

Quebec to fund in vitro fertility treatments

Last Updated: Thursday, March 11, 2010 | 8:15 PM ET [Comments 173](#) [Recommend 47](#)

[CBC News](#)



Quebec Health Minister Yves Bolduc says the program will save the government up to \$30 million a year in treatment provided to premature babies. (CBC)

Quebec Health Minister Yves Bolduc says the province is going ahead with a plan to fully fund in vitro fertility treatments for women.

The province will fund up to three cycles of in vitro fertilization (IVF) treatments by the end of the spring, Bolduc said Thursday during a news conference in Montreal.

Bolduc said he is happy to be able to give this gift to couples trying to conceive, but he said it will also save the province up to \$30 million a year on money being spent to treat premature babies born as a result of fertility treatments.

The plan will include regulations limiting to three the number of embryos that can be implanted in a woman's womb during one cycle of treatment — a move that will help reduce the number of multiple births, said Bolduc.

The program will cost \$32 million its first year, but funding will increase to \$80 million in the next three to four years, Bolduc said.

Currently, about 2,000 cycles are performed in the province on an annual basis at a cost of roughly \$10,000 per treatment.

With the new program, the number of cycles being performed could jump to 10,000, according to government estimates.

The regulations are expected to be published soon in the province's Official Gazette and will go into effect following a 45-day consultation period.

The move follows through on a promise made by Premier Jean Charest during the 2008 provincial election campaign.

Currently, Quebec offers a 50 per cent tax credit for IVF treatments.

Costly treatment

The news was welcomed by Quebecer Michael Kriaa.

Kriaa and his girlfriend have already spent \$23,000 trying to conceive through insemination and in vitro treatments — without any luck.

Now that the government will foot the bill for some treatments, he said it may actually improve their chance of success.

"The more the stress factor is up — it's actually proven that's it's worse for conceiving," he said. "So, the fact that the stress factor for the money is going to be taken [by] the government is actually very, very good news."

Bolduc made the announcement at the McGill University Health Centre Reproductive Centre at the Royal Victoria Hospital, which currently performs about half of the IVF treatments in the province.

He also announced an investment of \$2 million to update and renovate the facility.

- [Post a comment](#)
[173Comments have been posted](#)
- [Recommend this story](#)
[47People have recommended this story](#)

Story comments (173)

Sort: [Most recent](#) | [First to last](#) | [Agreed](#)

[Susie5](#) wrote: Posted 2010/03/15

at 9:45 PM ET****FreedomRules wrote “Read some National geographic magazines and see how much damage humans have done to this planet.

There are so many abused,unwanted,orphaned children....

the govt. could better spend this money trying to rescue them and GIVING them to people who want them “****”

I find it rather arrogant for you to assume that because I support equitable access to medical treatment for infertility that I am not aware of the very real needs and problems on this planet. I don't need to read a National geographic magazine to enlighten me.

Why are you not suggesting NO ONE have biological children, or at the very least have “one less” and adopt?

Why didn't YOU adopt?

Wouldn't that have been the “unselfish” thing to do? Wasn't it irresponsible of you to bring more people into the world when the planet is overpopulated (and likely the taxpayers including infertile people pay for the prenatal care/delivery for those voluntary pregnancies!)?

And yes, the government could spend the money rescuing orphaned children around the world. The government could spend lots of our money doing “good” for others.

Why not spend the money we spend on prenatal care/delivery of voluntary healthy pregnancies on that too, after all for health voluntary pregnancies why shouldn't those who choose to have children with their healthy reproductive systems not pay the related health care costs themselves instead of the “taxpayers” paying for it? Why should infertile taxpayers be paying for those costs?

Why pay for cataract surgery and other things that are not “life threatening”? If infertile people’s medical needs can be “sacrificed” for the greater good, then why not other people’s “non-essential” health needs too?

- [0](#)
- [0](#)

[0Agree](#) [0Disagree](#)[Policy](#) [Report abuse](#)

Susie5 wrote: Posted 2010/03/15

at 9:40 PM ET****

FreedomRules wrote: “to Susie5:

I am already forced to pay to have kids put in daycare at a cost of about 47,000 dollars per child per year, enough already, you don't have to have kids.

And no, people with reproduction problems are not responsible for all the population issues... ,but adopting would be the unselfish thing to do if you can't have your own.”

You don’t “have to have” clear eyesight, you don’t “have to have” good hearing, you don’t “have” to be able to walk, you don’t have to be able to do many things your body can/should be able to do when healthy to “live”. No, you don’t “have to have kids” any more than you have to be able to see clearly, hear clearly, be able to walk...etc...

But there is nothing wrong (or selfish) with desiring to have a healthy reproductive system (to be able to have children), just as there is nothing wrong with desiring to have clear vision (to be able to see well). And our collective health system that we ALL pay for covers all those other things to improve function and quality of life, there is no reason it should not covered reproductive system disease/disorder.

It would be “unselfish” for ANYONE who wants children to choose to adopt over procreating. If you are promoting those WITHOUT a medical problem with their reproductive organs choose adoption over procreation along with those who have medical problems conceiving, I could appreciate a consistency of views that adoption is a “unselfish socially responsible choice” to help and keep the world population in check. But that isn’t what you have been saying. I see no logical or fair reasoning in the conclusion that ONLY if you need medical assistance to conceive that it would be selfish to not adopt instead of using medical assistance.

- [0](#)
- [0](#)

[0Agree](#) [0Disagree](#)[Policy](#) [Report abuse](#)

Susie5 wrote: Posted 2010/03/15

at 9:08 PM ET***SallyBailley wrote: “There are many poor children in Canada who are waiting to be adopted. If you want to be a parent and you are having difficulty becoming pregnant than you can always apply to adopt a child looking for a good loving home. Atter all the world will definitely survive without your gene pool floating around! “*****

That there are children in need of adoptive homes in Canada isn’t the issue.

Adoption and infertility are two DIFFERENT issues.

Infertile Canadian's DO NOT have a greater social/moral responsibility to choose to adopt than anyone else because they happen to have a medical problem with their reproductive system.

Adoption is not a "fix" for infertility.

Adoptive children should NEVER be seen as a "fix" for anyone's problem, they should be adopted because a family (fertile OR infertile) chooses to adopt them on their own merits, because it is the right fit for the child and that family.

Adoption isn't the right fit/choice for every family, fertile or infertile.

While you seem to think you know so much about the issue with assumed "quick fixes and easy solutions" for what people should do, you need to understand that infertility is about far more than a person's "genes", or about parenting alone, and it certainly isn't about anyone worrying about world survival being dependant on their genes.

Infertility is a disease. It affects those dealing with it in real, significant and very heartbreaking ways-despite the ridiculous lack of understanding about it as shown by the disrespectful, uneducated and ill informed comments here.

Those dealing with infertile without question deserve fair and equitable treatment for their medical problem like any other person with a medical problem in this country does.

- [I](#)
- [Q](#)

[I Agree 0DisagreePolicy Report abuse](#)

[Sofaqueen](#) wrote: Posted 2010/03/15

at 10:41 AM ET Freedom Rules wrote:

Give me a break! That's one of the most ridiculous statements I've ever heard, It's about adopting children that are ORPHANED FROM WAR, DISASTERS, kids who are SOLD into slavery, ABUSED, UNWANTED!!!

It's not about taking babies from people who WANT them.

 What I wrote is no more absurd then the lack of compassion and hostility that most of the people making comments towards infertile people are. Infertile people have bad genetics. Infertile people should adopt. Infertile people should go find another spouse to procreate with. Infertile people are careerists and decided to have kids too late. Infertile people are selfish. All of these comments are absurd, rude and unfounded.

I bet more infertile people would adopt if they didn't have to spend thousands (more than IVF for the most part), and wait years and still may not have a child after all of that. Why should infertile people get discriminated against?

There are many studies done and if you have ever read any book about infertility then you may know then,

but I bet you don't. Studies done in the US and Europe have showed that parents that have conceived through IVF tend to be better parents than people who conceived naturally, are more emotionally connected to their children, and have less stress parenting. Being diagnosed with infertility is just as stressful as being diagnosed with cancer, HIV and heart disease. If you would like references to the books I read those in then feel free to ask.

- [4](#)
- [3](#)

[4 Agree 3 Disagree Policy Report abuse](#)

FreedomRules wrote: Posted 2010/03/15

at 9:59 AM ET Sofaqueen says: "since everyone thinks that infertile couples should just adopt then I suggest that all fertile couples should give away their last born to some infertile couple" " You don't want to spend all that time conceiving, going through the pregnancy and then birthing the baby and then give it away, but it's OK for you to think other people should give their babies away"

Give me a break! That's one of the most ridiculous statements I've ever heard, It's about adopting children that are ORPHANED FROM WAR, DISASTERS, kids who are SOLD into slavery, ABUSED, UNWANTED!!!

It's not about taking babies from people who WANT them.

- [2](#)
- [6](#)

[2 Agree 6 Disagree Policy Report abuse](#)

- First
- Previous
- [1](#)
- [2](#)
- [3](#)
- [4](#)
- [5](#)
- [6](#)
- [7](#)
- [8](#)
- [9](#)
- [10](#)
- [Next](#)
- [Last](#)

Comments on this story are pre-moderated. Before they appear, comments are reviewed by moderators to ensure they meet our [submission guidelines](#).

Comments are **open** and welcome until March 18, 2010 at 11:59 p.m. ET. We reserve the right to close comments before then.

Post your comment

Note: The CBC does not necessarily endorse any of the views posted. By submitting your comments, you acknowledge that CBC has the right to reproduce, broadcast and publicize those comments or any part thereof in any manner whatsoever. Please note that comments are pre-moderated/reviewed and published according to our [submission guidelines](#).

You must be logged in to leave a comment. [Log in](#) | [Sign up](#)

Comment:

[Submission policy](#)