



TO: Judiciary Committee
FROM: Marion Miner, Associate Director of Pro-Life & Family Policy
Nebraska Catholic Conference
DATE: January 30, 2026
RE: LB1148 (Provisions regarding Parentage and Assisted Reproductive Technologies) (Oppose)

The Nebraska Catholic Conference advocates for the public policy interests of the Catholic Church and advances the Gospel of Life through engaging, educating, and empowering public officials, Catholic laity, and the general public. I am here to express the Conference's opposition to LB1148.

We do not disregard the fact that in 2026, children come into the world who, due to their conception via gamete "donation," will never have a relationship with one or even both of their natural parents; nor is the Church dismissive of children whose parentage is complicated by surrogacy or other arrangements that make the story of their family of origin more complex. It is in fact on behalf of these children that we oppose policies like LB1148.

In our view this bill treats children as market commodities that can be acquired and/or abandoned at will. Adult desires, adult autonomy, and adult consent are *all* in this worldview, and what happens to the children at the center evidently counts for very little.

Section 2 of this bill makes clear that at least half the biological parentage of the child means nothing if the child is conceived via assisted reproduction. The following sections are worse. Recall that Nebraska law presumes, by default, that a woman who gives birth to a child is the child's legal mother.

Sec. 3(1)(a) provides that "*An individual who consents to assisted reproduction by a woman with the intent to be a parent of a child conceived by the assisted reproduction is a parent of the child.*"

This requires no biological ties to the child nor any commitment to the woman who gives birth to the child. Alarming, when read in conjunction with Section 3(1)(b), it also does not preclude:

- (a) The woman—assumed by Nebraska law to be the child's mother—making a written agreement with a man who is unrelated to the child to be that child's legal parent even over the objection of the child's biological father (who, as a "donor," is *not a parent* by definition according to Section 2); or

(b) A married mother making a written agreement with a person outside the marriage to be her child's other legal parent.

Section 3(1)(b) makes clear that this can be accomplished simply by a written agreement between the mother and the other person who intends, with the mother's consent, to be the child's legal parent.

Section 3(2)(b) requires a court, in certain circumstances, to navigate a maze of contingencies to try and establish what might best be described as an "intent to intend to consent to parent."

Section 4 allows for biological fathers of embryonic human beings created through ART, but not yet transferred to the mother's body, to abandon the children they consented to parent and cast off responsibility for them in the event of divorce.

Section 5 allows for *anyone* to revoke their prior consent to be parents to children so long as these children, already existing and languishing indefinitely as embryos in freezers, have not yet been transferred to the mother's body.

Section 8 reinforces the abandonment rights of a married adult whose spouse gives birth to a child conceived via ART, giving that married adult until the child is *two years old* in some cases to decide whether or not to be a parent after all and providing *no time limit* in other circumstances.

We believe, and we hope you agree, that the infirmity of this bill is evident. This proposal does not further the best interests of children or families. We ask that you not advance it from committee.

Thank you for your time and consideration.