# Example Debate Case

The Resolution for this topic was - Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee universal child care.

## Affirmative

**1AC --- Framework**

#### **I affirm the resolution, Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee universal child care.**

I value morality

My criteria is maximizing societal well being

**To clarify the resolution, I offer the following definitions:**

**Ought is defined by [Merriam Webster] as:**

(“OUGHT”; https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought, Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Accessed 01-14-2021) AP

: moral obligation: DUTY

Thus, we have a moral obligation to ensure more children are given access to child care, by utilizing a program that universalizes child care in the United States. In doing so, we can make sure children are taken care of in the best possible way, they are able to have brighter and better futures

#### Universal child care is defined by [Policy Perspectives] as:

Pendleton 19 Maya Pendleton (Staff writer for Policy Perspectives, the graduate student journal of George Washington University’s Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration). “A Closer Look at Universal Child Care.” Policy Perspectives. 6 May 2019. JDN. https://policy‐perspectives.org/2019/05/06/a‐closer‐look‐at‐universal‐child‐ care/

What is Universal Childcare? There are two programs that currently provide income‐based assistance for child care in the U.S, but both of these programs fall short of addressing the nation’s child care needs. The nation’s largest federal child care program, the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG), provides child care to 15 percent of eligible families. Head Start offers subsidized early childhood education programs but only serves about “7 percent of eligible children under age three.” The tax code also subsidizes support for working families and their children through the Child Tax Credit and the child and dependent care tax credit. Tax credits also fail to meet child care needs, as the annual costs of child care far outweigh maximum tax credit amounts. Additionally, tax credits provide a lump sum once a year, which is not aligned with families’ monthly obligations. Advocates and Presidential candidates on both sides of the aisle have proposed amendments to these existing programs in order to mitigate child care costs. Recent proposals include doubling the child care tax credit and a one‐time $1 billion investment to increase the supply of child care. Additionally, several 2020 presidential hopefuls co‐sponsored a bill expanding access to child care for families with low to moderate incomes. None of these plans go as far as offering universal child care. On February 19, Presidential candidate and current U.S. Senator, Elizabeth Warren, outlined the Universal Child Care and Early Learning Plan. The plan outlines a federal program that “would make child care available to all families at no‐cost or an affordable cost; establish quality standards that support child development; provide comprehensive child development services for children who need support; and strengthen pay and benefits for the child care and early education workforce.” Under the Universal Child Care and Early Learning plan, the CCDBG would become a supplemental program providing extended care hours, tailored services for children with disabilities, and after‐school care for 5 to 13‐year‐olds. The program would cost taxpayers approximately $70 billion per year and is expected to cut child care costs for families with young children by 17 percent. Some economists estimate that the plan would increase the number of children receiving child care from 6.8 million to 12 million.

### 1AC---Child Care

**Contention one is accessibility**

**[Uniqueness] – proves that the status quo/current situation is bad because the US doesn’t have universal child care**

#### Sweden proves universal child care is feasible and extremely beneficial; but right now in the US, childcare is still difficult to get for many families

Wang 20 [Anni Wang. “The Lack of Childcare and its Impact in America”. 4-22-2020. Golden Gate University School of Law. https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1016&context=povlaw. Accessed 3-10-2021]

There are many elements that contribute to the high cost of childcare. First, there is the price of labor that go into child-care facilities. Unlike other businesses that use outsourcing to cut down costs, the child care industry cannot cut spending by moving labor to poorer countries or by replacing human workers with machines. Similar to health care and education, child care requires the implementation of domestic salaries. Second, the childcare industry is highly regulated which drives costs upward. States with more stringent labor laws tend to have the most expensive facilities.8 In Massachusetts, which requires one caregiver for every three infants, the average annual cost is more than $16,000. In contrast, in Mississippi, which requires one caregiver to every five infants, the cost is less than $5,000. The cost of insurance also comes into play where it is needed in order to cover damage to the property and worker injuries, as well as legal fees to deal with any possible lawsuits. The third factor is location. The most expensive child-care facilities tend to be located near high-income neighborhoods or in commercial districts where rent is usually high. Not every child care facility can move into a smaller building because as per regulation the number of infants is limited to the size of the facility.9 Securing quality childcare is a challenge for parents. Chances are that other parents are also out there searching for an affordable facility that offers high quality care. Most childcare centers operate out of homes and the spots available often fill up quickly.10 The number of parents looking for childcare drives the price of these home operated centers upward as many parents are willing to pay more for better quality childcare services. There are some employers who recognize the cost and need for childcare. However not everyone has the opportunity to work for companies such as Apple or Google. These companies are stepping in to offer daycare centers for employees or to pay for childcare costs if an employee’s first option in childcare becomes unavailable. 11 As most people do not work for employers who offer childcare services, there is a common practice where one parent chooses to stay home to care for the child. This practice impacts the earning potential of the family because only one parent is working and earning income. Typically, young parents are the most affected.12 When starting out, most younger parents have less money and are less established in their career. As parents balance competing responsibilities of work and family, access to high-quality child care has become more critical. Having high-quality childcare enables parents to increase their employment and earnings knowing their children are being well cared for during the hours they are at work. In comparison to the United States countries like Sweden offers up to 16 months of paid leave after the birth of a newborn, extra tax credits to defray the cost of childcare. Sweden also offers access to regulated, subsidized day care facilities that stay open from 6:30 in the morning until 6:30 at night.13 These programs are available to everybody, regardless of income. Sweden's maximum fee policy makes childcare affordable. Fees are calculated according to income with low-income families paying nothing while the cost is capped for all families.14 Swedish parents pay 3% of their gross salary but with a maximum cap so you never have to pay more than 1,260 Swedish krona about $120 USD a month per child. If parents have more children, they pay a maximum of 420 krona or $40 USD for the third child and nothing for the fourth. The message behind the program is that every parent should have the same opportunity to have childcare, regardless of income or circumstances.15 Evidence from other countries and states that have adopted paid leave policies suggests that parental leave boosts female employment and helps increase subsequent earnings.16 At the same time, women who are offered maternity leave are more likely to return to the same employer and many women who would not have otherwise returned to work re-enter the labor force within a year.17 Studies that have examined the effects of paid sick leave and concluded having childcare policies would increase businesses profits by improving productivity, and reducing the need to hire and train new employees which would save time and resources.18

**[Link/internal link] – Proves that the AFF will help children’s education, and why this matters**

#### **Universal childcare benefits child school performance**

Sawhill 99 [Isabel V. Sawhill. “Kids Need an Early Start: Universal preschool education may be the best investment Americans can make in our children’s education – and our nation’s future.” 9-1-1999 <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/kids-need-an-early-start-universal-preschool-education-may-be-the-best-investment-americans-can-make-in-our-childrens-education-and-our-nations-future/>. Accessed 3-25-2021]

The keys to academic success for disadvantaged children may not be smaller class sizes, better-prepared teachers, tougher standards, more accountability, or greater choice—laudable as these goals may be. They may instead hinge on a single factor: preschool. Because of their family environments, too many children come to school ill-prepared to learn. They lack language skills, social skills, and motivation. In Oxford, Miss., for example, Superintendent John Jordan reports that 5-year-olds sometimes arrive in kindergarten not knowing their own names—only their nicknames. Almost all experts now agree that a preschool experience or its first cousin—high quality, educationally-oriented child care—is one of the most effective strategies for improving later school performance. Consider the emphasis on reducing class size. The evidence suggests that its major benefits come from the extra socialization that it allows teachers to provide to children in the early grades. Yet a more cost-effective solution is to provide these same children with appropriate experiences before they enter school. Ironically, by attempting to reduce class size, schools are competing for staff with child care and preschool programs—to the detriment of the latter. What evidence is there that increased support for pre-kindergarten will have the hoped-for effects on school readiness? The best studies strongly suggest that children benefit greatly from an early learning experience. High-quality programs have produced short-term gains in cognitive functioning and longer-term gains in school achievement and social adjustment. Recent reviews of the literature by the Rand Corporation, by Steven Barnett at Rutgers University, and by a team of researchers at the University of Wisconsin conclude that early interventions, especially with disadvantaged children, have produced a variety of positive results. Those results include higher school achievement, less retention in grade, a reduced need for special education at a later age, and less crime. The study estimates that the most effective programs create savings to the government of $13,000 to $19,000 per child above the cost of the pre-school programs themselves. The best results come from programs that begin early, include children from the most disadvantaged homes, and provide intensive education and other services over a lengthy period.

**[Impact] – How not passing the aff will prevent children from getting good jobs in the future**

#### Conversely, inadequate education hurts children’s futures

**Imoukhuede, 14** – Professor of Law, Nova Southeastern University - Shepard Broad Law Center (Areto, “Education Rights and the New Due Process” 47 Ind. L. Rev, <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1060&context=law_facarticles>

 Irrespective of the overall or average adequacy of the U.S. education system, one point that is not in serious debate is the woeful race and wealth-based inequities in public education.34 Sadly, Julius Chambers’ statement regarding race, poverty and education is as true today as it was back in 1987: In America. . . **the quality and quantity of education that children receive remain tied to the race and economic status of their family**. **Many black and poor children**, through no fault of their own, **continue to be deprived of training in even the most basic skills, such as reading**, writing and arithmetic. **This** deprivation works a profound and lifelong injury to these neglected youths, and cripples **their ability to participate in political and economic life**. . . . . The United States is often romantically portrayed as a meritocracy. Yet, the continuing poverty of a disproportionate number of black children, their increasing isolation in largely segregated school systems, and the resistance of white citizens both to full integration and to adequate funding of all school districts, have perpetuated a system in which the potential achievement of a child is highly correlated with the race and economic status of his parents.35 More recently, education scholar, Linda Darling-Hammond’s research demonstrates that if anything, the racial inequities in education have only worsened. 36 In 2011, the four-year high school graduation rate remains stagnant at about 70 percent; the achievement gap between minority and White students in reading and math is larger than it was in 1988; and U.S. performance on international tests has continued to drop… . . . . . . . In the U.S., the impact of socio-economic factors on student performance is almost double what it is in Canada. . . . . In the U.S., White and Asian students score just above the average for the European OECD nations in each subject area, but African-American and Hispanic students – many of whom are in highly segregated schools that lack qualified teachers and up-to-date materials – score so much lower that the national average plummets to the bottom tier. Thus, the poor U.S. standing is substantially a product of unequal access to the kind of intellectually challenging learning measured on these international assessments.37

## Negative

**1NC --- Framework**

#### **I negate the resolution, Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee universal child care.**

I value morality

My criteria is reducing the amount of people in poverty

Misra 21 writes that President Biden’s recently passed 1.9 trillion dollar stimulus package will reduce child poverty thus the status quo is solving poverty

The federal government’s US$1.9 trillion relief package that President Joe Biden signed on March 11 will temporarily expand the child tax credit. This credit, currently pegged at up to $2,000 a year per child until they turn 17, will instead total $3,600 for children under 6 and $3,000 for kids up to the age of 18 over the next 12 months. Starting in July, the Internal Revenue Service will distribute half this money to most families with children in monthly payments of either $250 or $300 per child. The IRS will deliver the balance at tax time in 2022. The Conversation U.S. asked Joya Misra, a sociologist who studies how public policies influence inequality, four questions about this new temporary benefit. 1. Why are families with children getting these benefits? This program builds on the existing child tax credit, which reduces the tax burden for families with children as a way of offsetting part of the cost of raising kids. Of all age groups in the U.S., children are the most likely to live in poverty. Don’t let yourself be misled. Understand issues with help from experts Families taking care of children must spend a great deal of money on food, housing, clothing, child care, school supplies and health care. This spending has greatly increased during the COVID-19 pandemic for many families, amid an unemployment spike. These benefits are also useful for households with breadwinners who kept their jobs. Food costs have surged, and new needs have arisen for many families as they’ve scrambled to pay for sharply higher child care tuition, hire private tutors and try to address their kids’ many other new needs created by social distancing. 2. Do other countries provide these payments? Just as it’s very common around the world to provide benefits for the elderly, the disabled and the unemployed, providing benefits for families with children is the norm. Most wealthy countries, and many countries that aren’t as well-off as the United States, have provided monthly benefits for children for decades. Whether they’re in Canada, Germany or the United States, research shows that these payments are an investment in a nation’s future. They help families afford what their children need today to become healthy, educated and productive members of society tomorrow. Other research suggests that child poverty currently costs the U.S. government more than $1 trillion a year. 3. Could this arrangement continue past the 2021 tax year? Yes. Rep. Richard Neal, a Massachusetts Democrat who chairs the House Ways and Means Committee, is reportedly seeking to make this benefit permanent. Reps. Rosa DeLauro, Suzan DelBene and Ritchie Torres, three other House Democrats, have reintroduced the American Family Act, which would permanently increase the child tax credit and make its payments monthly. Sen. Mitt Romney, a Utah Republican, is proposing a different kind of monthly child allowance. It would replace the tax credit and a few other programs – leading to concerns that some Americans might benefit less if his proposal were to be adopted. Interestingly, Romney has called for the government to make these payments through the Social Security system instead of the IRS.

Several experts have suggested that this package could halve child poverty, as has been widely reported Child poverty is extremely high in the U.S., relative to other rich countries, primarily because for decades it has spent less on supporting families with children. Nearly 1 in 5 American children live in poverty, far above the 12% average for the 37 wealthy and middle-income countries that belong to the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation.

Biden’s proposed legislation included several sources of support for families with children. One study predicted that the entire package – including far more than the expanded child tax credit – would reduce U.S. child poverty by 57%. Many of these provisions are in the legislation that Congress passed, with some notable exceptions. For example, the relief package doesn’t include an increase in the federal minimum wage.

Although a study from 2019 also suggested that expanding the child tax credit could halve child poverty, I don’t think that this expanded – but temporary – child tax credit will make that happen. I do think it will benefit low-income families a great deal and will lower child poverty rates significantly. But because of the many ways that the COVID-19 pandemic has upended life for people facing economic hardship, the earlier findings may be overly optimistic for the current moment. It’s also important to remember that the cost of raising children varies enormously from place to place. Clearly this boost to the child tax benefit will mean different things for families in different parts of the country. [Research into coronavirus and other news from science Subscribe to The Conversation’s weekly science newsletter.] This article was updated to indicate that President Biden signed the bill on March 11, 2021.

**To clarify the resolution, I offer the following definitions:**

**Ought is defined by [Merriam Webster] as:**

(“OUGHT”; https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought, Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Accessed 01-14-2021) AP

: moral obligation: DUTY

Thus, we have a moral obligation to alleviate those in poverty’s quality of life by not passing a UCC while still making sure everyone is living fulfilling lives.

#### Universal child care is defined by [Policy Perspectives] as:

Pendleton 19 Maya Pendleton (Staff writer for Policy Perspectives, the graduate student journal of George Washington University’s Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration). “A Closer Look at Universal Child Care.” Policy Perspectives. 6 May 2019. JDN. https://policy‐perspectives.org/2019/05/06/a‐closer‐look‐at‐universal‐child‐ care/

What is Universal Childcare? There are two programs that currently provide income‐based assistance for child care in the U.S, but both of these programs fall short of addressing the nation’s child care needs. The nation’s largest federal child care program, the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG), provides child care to 15 percent of eligible families. Head Start offers subsidized early childhood education programs but only serves about “7 percent of eligible children under age three.” The tax code also subsidizes support for working families and their children through the Child Tax Credit and the child and dependent care tax credit. Tax credits also fail to meet child care needs, as the annual costs of child care far outweigh maximum tax credit amounts. Additionally, tax credits provide a lump sum once a year, which is not aligned with families’ monthly obligations. Advocates and Presidential candidates on both sides of the aisle have proposed amendments to these existing programs in order to mitigate child care costs. Recent proposals include doubling the child care tax credit and a one‐time $1 billion investment to increase the supply of child care. Additionally, several 2020 presidential hopefuls co‐sponsored a bill expanding access to child care for families with low to moderate incomes. None of these plans go as far as offering universal child care. On February 19, Presidential candidate and current U.S. Senator, Elizabeth Warren, outlined the Universal Child Care and Early Learning Plan. The plan outlines a federal program that “would make child care available to all families at no‐cost or an affordable cost; establish quality standards that support child development; provide comprehensive child development services for children who need support; and strengthen pay and benefits for the child care and early education workforce.” Under the Universal Child Care and Early Learning plan, the CCDBG would become a supplemental program providing extended care hours, tailored services for children with disabilities, and after‐school care for 5 to 13‐year‐olds. The program would cost taxpayers approximately $70 billion per year and is expected to cut child care costs for families with young children by 17 percent. Some economists estimate that the plan would increase the number of children receiving child care from 6.8 million to 12 million.

### 1NC---Segregation

Contention one is poverty

**[Uniqueness] – proves that the status quo/current situation is good, and sets up that the aff makes things worse.**

#### UCC fails and leads to the segregation of children by socioeconomic status- the affirmative does not address the root cause of divisions in class within the childcare industry.

**Drange & Telle 20** [ Nina Drange PHD in Ecomincs and Senior Researcher at Statistics Norway and Kjetil Telle Direcotr of Health Services Research at the Norwegian Institute of Public Health, May 2020, “Segregation in a Universal Child Care System: Descriptive Findings from Norway”, Oxford University Press, https://academic.oup.com/esr/article-abstract/36/6/886/5864520?redirectedFrom=fulltext ]

These features should limit advantaged parents’ ability to utilize high income or valuable networks to dis-proportionally occupy care of higher quality—reasons often put forth to explain perpetuating social inequalities in educational choices and outcomes (Lareau, 2014; Austin and Berends, 2018; Farkas, 2018; Thompson, 2019). Still, we describe excessive segregation of children by socioeconomic background across centres. We find some signs that private centres take advantage of their discretion with respect to whom to admit by enrolling dis-proportionally more advantaged children than those who applied. The impact of this on the overall segregation is, however, limited. Our main finding is that the excessive segregation of children by socioeconomic background across centres in Oslo stems from parental application behaviour, and that this application behaviour extends far beyond what would follow from residential segregation. The segregating parental behaviour may be explained by different parental preferences across social class status, in line with theories of cultural capital (Farkas, 2018) and previous empirical studies of parents’ school choices (Austin and Berends, 2018). Another explanation may be that preferences are similar, but that advantaged parents have better access to networks with more reliable and relevant information (Schneider et al., 1997; McPherson, Smith-Lovin and Cook, 2001; Lareau, 2014). At least in the latter case, policymakers may want to undertake compensatory measures to secure the opportunities of children from disadvantaged backgrounds, for example by providing information and guiding to disadvantaged parents about characteristics of child care centres that may benefit their children the most. Furthermore, since the segregation from parental application behaviour by far exceeds residential segregation, our simulation results suggest that policymakers can reduce segregation substantially by making relatively modest changes in the assignment rules. Previous studies have found that generous and high quality public child care targeted exclusively at disadvantaged children can improve their development and reduce social inequality in childhood and beyond (Heckman and Karapakula, 2019). This has spurred hopes that publicly subsidized universal expansions of high-quality child care can improve opportunities of children from disadvantaged families and reduce social inequality. But universal child care is not targeted exclusively at children from disadvantaged families, and we may fear that parental behavioural responses can undermine many of the potential benefits of universal child care expansions (Van Lancker, 2013; Van Lancker and Van Mechelen, 2015). Our findings suggest that such fears may not be unwarranted. Even in a child care system with almost universal participation and where parents’ ability to utilize high income or networks to dis-proportionally occupy care of higher quality is limited, substantial segregation may prevail in the quality of child care. This implies that universal child care systems may not be able to fully counter-act inequalities in other spheres of life, unless deliberate policy action is undertaken. Information and guiding to disadvantaged parents about characteristics of child care centres that may benefit their children the most, and assignment rules that reduce segregation, may be necessary to secure the opportunities of all families and children alike.

**[Link] – proves that the aff increases inequality, which is bad.**

#### The affirmative increases inequality since more informed families are able to sign up first, leaving poorer families on the waiting list.

Ding et al. 20 Weili Ding, Queen’s University, Michael J. Kottelenberg, Huron University College, and Steven F. Lehrer, Queen’s University and NBER. "Anticipating the (Un)expected: Evidence from Introducing a Universal Childcare Policy with a Shortage of Spaces." Asian and Australasian Society of Labour Economics 2019 Conference. January 2020. econ.queensu.ca/faculty/lehrer/tripd.pdf.

This paper exploits the staggered introduction of the QFP to shed new light on the effectiveness of, and equity as proxied by access to, universal subsidized childcare. Our results highlight the challenges of policy implementation in the childcare market, by demonstrating that since government capacity to provide these services was limited, many families placed their younger children who were not subsidized into day-care to hold a space that would be subsequently subsidized. The pattern of this strategic positioning of children by subgroups defined on the basis of maternal education is suggestive of many parents tried to reap the potential benefits of the new system. To this day, we not only continue to see a shortage of spaces in Quebec’s childcare centers, and waiting lists abound but survey evidence continues to show that the take-up rate is higher for children from wealthier families.37 Thus, even within the context of this universal policy, equality of child opportunity appears limited. A popular motivation for universal childcare across OECD countries is the notion that it will help middle class and low income families to gain affordable childcare. However, equity concerns from universal childcare policy may not solely arise from a potential shortage in the number of spaces. Consider a setting where the childcare centers offer significantly different levels of quality services. It is reasonable to expect that spots in relatively higher quality daycare centers are and would always be more scarce in such a setting. Further, if price is not allowed to be the invisible hand that allocates spots in the higher quality centers, the excess demand for a quality daycare spot will result in some form of rationing

**[Impact] – proves that how inequality causes marginalization, which is a form of structural violence.**

#### Thus, marginalization of those in poverty is perpetual structural violence.

**Imoukhuede, 14** – Professor of Law, Nova Southeastern University - Shepard Broad Law Center (Areto, “Education Rights and the New Due Process” 47 Ind. L. Rev, <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1060&context=law_facarticles>

 Irrespective of the overall or average adequacy of the U.S. education system, one point that is not in serious debate is the woeful race and wealth-based inequities in public education.34 Sadly, Julius Chambers’ statement regarding race, poverty and education is as true today as it was back in 1987: In America. . . the quality and quantity of education that children receive remain tied to the race and economic status of their family. Many black and poor children, through no fault of their own, continue to be deprived of training in even the most basic skills, such as reading, writing and arithmetic. This deprivation works a profound and lifelong injury to these neglected youths, and cripples their ability to participate in political and economic life. . . . .