

[OPENING STATEMENT]

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE, AND MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT:

Public servants have no duty more sacred than protecting the peoples' right to vote while maintaining confidence in the integrity of election results. This case is about establishing a clear and Constitutional test that allows States to meet these imperatives. A Section 2 vote-denial claim requires a substantial disparate impact that is also caused by a challenged law. The laws at issue here are valid under that test. They are also commonsense and commonplace. Requiring in-person voters to cast their ballots at assigned precincts ensures they can vote on local races and helps officials monitor for fraud. Restricting early ballot collection by third parties, including political operatives, protects against voter coercion and preserves ballot secrecy. Arizona urges this Court to adopt a clear and workable test for vote-denial claims that allows States to properly regulate elections.

[CLOSING STATEMENT]

Arizona endorses without qualification the VRA's (Voting Rights Act) goal of ending racial discrimination in voting. The Constitution demands that all Americans be free from that pernicious evil. A disparate impact on minority voters can be an appropriate proxy for illegal discrimination when the disparity is substantial. But without those showings, Section 2 would exceed Congress' powers to enforce the Reconstruction Amendments, improperly inject race into all voting laws, and impede States' ability to run their elections. Arizona's requirement that ballots be cast at assigned local precincts, and its restrictions on Ballot Harvesting, are appropriate election integrity measures that do not create any disparate impact on racial minorities, but equally serve us all. The desire to enhance the convenience of voting must never outweigh the imperative of securing the integrity of the results. We urge this court to reverse with instructions to enter judgment for Defendants.