The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would promote nondiscrimination by ensuring that pregnant workers are not forced out of their jobs unnecessarily or denied reasonable job accommodations that would allow them to continue working while maintaining healthy pregnancies.

Existing Federal Laws Are Inadequate for Pregnant Workers Who Need Accommodations to Stay Healthy and Working

- Women now make up over half of the American workforce and families rely on women’s salaries to make ends meet: Women are the primary or co-breadwinners in almost two-thirds of families in the United States.
- Three-quarters of women entering the workforce in our country will be pregnant and employed at some point in their lives. Some of these women—especially those in physically strenuous jobs—will face a conflict between their duties at work and the demands of pregnancy.
- All too often, pregnant women are pushed out of their jobs, or forced to risk their health to continue earning a paycheck to feed their families.
- Even after the Supreme Court’s ruling in Young v. UPS, pregnant women remain vulnerable. A pregnant worker who seeks an accommodation must currently workers to identify someone else in the workplace who was provided accommodations in order to obtain their own medical necessary accommodation, a burden not placed workers with disabilities.
- According to a recent report by A Better Balance, 2/3 of workers lost their pregnancy accommodation cases post-Young v. UPS — the majority of these losses owing to the fact that the workers could not produce evidence of other similar employees who had been provided accommodations.
- The Americans with Disabilities Amendments Act is inadequate because Pregnancy is not itself a disability under the law, and hence a pregnant worker who has no complications but seeks an accommodation in order to avoid a complication, will not be able to get an accommodation under the ADAAA.
- Furthermore, even though Congress expanded the ADA in 2008 and in theory it should provide accommodations for workers with pregnancy-related disabilities, courts have interpreted the ADA Amendments Act in a way that it did little to expand coverage even for those pregnant workers with serious health complications.

The Need for Pregnancy Accommodation Laws Has Been Recognized Across the Country

- Twenty-seven states and five cities including Alaska California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, New York City, NY, Philadelphia, PA, Providence, RI, Central Falls, RI, and Washington, D.C. all explicitly require certain employers to provide some form of accommodations to pregnant employees.
- The PWFA has already garnered broad support from prominent women’s groups across the country, health groups, unions, and dozens of other organizations.
The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694) Will Clarify Existing Law and Create a Uniform National Standard

- The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports H.R. 2694 because “ensuring that expectant mothers have every option to stay active in the workplace is good for women, families, and business. This legislation reduces confusion by establishing clear guidelines and a balanced process that works for employers and employees alike.”
- The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will protect pregnant workers who face being pushed out on leave or terminated when they ask their employers for minor workplace accommodations.
- The law will require reasonable accommodations for pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions, unless they cause an undue hardship for the employer.
- An employer cannot deny a pregnant worker employment opportunities or force the worker to take an accommodation that she does not want or need. An employer cannot unilaterally force a pregnant worker to take leave when another reasonable accommodation could help keep her on the job.
- The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will direct the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to make rules implementing the law within two years of enactment, including a list of exemplary accommodations that should be provided unless they pose an undue hardship for the employer.
- The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act addresses the problem through an existing and familiar reasonable accommodations framework, modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694) Will Benefit Working Women, Their Families, Their Employers, and the Public

- Women who need income but lack accommodations are often forced to continue working under unhealthy conditions, thus risking their own health as well as the health of their babies.\(^\text{10}\)
- Research has shown that stress from job loss can increase the risk of having a premature baby and/or a baby with low birth weight.\(^\text{11}\) There is no need for these risks if a simple accommodation will allow a woman to stay on the job.
- Working during pregnancy can be a beneficial choice for many women. By working extra months, women can earn additional income and achieve increased seniority.
- The PWFA would promote women’s economic security during a critical time that is often filled with financial hardship.\(^\text{12}\) Keeping women employed also saves taxpayers money in the form of unemployment insurance and other public benefits.
- Providing reasonable accommodations also carries benefits for employers, including reduced turnover and increased productivity.\(^\text{13}\) The PWFA would provide clearer guidelines for employers so they can anticipate their responsibilities and avoid costly litigation. Clear statutory protection allows for informal resolutions and eliminates the need for legal intervention.

For more information, visit [www.abetterbalance.org/resources](http://www.abetterbalance.org/resources).
THE PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT (H.R. 2694)
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