



November 26, 2007

The Honorable Steny Hoyer  
U.S. House of Representatives  
1705 Longworth Building  
Washington, DC 20515-2005

The Honorable Jim Sensenbrenner Jr.  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2449 Rayburn Building  
Washington, DC 20515-4905

**Re: THANK YOU FOR SPONSORING THE AMERICANS WITH  
DISABILITIES ACT RESTORATION ACT OF 2007 (H.R. 3195)**

AMERICAN CIVIL  
LIBERTIES UNION  
WASHINGTON  
LEGISLATIVE OFFICE  
915 15th STREET, NW, 6<sup>TH</sup> FL  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
T/202.544.1681  
F/202.546.0738  
[WWW.ACLU.ORG](http://WWW.ACLU.ORG)

Caroline Fredrickson  
DIRECTOR

NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET, 18<sup>TH</sup> FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
NADINE STROSSEN  
PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RICHARD ZACKS  
TREASURER

Dear Majority Leader Hoyer and Representative Sensenbrenner:

The American Civil Liberties Union (“ACLU”) thanks you for sponsoring the Americans with Disabilities Act Restoration Act of 2007, H.R. 3195 (“ADA Restoration Act”) and urges you to continue pressing for its passage. The ACLU believes that all workers have a right be free from workplace discrimination based on race, gender, language, national origin, age, religion, or disability.

The ACLU is a nonpartisan public interest organization dedicated to protecting the constitutional rights of individuals. The ACLU consists of hundreds of thousands of members, activists, and 53 affiliates nationwide. The ACLU has pursued pioneering work in disability rights for over 35 years. A highlight in this long record was the ACLU’s leadership role in securing passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) in 1990.<sup>1</sup> In addition, the ACLU has participated in landmark disability litigation including Bragdon v. Abbott, 524 U.S. 624 (1998)<sup>2</sup>; Sutton v. United Airlines, Inc., 527 U.S. 471 (1999)<sup>3</sup>; Chevron, USA, Inc. v. Mario Echazabal, 122 S. Ct. 2045 (2002).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Chai Feldblum, former legislative counsel with the ACLU, served as a lead legal advisor to the disability and civil rights communities in the drafting and negotiating of the ADA in the late 1980s and 1990.

<sup>2</sup> The ACLU wrote an amicus brief in Bragdon which addressed whether individuals with asymptomatic HIV and AIDS were covered under the protections of the ADA. Available at <http://www.aclu.org/scotus/1997/22683lg119980201.html>.

<sup>3</sup> The ACLU wrote an amicus brief in Sutton, arguing that the ADA was intended to be applied broadly to protect individuals with disabilities from discrimination in the workplace. Available at <http://www.aclu.org/scotus/1998/22639lg119990222.html>.

<sup>4</sup> The ACLU wrote an amicus brief in Echazabal, arguing that an employer violates the ADA when refusing to hire an individual on the basis of her or his disability. The ACLU further argued that allowing individuals to decide what risks – physical, social, or otherwise – she or he is willing to take is at the very core of a person’s civil rights. Available at [http://www.aclu.org/images/asset\\_upload\\_file411\\_21954.pdf](http://www.aclu.org/images/asset_upload_file411_21954.pdf).

In 1990 Congress passed the ADA with overwhelming bipartisan support, creating a landmark civil rights law that improved the lives of millions of people with disabilities. In passing the ADA, Congress advanced the goals of ensuring equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for all people with disabilities.<sup>5</sup> The purpose of the ADA was to “provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination” on the basis of disability, and “to provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards” for addressing such discrimination.<sup>6</sup>

Unfortunately 17 years after enactment of the ADA, the promise of equal opportunity in employment has gone unfulfilled for many people with disabilities due to a series of U.S. Supreme Court decisions that have narrowed the definition of disability under the ADA contrary to Congressional intent. This has resulted in the exclusion of many persons whom Congress intended to protect including people with cancer, epilepsy, diabetes, hearing loss, multiple sclerosis, HIV infection, intellectual disabilities, post traumatic stress syndrome, and many other impairments. The ACLU believes that an individual has the right to be judged on the basis of her or his individual capabilities, not on the presumed characteristics and capabilities that others may attribute to those who share a particular impairment. The court decisions are at odds with this regimen and have created an unintended Catch-22 where individuals taking medication or using other mitigation measures to manage their condition may no longer qualify as “disabled” under the ADA. Thus those individuals who diligently manage their condition or impairment may be denied reasonable accommodations or be terminated, without ever being able to present the merits of their case in court.

**Passage of the ADA Restoration Act is critical to restoring the intent of Congress when it enacted the ADA in 1990.** The ACLU supports the ADA Restoration Act of 2007 (H.R. 3195) as a necessary fix to this Catch-22 problem. The ADA Restoration Act restores Congress’s original intent in extending discrimination protections to all people with disabilities, regardless of mitigating measures, who are discriminated against because of their disability. The ACLU encourages its passage in order to guarantee equal protection for all people, regardless of the nature of the disability. For additional information, please contact Joanne Lin, ACLU legislative counsel, at (202) 675-2317.

Sincerely,



Caroline Fredrickson  
Director, ACLU Washington Legislative Office



Joanne Lin  
Legislative Counsel

---

<sup>5</sup> See 42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(8).

<sup>6</sup> See Americans with Disabilities Act § 2(b), 42 U.S.C. § 12101(b) (2007).