



April 9, 2026

VERBAL TESTIMONY

RE: Opposition to IVF Insurance Mandate (H.F. 4609)

Chair Koegel, Chair O’Driscoll and members of the committee,

My name is Maggee Hangge, and I am the assistant director for family policy at the Minnesota Catholic Conference, the public policy voice of the Catholic Church in Minnesota.

We are speaking today in opposition to H.F. 4609. Please vote no.

When a couple is eager to start their family, but month after month sees a negative pregnancy test, the reality is devastating. They carry a heavy burden, and we have great compassion for their circumstances.

It is out of that compassion that we are called to help these couples with the best tools possible. That is not through pushing expensive and ethically questionable treatments like IVF, but rather by finding and treating the root cause of infertility through restorative reproductive medicine.

To truly help couples struggling with infertility, a more effective approach is promoting and covering restorative reproductive medicine. House file 4154, for example, would increase educational resources around RRM for patients and providers.

If the issue is left undetected and they happen to get around it through IVF, that couple may have to again employ IVF to continue growing their family, or they may end up with more embryos than they anticipated, leaving them with another ethical dilemma—do they leave their children on ice indefinitely, discard them, donate them to science, or continue trying to implant them, if they can afford that. Some reports say that up to 90 percent of embryos created are never born.

Undergoing IVF comes at a high financial cost, too. One cycle averages between \$15,000 to \$30,000, and most couples endure multiple cycles before achieving a successful pregnancy. This would certainly impact our healthcare premiums. Minnesota taxpayers should not be forced to fund this unethical and often ineffective practice.

While proponents have tried to say otherwise, this bill would allow for taxpayer funding for commercial surrogacy. A single male who would be considered infertile under the definition in this bill, cannot reproduce without a surrogate who will carry his baby.

In practice, surrogacy creates a marketplace where wombs become commodities and children become products. We should certainly not be funding this practice without properly vetting it through the legislative process.

Couples deserve better than being funneled down the assisted reproduction path. They deserve real answers. RRM can provide those, IVF cannot. Please vote no.