

PROTECTING PREGNANCY HELP CENTERS FROM TARGETED LEGISLATION



DATA, LEGAL PRECEDENTS & TALKING POINTS FOR LAWMAKERS

Pregnancy Help Centers (PHCs) are facing growing hostility from state lawmakers advancing a pro-abortion agenda. These efforts aim to silence, regulate, and punish PHCs for their life affirming work, violating their constitutional rights and discriminating against them for their pro-life views. When such laws are challenged in court, they are consistently struck down as unconstitutional. This rapid response brief provides lawmakers and advocates with key data, legal context, and strategic messaging to protect PHCs from unjust and politically motivated legislation.

PREGNANCY HELP CENTERS SERVE WITHOUT PROFIT

PHCs are nonprofit, donor-funded organizations that provide practical, compassionate support to women facing unplanned pregnancies. They do not profit from a woman's decision. In contrast, abortion providers lose revenue when a woman chooses life. That's not comprehensive care—that's coercive care.

PHCs meet critical needs, often filling service gaps left by other providers and reducing strain on public assistance programs. Services include:

- Medical care
- Ultrasounds and pregnancy confirmation
- Counseling and mentoring
- Parenting classes and life skills
- Material aid like diapers, car seats, and baby clothes
- Referrals to housing, healthcare, and social services
- Post-abortion recovery support
- Adoption support

PUBLIC OPINION AND IMPACT

- **83%** of Americans across the political spectrum **support** Pregnancy Help Centers. Public support is overwhelming. (Source: *2025 Marist Poll*)
- **97%** of women who visited pregnancy centers reported **a positive experience** with the care and support they received. (Source: *Lozier Institute*)
- **96%** of Planned Parenthood's pregnancy resolution services are **abortions**. Prenatal care, miscarriage treatment, and adoption referrals account for less than **4%**. (Source: *Planned Parenthood 2020-2021 Annual Report; Lozier Institute*)

Accusations against PHCs are politically motivated and **unsupported by data**. National smear campaigns have emerged simply because PHCs **are effective**.

LEGAL PRECEDENTS: FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTIONS

Courts are ruling in favor of PHCs, striking down laws that unfairly regulate or compel their speech.

NIFLA V. BECERRA (2018) – U.S. Supreme Court

The court struck down California *AB 775*, which required lawfully unlicensed pregnancy centers to post notices stating that they were **not licensed medical facilities** and did not have **licensed medical professionals** providing or supervising services.

- Targeted pro-life centers while exempting others
- No evidence of consumer confusion
- Mandated government-scripted speech violated the First Amendment
(Source: *NIFLA v. Becerra (2018)* - U.S. Supreme Court)

Case Information: [*NIFLA v. Becerra*](#) | [*Defending Pro-Life Pregnancy Centers*](#) | [NIFLA.org](#)

NIFLA V. RAOUL (2023) – U.S. District Court, Illinois

The court blocked Illinois *SB 1909*, which sought to regulate “**deceptive**” practices by pregnancy centers at the sole discretion of the attorney general.

- Law unfairly targeted PHCs
- No proven deceptive practices
- Government-approved messaging under threat of penalties violated constitutionally protected speech
(Source: *NIFLA v. Raoul (2023)* - U.S. District Court, Illinois)

Case Information: [*NIFLA v. Raoul*](#) | [*Thomas More Society*](#)

NIFLA V. CLARK (2024) – U.S. District Court, Vermont

After a lawsuit challenged Vermont *SB 37*, which labeled pregnancy centers as “**limited services**” for not referring or performing abortions and allowed fines for “**misleading**” advertising, the state amended the law to end its discrimination against their life affirming work.

- Discriminated against pregnancy centers for their pro-life views
- Ambiguous language enabled selective enforcement against specific viewpoints
- The law discouraged centers from expressing beliefs due to enforcement threat
(Source: *NIFLA v. Clark (2024)* - U.S. District Court, Vermont)

Case Information: [*NIFLA v. Clark*](#) | [*Alliance Defending Freedom*](#)

RESOURCES FOR LAWMAKERS

The National Institute of Family and Life Advocates (NIFLA): [nifla.org](#)

Thomas More Society: [thomasmoresociety.org](#)

Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF): [adflegal.org](#)

BOTTOM LINE

PHCs support women, serve families, and operate within the law. Targeted legislation is not only unconstitutional—it’s unnecessary and unpopular. Any attempt to restrict their free speech or services will trigger costly legal battles and undermine trusted community resources.

HOW TO CONTACT US

info@chooselifecoalition.org

[chooselifecoalition.org](#)

(573) 445-9295