

Zeitschrift: Swiss review : the magazine for the Swiss abroad
Herausgeber: Organisation of the Swiss Abroad
Band: 46 (2019)
Heft: 4

Artikel: A clear judgement with unclear consequences
Autor: Lettau, Marc
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-907168>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 31.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

A clear judgement with unclear consequences

A popular vote has been annulled by the courts in Switzerland for the very first time. Is this a slap in the face for the Federal Council, or proof of the power of democracy? Opinions are divided, and the consequences of the judgement are unclear.

MARC LETTAU

The vote was on an issue that affects high-earning married couples. They pay more federal tax than unmarried couples who earn exactly the same income. This 'marriage penalty' has been a political issue for years. The Christian Democrat People's Party (CVP) attempted to abolish the marriage penalty with their rather cumbersomely-named referendum "For marriage and family – against the marriage penalty". But the initiative failed at the ballot box in 2016 when 50.8 percent voted against it.

More than close

Just 55,000 votes divided the yes and no camps, so it was a narrow defeat. However, the figures that the Federal Council quoted before the vote were incorrect. It claimed that the marriage penalty affected only 80,000 double-income married couples. Later it conceded that it had fundamentally miscalculated – by a factor of five. It turned out that 450,000 married couples are fiscally disadvan-

After the sweetness of the wedding cake comes the bitter taste of the fiscal marriage penalty for solvent double-income married couples.

Photo: Keystone



taged. On the basis of this admission, the CVP eventually submitted a voting complaint.

Historical significance

The Federal Supreme Court judgement on this matter on 10 April 2019 is of historical significance. The court upheld the complaint and annulled the referendum decision. This is ground-breaking – the first annulment of a national referendum result since the foundation of the modern Swiss federal state in 1848. The federal judges deemed the misinformation of the Federal Council to be "grave", and a "shocking infringement" of the freedom of vote. In light of this, it was "probable" that the voting results had been distorted, they ruled.

"A slap in the face for the Federal Council" was the title of the article published by the "Neue Zürcher Zeitung" after the judgement. In contrast, the newspapers of the Tamedia Group viewed the judgement as a seal of approval for Swiss democracy, as it has strengthened the rights of committed citizens vis-à-vis the administrative apparatus.

What now?

Will this initiative be placed before the people once more? That is by no means mandatory. The CVP itself is not interested in a further referendum. Opinions are divided within the party on the text of the initiative, as it dictates a very narrowly formulated definition of marriage as "legally regulated cohabitation between a man and a woman". That goes too far for the CVP members who are open to same-sex marriage.

Against this backdrop, the initiators hope to abolish the marriage penalty through legal channels. That would make a second referendum on the initiative obsolete. This hope is not unfounded as one month after the judgement, the National Council approved a cantonal initiative from the canton of Aargau. It demanded that the discrimination against married couples not only be ended with regard to taxes but also for social insurance. Upon retirement, they receive a married couples' pension which is lower than two individual pensions for a couple that lives together without a marriage licence. That is just as disturbing as the fiscal marriage penalty.