



Americans United for Life

Written Testimony of Emily Hoegler, J.D.

Policy Counsel, Americans United for Life

In Support of House Bill 1416

Submitted to the House Judiciary Committee

February 25, 2026

Dear Chairman Lynn and Members of the Committee:

My name is Emily Hoegler, and I serve as Policy Counsel at Americans United for Life (“AUL”). Established in 1971, AUL is a national law and policy nonprofit organization with a specialization in abortion, end-of-life issues, and bioethics law. AUL publishes pro-life model legislation and policy guides,¹ tracks state bioethics legislation,² and regularly testifies on pro-life legislation in Congress and the states. Our vision at AUL is to strive for a world where everyone is welcomed in life and protected in law. As Policy Counsel, I specialize in life-related legislation, constitutional law, and abortion jurisprudence.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of House Bill 1416 (“H.B. 1416”), which protects Pregnancy Resource Centers (“PRCs”) from discrimination from the state, state agencies, and municipalities (collectively “the state”). Specifically, H.B. 1416 guards PRCS from being forced by the state to perform or refer for abortions. It also prohibits mandates that would force centers to post advertisements or flyers about obtaining abortions or to counsel in favor of them. Furthermore, the bill ensures that centers cannot be prohibited from offering prenatal and postnatal resources, such as baby supplies or medical testing, solely because they do not support or refer for abortion. PRCS help ensure that more underserved women will receive quality professional care,

¹ *Pro-Life Model Legislation and Guides*, AMS. UNITED FOR LIFE, <https://aul.org/law-and-policy/> (last visited Oct. 16, 2025). AUL is the original drafter of many of the hundreds of pro-life bills enacted in the States in recent years. See Olga Khazan, *Planning the End of Abortion*, ATLANTIC (July 16, 2020), www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/07/what-pro-life-activists-really-want/398297/ (“State legislatures have enacted a slew of abortion restrictions in recent years. Americans United for Life wrote most of them.”); see also Anne Ryman & Matt Wynn, *For Anti-Abortion Activists, Success of ‘Heartbeat’ Bills was 10 Years in the Making*, CTR. PUB. INTEGRITY (Jun. 20, 2019), <https://publicintegrity.org/politics/state-politics/copy-paste-legislate/for-anti-abortion-activists-success-of-heartbeat-bills-was-10-years-in-the-making/> (“The USA TODAY/Arizona Republic analysis found Americans United for Life was behind the bulk of the more than 400 copycat [anti]-abortion bills introduced in 41 states.”).

² *Defending Life: State Legislation Tracker*, AMS. UNITED FOR LIFE, <https://aul.org/law-and-policy/state-legislation-tracker/> (last visited Oct. 16, 2025).

at usually no cost to them. For this reason, I strongly urge the Committee to support this bill and the work of PRCs in New Hampshire.

I. **H.B. 1416 Provides Necessary Protections for PRCs, which Face Consistent Discrimination.**

H.B. 1416 provides PRCs with a necessary shield against discrimination. Despite repeated legal affirmations of their First Amendment rights, PRCs are currently besieged by a three-pronged campaign of administrative weaponization, legislative hostility, and physical violence.

States have consistently engaged in viewpoint-based harassment intended to chill the speech of those offering alternatives to abortion. For example, without citing a single instance of deceptive marketing or consumer complaint, the Washington Attorney General launched an investigation into the allegedly deceptive marketing of PRCs and issued a 13-year records demand,³ and the New Jersey Attorney General launched a similar investigation by issuing intrusive subpoenas for donor lists.⁴ Likewise, Attorneys General in California⁵ and New York⁶ have coordinated campaigns to delegitimize PRCs by labeling the promotion of Abortion Pill Reversal (APR) as “fraudulent” and “deceptive,” despite the medical history that shows APR is safe.⁷ Notwithstanding these efforts, a New York District Court and the Second Circuit have recently issued and

³ See *Obria Group Inc. v. Ferguson*, 2025 WL 27691 (W.D. Wash. 2025).

⁴ See *First Choice Women’s Res. Ctrs., Inc. v. Platkin*, 2024 WL 150096 (D.N.J. Jan. 12, 2024). The Supreme Court heard oral argument on December 2, 2025. *First Choice Women’s Res. Ctrs., Inc. v. Platkin*, No. 24-781 (U.S. argued Dec. 2, 2025).

⁵ *California v. Heartbeat Int’l*, Case No. 23CV044940 (Cal. Super. Ct. Sept. 21, 2023).

⁶ *Heartbeat Int’l v. James*, No. E2024007242 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2025).

⁷ APR is a process by which progesterone is used to reverse the effects of mifepristone, an antiprogesterone that starves an unborn fetus to death, thereby causing a chemical abortion. Medical professionals have been using progesterone in pregnancies to prevent preterm birth for decades. See Line Rode et al., *Systematic Review of Progesterone for the Prevention of Preterm Birth in Singleton Pregnancies*, 88 ACTA OBSTETRICIA ET GYNECOLOGICA SCANDINAVICA 1180 (2009). Progesterone is also commonly used in in vitro fertilization when women experience low estrogen production. See Michelle van der Linden et al., *Luteal Phase Support for Assisted Reproduction Cycles*, 7 COCHRANE DATABASE OF SYS. REV. 1 (2015). Likewise, if a woman’s ovary must be removed early in pregnancy, physicians regularly use progesterone to sustain the pregnancy. *Id.* Using the natural hormone progesterone, medical professionals have been able to save 64–68% of pregnancies through APR. George Delgado et al., *A Case Series Detailing the Successful Reversal of the Effects of Mifepristone Using Progesterone*, 33 ISSUES L. & MED. 21 (2018). Notably, these saved pregnancies have had no increased rate of birth defects. *Id.* So far, APR has been used to save over 6,000 lives. *A Last Chance to Choose Life*, HEARTBEAT INT’L. <https://www.heartbeatinternational.org/our-work/apr> (last visited Feb. 20, 2026).

upheld injunctions to protect PRCs' right to share APR information, affirming that such state-led targeting unconstitutionally suppresses protected speech.⁸

These government-sanctioned attacks on PRCs continued in the media. In 2024, the Massachusetts Governor launched a one million dollar statewide media blitz targeting PRCs through social media, radio, and public transit advertisements.⁹ States like California, Minnesota, Arizona, and New Jersey issued consumer alerts targeting pregnancy centers, claiming that they seek to deceive women and block their access to reproductive health care.¹⁰ The Massachusetts State Government website describes PRCs as “harmful” and alleges—without citing a single source or referencing a single instance in which these allegations have occurred—that PRCs falsely advertise their services, misleadingly provide free services to entice women to enter a center, lie to women about how far along their pregnancy is, delay scheduling appointments, provide medical disinformation, and misrepresent their volunteer staff as medical professionals.¹¹ Additionally, a group of nearly 24 congressional members lobbied Google to restrict crisis pregnancy center search listings.¹²

Across the country, bills are being introduced to “harass [PRCs] that simply want to help women make a different choice than abortion.”¹³ In Congress, a United States

⁸ *Nat'l Inst. for Fam. & Life Advocs. v. James*, 746 F. Supp. 3d 100 (W.D.N.Y. 2024), *aff'd sub nom. Nat'l Inst. of Fam. & Life Advocs. v. James*, 160 F.4th 360 (2d Cir. 2025).

⁹ Press Release: *Healey-Driscoll Administration Launches First-in-the-Nation Public Education Campaign on the Dangers of Anti-Abortion Centers*, MASS. EXEC. OFF. OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS. (Jun 10, 2024), <https://www.mass.gov/news/healey-driscoll-administration-launches-first-in-the-nation-public-education-campaign-on-the-dangers-of-anti-abortion-centers>.

¹⁰ *Know the Difference: Crisis Pregnancy Centers v. Reproductive Healthcare Facilities*, CAL. DOJ, <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/Crisis%20Pregnancy%20Center%20Bulletin.pdf> (last visited Feb. 19, 2026); *Attorney General Mayes Warns Patients About Crisis Pregnancy Centers*, ARIZONA.GOV (Mar. 13, 2024), <https://www.azag.gov/press-release/attorney-general-mayes-warns-patients-about-crisis-pregnancy-centers#:~:text=That%20delay%20can%20be%20devastating,consumer%20alert%20is%20available%20below;Attorney%20General%20Ellison%20Issues%20Consumer%20Alert%20About%20Crisis%20Pregnancy%20Centers>, (August 22, 2022), ATT'Y GEN. MINN. https://www.ag.state.mn.us/Office/Communications/2022/08/23_CrisisPregnancyCenters.asp; AG Platkin Announces Actions to Protect Reproductive Health Care Providers and Those Seeking Reproductive Care in New Jersey, N.J. DEP'T L. & PUB. SAFETY, <https://www.njoag.gov/ag-platkin-announces-actions-to-protect-reproductive-health-care-providers-and-those-seeking-reproductive-care-in-new-jersey/#:~:text=Consumer%20Alert%20Regarding%20Crisis%20Pregnancy,safety%20and%20legality%20of%20abortion> (last visited Feb. 20, 2026).

¹¹ *About Anti-Abortion Centers*, MASS.GOV, <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/about-anti-abortion-centers> (last visited Oct. 16, 2025).

¹² *Id.*

¹³ JorEl Godsey, *By Accusing Pregnancy Centers of False Advertising, Pro-Abortion Politicians Prove They Can't Handle The Truth*, THE FEDERALIST (Feb. 20, 2023), <https://thefederalist.com/2023/02/20/by-accusing-pregnancycenters-of-false-advertising-pro-abortion-politiciansprove-they-cant-handle-the-truth/>.

Senator called on fellow elected officials to “move more aggressively” in regulating PRCs.¹⁴ The Senator went on to falsely accuse PRCs of “torturing pregnant women” and called on Congress to “shut them down all around the country.”¹⁵ In Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, and Washington, local and state laws already falsely classify PRCs as “¹⁶”^[OBJ] This trend is intensifying in the 2025–2026 legislative session, with more than ten new bills attempting to brand these facilities as “fraudulent” providers of “anti-abortion disinformation”¹⁷”^[OBJ] This follows a heavy 2023–2024 session where a federal¹⁸ bill^[OBJ] and¹⁹ state bills in California,²⁰ Colorado,²¹ Delaware,²² Illinois,^[OBJ] ²³ ,^[OBJ] ²⁴ ,^[OBJ]

¹⁴ Alison Kuznitz, U.S. Sen. Elizabeth Warren Wants to Crack Down on ‘Deceptive’ Crisis Pregnancy Centers in Massachusetts, Across the Country, *MassLive* (Jun. 29, 2022) <https://www.masslive.com/politics/2022/06/us-sen-elizabethwarren-wants-to-crack-down-on-deceptive-crisispregnancy-centers-in-massachusetts-across-the-country.html>.

¹⁵ Jessica Chasmar, *Google to Crack Down on Search Results for Crisis Pregnancy Centers After Dem Pressure*, *FOX BUSINESS* (Aug. 25, 2022), <https://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/googlecrack-down-search-results-crisis-pregnancy-centersdem-pressure>.

¹⁶ *Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 19a-912b* (regulating the “deceptive” advertising practices of PRCs despite the fact that Connecticut has a general deceptive advertising prohibition. *Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 42-110b*); *Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2502M* (compelling “limited services medical facility” to make certain licensing disclosures); *815 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 505/2BBBB* (regulating the “unfair or deceptive acts or practices” of “limited services pregnancy centers”); *Colorado. SB 23-190* (2023) (enjoined by *Bella Health and Wellness v. Weiser*, D. Colo. No. 1:23-cv-939, (Aug. 1, 2025)); Jesse Dranz, *Seattle City Council Passes Legislation to Prohibit Deceptive Practices of ‘Crisis Pregnancy Centers’*, *SEATTLE CITY COUNCIL BLOG* (Sept. 6, 2022), <https://council.seattle.gov/2022/09/06/seattle-city-council-passes-legislation-to-prohibit-deceptive-practices-of-crisis-pregnancy-centers/>.

¹⁷ *Stop Antiabortion Disinformation (“SAD”) Act*, H.R. 846, 119th Cong. (2025); *Pregnancy Center Fraud Prevention Act*, H.B. 488, 158th Gen. Assemb. Reg. Sess. (Ga. 2025); *Crisis Pregnancy Center Fraud Prevention Act*, H.B. 522, 106th Gen. Assemb. Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2025); *An Act Relating to Access to Certain Legally Protected Health Care Services*, S. 28, 2025 Reg. Sess. (Va. 2025); H.C.R. 144, 2025 Reg. Sess. (Haw. 2025); A. 4338, 2025 Reg. Sess. (N.Y. 2025); S. 2692, 2025 Reg. Sess. (N.Y. 2025); A. 1547, 2025 Reg. Sess. (N.Y. 2025); S.B. 1684, 2025 Reg. Sess. (Tex. 2025); *Pregnancy Center Fraud Prevention Act*, S.B. 196, 158th Gen. Assemb. Reg. Sess. (Ga. 2025); S. 3319, 2026 Reg. Sess. (N.J. 2026).

¹⁸ *Stop Antiabortion Disinformation (“SAD”) Act*, H.R. 846, 119th Cong. (2024).

¹⁹ A.B. 602, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2023); A.B. 710, 2024 Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2023).

²⁰ *Deceptive Trade Practice Pregnancy-related Service*, S.B. 23-90, 2023-2024 Reg. Sess. (Col. 2023).

²¹ S.B. 300, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (De. 2023).

²² *Deceptive Practice-Preg Center*, S.B. 1909, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (Ill. 2023); *Deceptive Practice-Preg Center*, H.B. 2463, 2023-2024 Reg. Sess. (Ill. 2023).

²³ *An Act Relating to Pregnancy Resource Centers*, H.B. 538, 2024 Reg. Sess. (Ky. 2024).

²⁴ *An Act to Prohibit Deceptive Advertising in Limited Pregnancy Center Services*, H.D. 1137, 2023–2024 Reg. and Spec. Sess. (Me. 2023).

²⁵*S.*^[OBJ] *Minnesota*²⁶^[OBJ] *New Jersey*²⁷^[OBJ] ²⁸^[OBJ] *North Carolina*²⁹^[OBJ] *Pennsylvania*³⁰^[OBJ] ³¹^[OBJ] and ³²^[OBJ] were introduced. These measures aimed to undermine PRC credibility by labeling them as deceptive, forcing them to disclose non-provided services, and imposing hospital-grade regulations on centers that often focus on distributing basic material goods, such as free diapers and baby wipes.

This discriminatory legislation continues to be introduced even though legal precedent has consistently upheld PRCs' fundamental right to offer non-abortion services.

- *In 2015, a Maryland U.S. District Court ruled that requiring PRCs to post signs regarding their lack of licensed medical staff violated their First Amendment rights.³³ Similarly, in 2018, the U.S. Fourth Circuit struck down a disclaimer mandate, labeling it unconstitutional “compelled speech.”³⁴*
- *An Illinois District Court in 2017 blocked a law that would have forced PRCs to describe abortion as a “beneficial” option and provide referrals to abortion providers because it violated the First Amendment.³⁵*
- *In 2023, a District Court permanently enjoined an Illinois statute after finding it constituted unconstitutional content and viewpoint discrimination by targeting pro-life organizations and their speech regarding abortion’s negative effects.³⁶ The court held that the law failed strict scrutiny because the state provided no evidence of actual deception by PRCs to justify such a restriction.³⁷*

²⁵ *An Act to protect patient privacy and prevent unfair and deceptive advertising of pregnancy-related services, H. 377, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2023); An Act to protect patient privacy and prevent unfair and deceptive advertising of pregnancy-related services, HD 1850, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2023).*

²⁶ *H.F. 289, 2023–2024 Reg Sess. (Minn. 2023).*

²⁷ *S. 2522, 2024–2025 Reg. Sess. (N.J. 2024); S. 2199, 2024–2025 Reg. Sess. (N.J. 2024); A.B. 861, 2024–2025 Reg. Sess. (N.J. 2024).*

²⁸ *S. 9400, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (N.Y. 2024); A. 7084, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (N.Y. 2024).*

²⁹ *Taxpayer Accountability/Crisis Pregnancy Centers, H.B. 1033, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2023); Redirect Crisis Pregnancy Center Funds, S.B. 859, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2023); Crisis Pregnancy Center Accountability Study, H.B. 977, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2023); Unfair/Deceptive Healthcare Advertising, H.B. 740, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2023).*

³⁰ *H.B. 1589, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (Pa. 2023); H.B. 1193, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (Pa. 2023); H.B. 1118, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (Pa. 2023).*

³¹ *Relating to Minimum Standards for Pregnancy Resource Centers, H.B. 1478, 2023 Reg. Sess. (Tex. 2023).*

³² *An Act Relating to Pregnancy Center Fraud, H. 254, 2023–2024 Reg. Sess. (Vt. 2023).*

³³ *See Centro Tepeyac v. Montgomery Cnty., No. 10-1259 (Md. D. Ct. Mar. 7, 2014).*

³⁴ *See Greater Bal. Ctr. for Pregnancy Concerns Inc. v. City of Balt., No. 16-2325 (4th Cir. Jan. 5, 2018).*

³⁵ *Nat'l Inst. of Fam. & Life Advoc. v. Rauner, No. 16 C 50310 (N.D. Ill. July 19, 2017).*

³⁶ *Nat'l Inst. of Fam. & Life Advoc. v. Raoul, 685 F. Supp. 3d 688, 697 (N.D. Ill. 2023).*

³⁷ *Id.*

- *In NIFLA v. Becerra*, the Supreme Court found unconstitutional a California law that mandated pro-life PRCs, if “licensed,” provide information to patients on how to obtain a state-funded abortion or, if “unlicensed,” provide notice it is an unlicensed facility.³⁸ The Court found that requiring notice that the PRC is unlicensed unconstitutionally chills protected speech and targets the speaker’s identity rather than the speech itself, and requiring notice on how to obtain state-funded abortion unconstitutionally compels the PRCs’ speech.³⁹

Despite these rulings, anti-PRC activists continue to target PRCs by introducing discriminatory legislation that especially targets PRCs’ First Amendment activities and mission of serving pregnant women and their families.

The mistreatment of PRCs is not limited to state policy; it has spilled over into public life through acts of vandalism and property damage. Following the leak of the *Dobbs* decision in 2022, radical groups began issuing nationwide threats against pregnancy center advocates, vowing to “hunt [them] down” and “make [their] lives a living hell.”⁴⁰ These extremists declared “war” on not only the centers themselves but also the personal property, homes, and lives of those who support them.⁴¹ Around this time, a pregnancy center in Littleton, New Hampshire, was vandalized.⁴² The incident became part of a national trend of attacks on crisis pregnancy centers.⁴³ Since the *Dobbs* decision, PRCs have been the target of nearly 100 criminal incidents—including violence, firebombing,⁴⁴ and assault.⁴⁵

³⁸ *Nat’l Inst. of Fam. & Life Advocs. v. Becerra*, 585 U.S. 755, 761–62 (2018).

³⁹ *Id.* at 766–79.

⁴⁰ *Jane’s Revenge – Night of Rage Communique*, JANE’S REVENGE (June 26, 2022), perma.cc/Z9W4-8XMR.

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² Damien Fisher, *Vandals Hit Littleton Pregnancy Center, Part of National Trend*, N.H.J. (June 30, 2022), <https://nhjournal.com/vandals-hit-littleton-pregnancy-center-part-of-national-trend/#:~:text=Vandals%20Hit%20Littleton%20Pregnancy%20Center,Dobbs%20decision%20overturned%20Roe%20v.>

⁴³ Jessica Chasmar, *More than 100 Pro-Life Organizations, Churches Attacked Since Dobbs Leak*, CONGRESS.GOV (Oct. 20, 2022), <https://www.congress.gov/117/meeting/house/115243/documents/HHRG-117-GO00-20221214-SD003.pdf>; *FBI Offering \$25,000 Rewards for Information in Series of Attacks Against Reproductive Health Service Facilities*, FBI (January 19, 2023), <https://www.fbi.gov/news/press-releases/fbi-offering-25000-rewards-for-information-in-series-of-attacks-against-reproductive-health-service-facilities>.

⁴⁴ Mary Margaret Olohan, *Firebombed Wisconsin Pro-Life Center Has Not Heard from FBI Since May*, THE DAILY SIGNAL (Oct. 11, 2022), <https://www.dailysignal.com/2022/10/11/firebombed-wisconsin-pro-life-center-has-not-heard-from-fbi-since-may/>.

⁴⁵ Following the *Dobbs* decision leak, there were over 500 attacks on Catholic Churches, Tommy Valentine, *Tracker: 500 Attacks on U.S. Catholic Churches Since May 2020*, CATHOLICVOTE (June 14, 2022), <https://catholicvote.org/tracker-church-attacks/>, and nearly 100 attacks on PRCs, *Tracking Attacks on Pregnancy Centers & Pro-Life Groups*, CATHOLICVOTE (June 9, 2022), <https://catholicvote.org/pregnancy-center-attack-tracker/>.

Furthermore, PRCs often lack adequate protection when these attacks occur. Although the federal Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (“FACE”) Act is intended to shield all reproductive health facilities from violence and vandalism,⁴⁶ its enforcement has been markedly uneven. Data from the DOJ reveals a significant disparity: between 2021 and 2024, approximately 92% of FACE Act cases targeted pro-life individuals, while only a small fraction addressed the nearly 100 criminal incidents—including firebombings—directed at PRCs during that same period.⁴⁷

H.B. 1416 represents a critical restoration of constitutional order for PRCs facing unprecedented hostility. As the evidence demonstrates, states have consistently engaged in viewpoint-based harassment intended to chill the speech of those offering alternatives to abortion. By codifying these defenses into law, H.B. 1416 ensures that the First Amendment rights of PRCs are no longer subject to administrative weaponization or state-funded defamation but are instead firmly shielded by the rule of law.

II. PRCs Provide Vital Services for Women and their Families.

Contrasting sharply with the public derision found in political and media circles that label PRCs as deceptive, “fake clinics” is the firsthand testimony of the women served: women “who find and utilize these pregnancy help services overwhelmingly give pregnancy centers 99 percent satisfaction ratings for the care they receive, because it helps them through difficult times and puts them on a path toward success as parents.”⁴⁸ 2019 data demonstrates that 99.19 percent of Care Net clients and 99.6 percent of Heartbeat International clients report positive experiences at PRCs.⁴⁹ This data

⁴⁶ 18 U.S.C. § 248.

⁴⁷ *Revisiting the Implications of the FACE Act: Part II, 118th Congress (2023–2024) (2/18/2024)*, <https://www.congress.gov/event/118th-congress/house-event/117765/text>; Reproductive Rights, U.S. DOJ, <https://www.justice.gov/archives/reproductive-rights/news> (last visited Feb. 20, 2026); Mary Margaret Olohan, *Republicans to Hold Hearing on DOJ Targeting Pro-Lifers*, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMM. REP. (May 12, 2023), <https://judiciary.house.gov/media/in-the-news/republicans-hold-hearing-doj-targeting-pro-lifers#:~:text=The%20FBI's%20FACE%20Act%20charges,a%20few%20of%20these%20incidents.> When asked if these attacks were being investigated, the DOJ’s spokeswoman could only name four individuals who were charged for pro-abortion violence. *Id.* In contrast, over 22 pro-life individuals had been prosecuted under the FACE act for anti-abortion protests. *Id.*

⁴⁸ Jor-El Godsey, *By Accusing Pregnancy Centers of False Advertising, Pro-Abortion Politicians Prove They Can’t Handle The Truth*, THE FEDERALIST (Feb. 20, 2023), <https://thefederalist.com/2023/02/20/by-accusing-pregnancycenters-of-false-advertising-pro-abortionpoliticians-prove-they-cant-handle-the-truth/>; see Moira Gaul, *Fact Sheet: Pregnancy Centers—Serving Women and Saving Lives*, CHARLOTTE LOZIER INST. (July 2021), <https://lozierinstitute.org/fact-sheet-pregnancycenters-serving-women-and-saving-lives-2020/>.

⁴⁹ *Pregnancy Centers Stand the Test of Time*, CHARLOTTE LOZIER INST. 1, 66, www.lozierinstitute.org/pcr2020 (last visited Oct. 16, 2025).

demonstrates that PRCs serve women with compassion and professionalism, despite the pro-abortion narrative that PRCs manipulate and fail to serve their clients.

PRCs provide support to women who wish to become mothers but are hindered by economic or interpersonal instability. Over the past 50 years, PRCs have provided invaluable, free services to low-income women across the United States. According to CareNet and the Charlotte Lozier Institute, over 2,750 PRCs served 3,255,856 people in the United States in 2022 alone.⁵⁰ This included 546,683 free ultrasounds, 703,835 free pregnancy tests, 203,171 free STI/STD tests, 3,590,911 free packs of diapers, 1,216,438 free packs of wipes, 43,192 free new car seats, 4,256,274 free baby clothing outfits, 30,188 free strollers, 23,486 free new cribs, 300,008 free new cans/bottles of infant formula, and 967,251 free consultations with new clients.⁵¹ PRCs also provide additional services, such as adoption information, onsite adoption agencies, college/university outreach, professional counseling, safe haven locations, housing referrals, medical referrals, and information on abortion.⁵² And these services are typically offered “at no cost to the women, men, and youth they serve.”⁵³ In 2022, the estimated value of PRCs’ services was \$367,896,513, which highlights the incredible community resource these centers have become.⁵⁴

The free, accessible services provided by PRCs are especially crucial, as most women who seek abortions do so primarily for financial reasons.⁵⁵ Many do not actually want an abortion but feel pressured by a lack of support and economic security. A 2023 national study found that over 60% of women who had abortions reported experiencing high levels of pressure to abort from one or more sources.⁵⁶ Studies also show that 70 percent of women who have abortions say the decision conflicts with their values.⁵⁷ In another study, a majority of women who had abortions (sixty percent) “reported they

⁵⁰ *Pregnancy Centers Offer Hope for a New Generation*, CHARLOTTE LOZIER INST. 1, 19, <https://lozierinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Pregnancy-Center-Report-Dec-2024-Interactive.pdf> (last visited Oct. 16, 2025).

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² *Id.* at 24.

⁵³ Moira Gaul, *Fact Sheet: Pregnancy Centers – Serving Women and Saving Lives (2020 Study)*, CHARLOTTE LOZIER INST. (July 19, 2021), bit.ly/3jynufi.

⁵⁴ *Id.* at 19.

⁵⁵ Lawrence B. Finer et al., *Reasons U.S. Women Have Abortions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives*, 37 PERSP. SEXUAL & REPROD. HEALTH 110, 117–18 (2005).

⁵⁶ David C. Reardon & Tessa Longbons, *Effects of Pressure to Abort on Women’s Emotional Responses and Mental Health*, CUREUS (2023).

⁵⁷ Tessa Longbons, *Hidden Epidemic: Nearly 70% of Abortions Are Coerced, Unwanted or Inconsistent with Women’s Preferences*, CHARLOTTE LOZIER INST., (May 15, 2023), <https://lozierinstitute.org/hidden-epidemic-nearly-70-of-abortions-are-coerced-unwanted-or-inconsistent-with-womens-preferences/>.

would have preferred to give birth if they had received either more emotional support or had more financial security.”⁵⁸

Additionally, the need for PRCs has become even more pressing now that women are increasingly rejecting abortion and choosing to keep their babies. The abortion rate is nearly half of what it was in the late 1980s after *Roe v. Wade* was decided.⁵⁹ Despite the common narrative, women are recognizing that they do not need abortion to have success and equality in American society.⁶⁰ When women are offered options other than abortion, they frequently choose life. PRCs inform women of the alternatives to abortion and provide support throughout their pregnancies and postpartum, unlike abortion clinics that fail to address women’s underlying needs.⁶¹

Indeed, research shows that PRCs make pregnancy confirmation services more accessible than abortion clinics.⁶² PRCs typically offer lower wait times than abortion clinics, receive same-day appointments two times more often than abortion clinics, have a zero-day median wait time (compared to a one-day median wait time at abortion clinics), and are six times as likely to offer free pregnancy testing than abortion clinics.⁶³ This data directly contradicts claims that PRCs delay care or mislead patients. Far from dishonestly delaying appointments, PRCs have demonstrated dedication to serving their clients faster than abortion clinics.

The practical value of these services is immense. Consider the experience of Lindsay Smith, a Pennsylvania woman who utilized A Woman’s Concern, a local PRC.⁶⁴ She and her husband received enough supplies that they “didn’t have to buy diapers till after [their son Rocky’s] first birthday.”⁶⁵ By participating in parenting workshops,

⁵⁸ David C. Reardon et al., *The Effects of Abortion Decision Rightness and Decision Type on Women’s Satisfaction and Mental Health*, 15 CUREUS 1, 4 (2023).

⁵⁹ CTRS. FOR DISEASE CONTROL & PREVENTION, 69 SURVEILLANCE SUMMARIES 1, ABORTION SURVEILLANCE—UNITED STATES, 2018 (Nov. 27, 2020).

⁶⁰ See, e.g., Helen M. Alvaré, *Nearly 50 Years Post-Roe v. Wade and Nearing Its End: What is the Evidence that Abortion Advances Women’s Health and Equality?* 34 REGENT U.L. REV. 165, 208 (2022) (documenting the testimony in legislative hearings in several states).

⁶¹ See, e.g., Michael J. New, *Pregnancy Centers Offer Better Service Than Abortion Facilities, a New Study Shows*, Nat’l Rev. (Feb. 5, 2023), <https://www.nationalreview.com/corner/pregnancy-centers-offer-better-service-than-abortion-facilities-a-new-study-shows/> (study comparing 445 abortion facilities with nearby pregnancy centers, finding strong statistical evidence that pre-life pregnancy centers offer better and less expensive services than abortion facilities).

⁶² Kavita Vinekar et al., *Early Pregnancy Confirmation Availability at Crisis Pregnancy Centers and Abortion Facilities in the United States*, 117 CONTRACEPTION 30, 35 (2023).

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ Stephanie Armour, *Pregnancy Resource Centers Spark Funding Row Between Biden Administration, Antiabortion Groups*, Wall St. J. (Jan. 1, 2024), [bit.ly/467Fply](https://www.wsj.com/articles/pregnancy-resource-centers-spark-funding-row-between-biden-administration-antiabortion-groups-2024-01-01).

⁶⁵ *Id.*

Lindsay also secured essential high-cost items—including a stroller, car seat, and baby bath—at no cost.⁶⁶

PRCs have been faithfully serving the women and families for decades, offering free resources such as pregnancy tests, ultrasounds, confidential pregnancy services, testing for STIs and STDs, counseling, parenting classes, material assistance, and post-abortion care. I urge the committee to support H.B. 1416 to protect these centers from political targeting and ensure that compassionate, free care remains accessible to every New Hampshire woman choosing life.

III. Conclusion.

I urge the committee to support NH H.B. 1416 to protect PRCs from political targeting and ensure that compassionate, accessible care remains available to every New Hampshire woman choosing life.

Respectfully Submitted,



Emily Hoegler
Policy Counsel
AMERICANS UNITED FOR LIFE

⁶⁶ *Id.*