

Proposed CT State Bill 5416 – Address the Root Causes

I believe that either pro-choice or pro-life, we all care about the women of CT. We just have different views of how to best serve them. The proposed bill wants to protect women from misleading or false advertising. CT Regulation 42-110b-18 already addresses misleading and false advertisements and is applicable to all groups. Section 1.7 of this proposed Bill makes it only applicable to groups that do not provide referrals for abortions. But why do women have abortions? Guttmacher, the research organization founded by Planned Parenthood, reports that the top reasons contributing to a woman's decision to have an abortion are:

- Can't afford
- Would interfere with education
- Would interfere with career
- Don't want to be a single mother or having relationship problems
- <https://www.guttmacher.org/journals/psrh/2005/reasons-us-women-have-abortions-quantitative-and-qualitative-perspectives>

The view point of the Abortion Industry advocating for this proposed bill is that all pregnant women should receive referrals to abortion clinics.

Pregnancy Resource Centers (PRCs) believe women deserve better. Mattie Brinkerhoff said "When a man steals to satisfy hunger, we may safely conclude that there is something wrong in society. So when a woman destroys the life of her unborn child, it is an evidence that either by education or circumstances she has been greatly wronged." <http://quotes.yourdictionary.com/author/quote/562701>

The view point of PRCs is that we should seek to address the root causes that drive women to abortion. The view point of PRCs is that women should not have to choose between sacrificing their unborn child and sacrificing their education, career plans, or their basic needs. The view point of PRCs is that services, material and emotional support should be available for pregnant women in need, so PRCs provide free services, material and emotional support to empower women.

This proposed Bill is only applicable to groups that do not provide referrals for abortions and therefore is intended to hamper a particular view point, which does not meet the requirement of being "content neutral" as established by the Supreme Court in 1989 in the case of Ward v. Rock Against Racism.

This proposed Bill is trying to compel PRCs to refer all clients to abortion clinics and control where they can locate their facilities. That would be like forcing Chick-fil-As to tell all their customers where they can get a hamburger and restricting them from locating a Chick-fil-A close to a restaurant that serves hamburgers.

I urge you to vote against this proposed bill and allow PRCs to continue to provide services, material and emotional support so that women don't have to choose between sacrificing their unborn child and sacrificing their education, career plans, or basic needs.

Respectfully,
Brian Hall