Boxer

Diane Fienstein

Patty Murray

Marcy Kapter

Pat Schroeder

Mayors

Archer

Rice

Webb

White

Chavez

Arrington

Box

Schmoke

Campbell

James

Cleaver

Morial

Harrington

Kirk

Sales-Benton

Katz

Stanley

Savage

Detroit

Seattle

Denver

Cleveland

Albuquerque

Birmingham

Rockford

Baltimore

Atlanta

Newark

Kansas City

New Orleans

Memphis

Dallas

Minneapolis

Portland

Flint

Tulsa

JUN 28 1993

Willie Mount
Joyce Savachio
Jones
Serna
Harris
Hammer
Sills
Barry
Bush
Barnes
Burny
Jenkins
Reeves
Harrison
Boisley
Cooper
Henry
Sheppard
Herenton
Young
Marshall

County

Molina
Stroger
Davis
Curry
Yvonne Burke
Gary Locke
Howard Fuller

Statewide

McCall
Robek
Kennedy Townsend
Morales
Whitehead
Campbell
Irma Dixon
Kathleen Blanca
Katherine Baker Knoll

Lake Charles
Erie
Las Vegas
Sacramento
Oakland
San Jose
Wilmington
Washington
East St. Louis
Gary
Augusta Maine
Lewiston, Maine
Cambridge, Ma
Pontiac
St. Louis
East Orange
Springfield, Ohio
Chester, Pa.
Memphis
Richmond
Morgantown

Los Angeles
Chicago
Chicago
Maryland
Los Angeles
King County (Seattle)
Milwaukee Supt of Schools

New York
Nebraska
Maryland
Texas
Texas
North Carolina
Louisiana
Louisiana
Pennsylvania

Legislature

Blue	North Carolina
Jones	Illinois
Brown	California
Groff	Colorado
Smyre	Georgia
Sykes	Ohio
Tyrone Brooks	Georgia
Oliver	Georgia
Alvin Thompson	Massachusetts
Sherman Copelin	Louisiana
Dennis Bagneris	Louisiana
Diana Bajoie	Louisiana
Paulette Irons	Louisiana
Charles Jones	Louisiana
Gregory Tarver	Louisiana
John Guidry	Louisiana
John Johnson	Louisiana
Yvonne Dorsey	Louisiana
Dwight Evans	Penn Phil
Allison Schwartz	Penn Phil
Joe Preston	Penn Pitts
McKinley Washington	South Carolina
Bill Lockyear	California
Vincent Hills	Pennsylvania
Gween Moore	Wisconsin
Polly Williams	Milwaukee*
Spencer Black	Wisconsin
Barbara Notestein	Wisconsin Milwaukee
Jennette Bell	Milwaukee
Rebecca Young	Madison
Judith Robson	Beloit
Michael Figures	Alabama
Art Hamilton	Arizona
Clarence Blount	Maryland
Elijah Cummings	Maryland
J.B. Banks	Missouri
Lois DeBerry	Tennessee
James Thomas	Alabama
Margaret Carter	Oregon
Gloria Tanner	Colorado
Ted Wallace	Michigan

Vernon Smith
Grace Davis
Charles Troupe

Indiana
Georgia
Missouri

Constituents

Reed
Stith
Sharpton
Richards
Gantt
Jordan
Woods
Young
Jackson
Herman Russell
Rupert Richardson
Delores Tucker

Bishop Fred James
Martha Love
Hannah Rosenthal
Elaine Jones
Marg Berry
Coretta Scott King
Joe Lowery
Dorothy Aeight
Myrie Evers
Hugh Price
Ramon Edelman
Eddie Williams
Marian Wright Edelman
Barbara Arnwine
Jesse Jackson
Vernon Jordan
Ernie Green

Alabama
Massachusetts
New York
Texas
North Carolina
Texas
NOW
Georgia
Georgia
Georgia
NAACP Louisiana
Penn Phil
AME Bishop South Carolina
National Baptist South Carolina
Maryland, D.C.
AFSCME Milwaukee
Wisconsin
NAACP Legal defense Fund

SCLC

NAACP
Urban league
Urban Coalition
Joint center for Political Studies

Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights
Rainbow Coalition

City Councils

Carolynn Long Banks

Atlanta

GA Shrub

✓ GA Bird nest long feathers]

with
NE - red water, - lower count

Top = Edible green, while Lee, green } 4 pieces
Caly = count - skin } do 1
dark

↓
✓ Stab Supreme Count



U.S. Department of Justice

Civil Rights Division

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20035

FAX TRANSMITTAL SHEET

Date:

6/29/95

TO:

Name: LORRAINE MILLER / ALEXIS HERMAN

Organization _____

FAX Phone # _____

Office Phone # _____

FROM:

Name: HELAINE GREENFELD / DEVAL PATRICK'S OFFICE

Organization _____

FAX Phone # _____

Office Phone # _____

574 0293
574-2151

SUBJECT:

Here is what we sent
to Mike McCurry. We'll
call soon about Deval's
preference for a mtg or a call.

Number of pages transmitted (including this sheet)

3

(max. trans. 30 sheets)

6/29

TALKING POINTS FOR REDISTRICTING CASES
White House

General.

- We are disappointed with today's decision which is a serious setback for the rights of minority voters and for the ability of minority voters in racially polarized areas to cast a meaningful vote.
- But it is important to note that once again the Court reaffirmed that race can be considered as a factor in shaping a district.
- The Department of Justice will continue to vigorously enforce the Voting Rights Act.

Additional Background Information

- While the Court already had required "bizarrely-shaped" districts to be strictly scrutinized, today it required such scrutiny of any district where race was a predominant factor in its creation.
- But the Court certainly recognized that many factors such as incumbency and community of interests are considered in drawing districts -- and as such reaffirmed that race can be considered as a factor in shaping a district.
- In fact, the Court said that even where race was the predominant factor, the district may still be valid if [as the lower court held in the case of N.C.] it can withstand strict scrutiny.
- As Justice Ginsburg noted, the strict scrutiny standard will have to be defined over time in cases to come - this is not the last word.
- Unlike the common misperception that these were segregated African American districts, these districts were among the most integrated Congressional districts in the Nation. [The Georgia district is 56% black, Louisiana 55%]
- Minorities have long been denied an equal opportunity to participate in the voting process through either outright exclusion or other schemes that effectively diluted their vote.
- For the past thirty years, the Voting Rights Act has required certain states with a discriminatory history to obtain Justice Department approval before reshaping districts -- to ensure that they are not being drawn to exclude minorities from the political process.
- Every district under consideration today was reviewed by the Justice Department under the Bush Administration and determined to be in compliance with the law. We defended the Bush Administration's determination.
- We do not have a policy of maximizing the number of majority minority districts. In fact, in states like Texas and New York where many more majority minority districts can be drawn - we did not require it.