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# Case – 1AC

#### I affirm the resolved: the United States ought to guarantee universal child care.

### Framework

#### My value is justice, defined as giving each their due.

#### The word “ought” in the resolution implies that this is a debate about what the United States morally ought to do, making justice the best value.

#### My standard is minimizing structural violence. Prefer this standard for three reasons:

#### The existence of structural violence perpetuates systems of inequality that are inherently unjust.

#### Structural violence is a cyclical event, meaning its impacts continue to occur if no direct action is taken.

#### Because the core of the topic is about accessibility and equity in terms of resources, which historically has had barriers to certain groups, the framework is specific to the topic.

### Contention 1: Economic Inequality

#### Unequal access to child care fuels inequality, which leads to inequity and economic loss.

Morrissey 20 - Taryn Morrissey[Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration and Policy American University, She received her Ph.D. in developmental psychology at Cornell University, her M.A. in human development and family studies at Cornell University, and her B.S. in psychology and child development at Tufts University.], 2-18-20, "Addressing the need for affordable, high-quality early childhood care and education for all in the United States," Equitable Growth, https://equitablegrowth.org/addressing-the-need-for-affordable-high-quality-early-childhood-care-and-education-for-all-in-the-united-states/

#### Unfortunately, families with young children today face barriers in accessing and paying for the opportunities offered by early care and education. High-quality early care and education is expensive and hard to find, particularly for infants and toddlers.23 Families with young children spend about 10 percent of their incomes on childcare expenses, but families in poverty—families below 100 percent of the Federal Poverty Level of about $12,000 per year for a family of three—spend 30 percent.24 These expenses represent families’ actual expenses at a mix of regulated centers and homes and informal lower-cost arrangements with relatives, not necessarily what they may choose to spend if more options were available. In 2017, infant childcare at centers or licensed homes cost an average of $9,000 to $12,000 per year across the country, more than public college tuition in most states.25 These high childcare costs accrue during a period when parents are at the lowest earning years of their careers and when the financing mechanisms of grants and low-interest loans are unavailable.26 The public programs that exist to help families access early care and education—namely the Early Head Start/Head Start program and childcare subsidies provided under the federal and state Child Care and Development Block Grant program—serve a small fraction of those eligible. In 2016–2017, 35 percent of 3- to 5-year-old children in poverty attended Head Start, and 10 percent of children under age 3 in poverty attended Early Head Start.27 In 2015, of the 13.5 million children eligible for childcare subsidies under federal rules, only 15 percent received them.28 Public investments in preschool contribute to dramatic increases in participation in early learning programs in the year or two prior to children’s entry into kindergarten. Whereas in 1970, about 1.09 million (27 percent) 3- to 5-year old children in the United States attended preschool, by 2016, 4.701 million (60 percent) were enrolled.29 Yet these overall rates mask disparities in attendance. While income-based gaps in enrollment in preschool narrowed in recent decades, children in low-income families continue to be less likely to attend center-based care than their higher-income peers.30 As shown in Figure 1, among children under age 5 with employed mothers, only 28 percent of those in homes under the poverty line attend center-based care, versus 39 percent of those above the poverty line. This is problematic, as center-based settings tend to provide higher-quality, more stable care, on average, than unregulated arrangements.31 Further, centers that low-income children attend provide lower quality care, on average, than those attended by their higher-income peers.32 Research shows that higher-income families are enrolling children in formal early care and education programs at increasingly younger ages.33 In 2005, for example, 22 percent of 1-year-olds from families with incomes above 200 percent of the federal poverty line (at that time, about $32,000 per year for a family of three) attended center-based settings, compared to just 11 percent of 1-year-olds from families with incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty line.34 Our system’s reliance on private family investment in early childhood is a driver of inequality, putting children on unequal playing fields well before they walk through the doors of their kindergarten classrooms.35 Despite their high expense, early care and education programs should actually cost more, not less. The quality of early care and education depends on the warmth and responsiveness of teachers and caregivers and on the strength and consistency of caregiver-child relationships, which means economies of scale do not apply to childcare in the same way as with other economic sectors. For good reason, state and local regulations set child-adult ratios and group sizes and teacher training requirements. In turn, most childcare costs are directed to labor expenses.36 Yet, despite parents paying as much (or more) than they can afford, childcare workers are paid little. In 2018, the median hourly wage for childcare workers was $11.17 ($23,240 per year).37 This is considerably less than the $16.56 median hourly wage for bus drivers ($34,450 per year).38 What’s more, there are wide racial and ethnic gaps in teacher pay and benefits such as health insurance coverage or paid sick leave.39 Many workers earn so little that they rely on public assistance. Between 2014 and 2016, more than half (53 percent) of childcare workers lived in families that participated in one or more of four public programs.40 This compares to 21 percent in the general population.41 Low pay and few benefits present barriers in attracting and retaining a skilled early care and education workforce. Teacher educational qualifications and stability are associated with the quality of early childhood settings and, in turn, a wide range of children’s outcomes.42 In 2012, 25 percent of childcare centers had turnover rates of 20 percent or higher.43 A 2018 study found that 10 percent of children in Head Start (whose teachers average lower pay than those at public preschool programs) had a teacher who left Head Start entirely during the program year, with harmful consequences for children’s outcomes.44 Adequate caregiver and teacher compensation and training is necessary for supporting quality and stability in, and augmenting the supply of, early care and education. This lack of reliable, affordable childcare has reverberating effects for parents, employers, and the U.S. economy. Interrupting a career due to a lack of adequate childcare—something more often done by mothers—has both short- and long-term economic ramifications for families in terms of lost wages, retirement savings, and other benefits, with an estimated average reduction of 19 percent in lifetime earnings.45 Even when maintaining labor force participation, working parents and their employers feel the economic consequences of childcare inadequacy. A 2018 survey found that workers with children under the age of 3 lose an average of 2 hours per week of work time due to childcare problems, such as leaving early or arriving late. One-quarter of respondents reported they reduced regular work hours, turned down further education or training, or turned down a job offer due to childcare problems.46 One recent study estimated that the childcare crisis results in $57 billion in lost earnings, productivity, and revenue each year.47

#### The need for universal childcare is more critical than ever for economic independence.

Wisman & Pacitti 2017, Jon D. Wisman (Professor of Economics, American University) and Aaron Pacitti (Associate Professor of Economics and Douglas T. Hickey Chair in Business, Siena College), “GUARANTEED EMPLOYMENT AND UNIVERSAL CHILD CARE FOR A NEW SOCIAL CONTRACT,” Working Paper, 2017, https://tinyurl.com/y44jsjeo

A half-century later, universal child care is more critical than ever. More families have dual-earners, work more hours, and more workers hold down more than one job, all responses to relatively stagnant real wages since the 1980s. Further, because the demand for child care has risen faster than supply, child-care costs have risen by 70 percent since 1985, forcing more mothers to stay at home (Khimm 2015). The passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act in 1996 made receipt of income support contingent on finding employment, a policy that caused the demand for child care to further increase.15 Still, only 24 percent of children with employed mothers are cared for in an organized facility, while 47.8 percent are cared for by a parent or relative (United States Census Bureau 2011b), suggesting that for many, the cost of formal care is too expensive or unavailable.16 The low supply of high-quality care and its high and rising costs create, especially for low-income families, significant barriers to achieving economic independence because they lower the return to and probability of employment (Executive Office of the President of the United States 2014; Blau 2000b; Hofferth 1999). Providing comprehensive child care lowers this barrier, and generates positive economic benefits related to working: increased incomes, human capital accumulation, and improved cognitive development and educational outcomes for children (Loeb et al. 2003; Black et al. 2011). Families below the poverty level spend 40 percent of their income on child care, leaving little for investment in human capital. Further, high childcare costs reduce disposable income, lowering consumption and savings of working families, thereby limiting the opportunity for upward mobility for disadvantaged families, contributing to the decline in social mobility.

#### Universal child care would benefit the least advantaged in society.

Wisman & Pacitti 2017, Jon D. Wisman (Professor of Economics, American University) and Aaron Pacitti (Associate Professor of Economics and Douglas T. Hickey Chair in Business, Siena College), “GUARANTEED EMPLOYMENT AND UNIVERSAL CHILD CARE FOR A NEW SOCIAL CONTRACT,” Working Paper, 2017, https://tinyurl.com/y44jsjeo

Socially-provided child care would also help counter the explosion in inequality that has taken place over the past four decades. Because low-income families spend a larger percentage of their income on child care, the returns to these families from child care are greater (Boushey and Wright 2004). This is also true with respect to skill, as child care subsidies increase the work force participation of low-skilled women more than other skill groups (P. M. Anderson and Levine 1999). Further, Tekin (2004a) finds that child care subsidies help low-income workers, especially single moms, secure jobs with more conventional schedules, with the added benefit that this can lower the long-term cost of child care, due to economies of scale in care provision as more families use it during traditional workday hours.

#### Universal child care eventually leads to more economic equality and growth.

Morrissey 20 - Taryn Morrissey[Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration and Policy American University, She received her Ph.D. in developmental psychology at Cornell University, her M.A. in human development and family studies at Cornell University, and her B.S. in psychology and child development at Tufts University.], 2-18-20, "Addressing the need for affordable, high-quality early childhood care and education for all in the United States," Equitable Growth, https://equitablegrowth.org/addressing-the-need-for-affordable-high-quality-early-childhood-care-and-education-for-all-in-the-united-states/

A universal plan, particularly one with a sliding income scale to provide progressive benefits, may not pay for itself in the short term, but will likely do so in the long term.48 A universal plan that offers benefits such as mixed-income classrooms may have beneficial peer effects.49 And these kinds of plans have fewer administrative barriers and stigma, and a broader base of political support.50 Further, an analysis of the Infant Health and Development Program estimates that socioeconomic achievement gaps would be substantially narrowed from universal programs.51 Policies should be flexible enough to meet families’ diverse needs, address the overall supply of early care and education, and cope with the gaps that are particularly troublesome for families today, such as care during nonstandard hours and for children with special needs.52 Two examples of universal policy solutions that would improve affordability, quality, and supply are the Child Care for Working Families Act and the Universal Child Care and Early Learning Act. Both of these proposed bills would increase public investment in early care and education to limit families’ out-of-pocket payments to 7 percent of family income (the threshold recommended by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services), increase childcare worker compensation and training, and expand public preschool and the supply of childcare for infants and toddlers. The Child Care for Working Families Act does so by expanding childcare subsidies, nearly doubling the number of children eligible.53 The Universal Child Care and Early Learning Act relies more on public provision, expanding a network of early care and education options through federal-state or federal-local partnerships.54 Both bills, if passed by Congress and signed into law, would lead to substantial increases in the availability of high-quality, affordable early care and education programs. An analysis of the Child Care for Working Families Act estimated that, at full implementation, the availability of new childcare subsidies and reduced childcare costs would lead to 1.6 million more parents joining the labor force, the bill would create 700,000 new jobs in the childcare sector, and pay among teachers and caregivers [increasing] would increase by 26 percent.55

### Contention 2: Educational Opportunities

#### Lack of access to early education perpetuates structural violence.

Rokosa 11, Jennifer Rokosa[Researcher for Center for American Progress, Georgetown University], 10-20-2011, "Fighting the War on Poverty with Early Childhood Education," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/poverty/news/2011/10/20/10547/fighting-the-war-on-poverty-with-early-childhood-education/>

A striking number of children in the United States are poor. The latest Census data reveal that in 2010 more than one out of every five U.S. children lived in poverty conditions. Minority children show the highest rates, with nearly 40 percent of black children and 35 percent of Hispanic children falling below the poverty line. Latino children comprise the single-largest ethnic group in poverty, with 6.1 million children in poverty in 2010. These young children suffer in the classroom: Poverty-stricken youth show higher rates of academic failure and an increased probability of grade retention. Children from poor families are twice as likely to repeat a grade, and they are about 10 times as likely to drop out of high school. These outcomes are likely due to the fact that poverty saddles children with a seemingly insurmountable disadvantage at perhaps the most critical time in their lives. **Early childhood is the single most prolific period of development for children**—90 percent of a child’s brain growth occurs between birth and the age of three. Children in poverty, however, frequently do not have access to the same educational and developmental resources as their counterparts from higher-income families during this vital time. Researchers estimate, for example, that children from professional families are exposed to 45 million words by the age of four, while children from working-class families only hear about 22 million. Children in poverty, however, are exposed to a scant 13 million.[1] Further, more than two-thirds of poverty-stricken households do not possess a single book developmentally appropriate for a child under five. The inequality is startling, and this early disadvantage is only compounded by these children’s lack of access to quality preschool education. Much remains to be done to improve access to preschool programs even though they expanded at a promising rate over the past decade. For instance, only 40 percent of four-year-olds are currently enrolled in state-funded early childhood education programs. This figure is even lower for three-year-olds. In fact, 10 states still have no publicly funded preschool programs of any kind. It is hardly surprising, then, that in low-income communities children enter school an average of 12 to 14 months behind their peers from higher-income brackets. These statistics are especially troubling because academic success is an important indicator of children’s future income and crime rates.

#### Early childhood education has many benefits, including low crime rates, higher income rates, and pursuit of higher education.

Rokosa 11, Jennifer Rokosa[Researcher for Center for American Progress, Georgetown University], 10-20-2011, "Fighting the War on Poverty with Early Childhood Education," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/poverty/news/2011/10/20/10547/fighting-the-war-on-poverty-with-early-childhood-education/>

**ECE = Early Childhood Education**

High-quality preschool programs are proven to raise academic performance and give children the skills and tools to be successful and contribute to society. The results of early childhood education programs speak for themselves. Adults who participate in ECE programs show lower crime rates, and both participants and their parents enjoy higher median income rates than their counterparts who were not afforded the same opportunity. ECE participants are also significantly more likely to graduate from high school and are 2.5 times more likely to continue on to higher education. Building up early childhood education programs is also one of the smartest investments we can make. Various studies determine that on average, society sees a return of $7 for every $1 invested in early childhood education programs. This figure can be broken down in the following ways: Costs to our already overtaxed public school system drop significantly as participants in ECE programs are less likely to repeat grades and require costly special education programs. Decreased crime rates translate to less expense for our justice system. ECE participants’ higher income rates result in greater contributions to the tax system. ECE participants tend to consume less governmental social services such as welfare. But this number can be even higher. In one longitudinal study of at-risk children, participants in a high-quality preschool program—the High Scope Perry Preschool in Ypsilanti, Michigan—were more successful in academics than the control group by age 19, and they also developed stronger social skills and looked forward to greater economic prospects. By age 27, participants boasted lower arrest rates, higher income levels, and greater rates of high school completion. The benefits only grew as the participants aged, and they compounded by age 40. The researchers estimated that over the course of the participants’ lifetimes every $1 invested in early childhood education programs yielded more than $17 in returns to society. Quality early childhood education programs also carry marked benefits for the parents and families of young children by allowing them to participate more productively in the workforce. The research is clear: ECE programs can combat poverty and make a significant difference in our school system’s success. At a time when record numbers of children are living in poverty, programs with proven and demonstrable effectiveness such as early childhood education are of the utmost importance

### Contention 3: Gender Equality

#### Lack of universal childcare entrenches sexism and discrimination.

Lyons 2020, J’Taime Lyons (is a dual degree MBA/MPP at the University of Michigan from Rocky Mount, North Carolina), “Narrowing the Gender Wage Gap with Universal Child Care,” Michigan Journal of Public Affairs, April 10, 2020, http://mjpa.umich.edu/2020/04/10/narrowing-the-gender-wage-gap-with-universal-child-care/

Not surprisingly, upper management positions tend to be male-segregated. Men are moving up the income ladder, even as they become fathers, while mothers are moving down. In a phenomenon known as “statistical discrimination,” employers see women as risky investments for costly training due to the fact that some women leave their jobs to raise their children. In addition, time out of the workplace due to child care demands depreciates the value of the skills women earned in school or from previous positions. They reenter the labor market at a lower entry point than when they left. A system of universal child care would lead to more on-the-job training and increase women’s access to higher-wage positions and jobs. Another factor that unfairly hurts women’s chances in the workforce is high-paying workplaces rewarding overwork and long hours. Both parents may be high earners, but society generally expects that the mother will need to be on-call for child care rather than the father, making it harder for women to meet the overwork requirement. That’s why overwork has led to an unequal departure of women from higher paying jobs as well as disproportionate rewards to workers who are able to work long hours

#### The lack of universal childcare hold women back from fulfilling careers.

Covert 2020, Bryce Covert (is a contributor at The Nation and a contributing op-ed writer at The New York Times), “We Can’t Save the Economy Without Universal Child Care,” The Nation, April 17, 2020, https://www.thenation.com/article/economy/child-care-economy-coronavirus/

Here in the US, Washington, DC, has been working toward something similar. In 2009 the city started offering free, universal preschool, which is now available for kids ages 3 to 4. The program increased the labor force participation rate for women with young children by 10 percentage points. You can dig back into US history to see a similar impact. During World War II, the federal government ran universal, low-cost child care for the Rosies going into factories as riveters. Where it was available, women were more likely to work and to work longer hours. But that program ended when the war did, and the US hasn’t had universal child care since. We know our economy is suffering for it. The labor force participation rate for women in the US has fallen behind that of other developed countries, thanks, in part, to our lack of investment in early care. In 2016 alone, nearly 2 million parents with children age 5 or younger quit their jobs, turned down offers, or significantly changed their work arrangements because they had problems getting child care. The burden falls hardest on women, who are still expected to be the primary caregivers. Mothers who can’t find child care are significantly less likely to be employed than those who can.

Covert 2020, Bryce Covert (is a contributor at The Nation and a contributing op-ed writer at The New York Times), “We Can’t Save the Economy Without Universal Child Care,” The Nation, April 17, 2020, https://www.thenation.com/article/economy/child-care-economy-coronavirus/

We don’t normally think of public school as child care, but schools are generally a safe place for children when their parents go to work. We have lots of evidence that offering something similar for children at younger ages would allow even more people to be employed. And now we’re witnessing the terrifying opposite: what happens to parents—and the economy—when free, accessible, quality child care is yanked away. One of the older examples of the economic benefits of offering inexpensive, universal care for young children comes from Canada. After the province of Quebec instituted a universal child care program in 1997, its share of working women ages 26 to 44 reached close to 85 percent, the highest in the world. The increased number of women in the workforce elevated tax revenues so much that the program essentially pays for itself now.

### C4: Universal Childcare would pay for itself:

#### An Australian study concluded that:

Australian Financial Review, 10-11-2020, "Cheaper childcare pays for itself,"<https://www.afr.com/policy/economy/cheaper-childcare-pays-for-itself-20201011-p563xj>

Our work suggests universal childcare would have an even bigger economic dividend, but would also be substantially more expensive.A 90 per cent universal subsidy would cost about $10 billion a year, and boost GDP by a whopping $24 billion a year. It can't happen overnight, though. Universal childcare would probably lead to a significant increase in demand, so the sector would need time to grow. Introducing a lower, means-tested out-of-pocket cost is a sensible transition path.

#### A Canadian study concluded:

Brendan Kennedy "Universal child care would generate up to $29 billion a year in tax revenues, new report says," The Toronto Star, <https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2020/11/25/universal-child-care-would-generate-up-to-29-billion-in-tax-revenues-new-report-says.html>

A cross-Canada, universal child-care system would generate $17 billion to $29 billion in annual government revenues and easily pay for itself in the long run, according to a new report. Published Wednesday by the Centre for Future Work, the report finds that the combination of jobs created by an expanded child-care system and increased participation in the labour force by women could add more than $100 billion to Canada’s GDP. The report suggests that building an affordable, national child-care program is Canada’s best path toward a post-pandemic economic recovery.“It’s an expensive program, and people are going to look at the cost of it and say, ‘Wow, that’s too much money,’” said economist Jim Stanford, who wrote the report. “This is where we have to compare that against the benefits that are going to be generated.”In September’s speech from the throne, the federal government committed to making a “significant, long-term, sustained investment to create a Canada-wide early-learning and child-care system.”Child-care advocates welcomed the commitment, but details of the program have yet to be revealed. Using Norway’s universal child-care system as a template, Stanford assumes Canada’s system will provide enough spaces for 92 per cent of all Canadian children from the ages of one to five. Other than that, the report doesn’t make any assumptions about the system’s design, nor does it put a precise price tag on the costs to build it. But Stanford said that even if Canada were to adopt the most ambitious proposals that have been put forth — with estimated costs as high as $70-$80 billion over 10 years — the report finds that the long-term economic benefits would still exceed them.Stanford estimates that a national child-care system would create more than 200,000 new jobs in early learning and child-care provision, and another 80,000 new jobs in “upstream and downstream” industries, including 8,000 construction jobs needed to build or retrofit child-care facilities. He estimates that the increase in labour supplied by women in the prime parenting age cohorts — from 25 to 50 — will be equal to as many as 725,000 additional workers, in terms of both women joining the labour force and increasing the number of hours they work.

#### Would the same be true here?  According to the analysis of two universal child care proposals considered by Congress by Prof. Morrissey (20),

 Morrissey 20 - Taryn Morrissey[Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration and Policy American University, She received her Ph.D. in developmental psychology at Cornell University, her M.A. in human development and family studies at Cornell University, and her B.S. in psychology and child development at Tufts University.], 2-18-20, "Addressing the need for affordable, high-quality early childhood care and education for all in the United States," Equitable Growth, <https://equitablegrowth.org/addressing-the-need-for-affordable-high-quality-early-childhood-care-and-education-for-all-in-the-united-states/>

A universal plan, particularly one with a sliding income scale to provide progressive benefits, may not pay for itself in the short term, but will likely [pay for itself] do so in the long term.48 A universal plan that offers benefits such as mixed-income classrooms may have beneficial peer effects.49 And these kinds of plans have fewer administrative barriers and stigma, and a broader base of political support.50 Further, an analysis of the Infant Health and Development Program estimates that socioeconomic achievement gaps would be substantially narrowed from universal programs.51 Policies should be flexible enough to meet families’ diverse needs, address the overall supply of early care and education, and cope with the gaps that are particularly troublesome for families today, such as care during nonstandard hours and for children with special needs.52 Two examples of universal policy solutions that would improve affordability, quality, and supply are the Child Care for Working Families Act and the Universal Child Care and Early Learning Act. Both of these proposed bills would increase public investment in early care and education to limit families’ out-of-pocket payments to 7 percent of family income (the threshold recommended by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services), increase childcare worker compensation and training, and expand public preschool and the supply of childcare for infants and toddlers. The Child Care for Working Families Act does so by expanding childcare subsidies, nearly doubling the number of children eligible.53 The Universal Child Care and Early Learning Act relies more on public provision, expanding a network of early care and education options through federal-state or federal-local partnerships.54 Both bills, if passed by Congress and signed into law, would lead to substantial increases in the availability of high-quality, affordable early care and education programs. An analysis of the Child Care for Working Families Act estimated that, at full implementation, the availability of new childcare subsidies and reduced childcare costs would [by] leading  to 1.6 million more parents joining the labor force, the bill wouldcreat[ing] 700,000 new jobs in the childcare sector, and pay among teachers and caregivers would increase by 26 percent.55

#### To conclude, universal childcare would promote equal opportunity and reduce structural violence at no cost over the long term. Therefore, I urge an affirmative ballot.

# Blocks

## AT: Universal Childcare is Bad

### AT: Quebec

#### Just because one implementation of Universal Childcare was bad does not disprove that the PRINCIPAL of UCC is bad. LD is a debate about principals not policy. The PRINCIPAL of every child having childcare does not INHERENTLY harm children.

#### Evidence from the Lanham act, a UCC example in the United States, finds that

Branko Marcetic, 12-27-2020, "The US Government Can Provide Universal Childcare — It’s Done So in the Past," No Publication, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/12/universal-childcare-lanham-act-us-government

In 1947, [Ruth Pearson Kushok](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00220973.1947.11010373) surveyed the developmental records of five hundred children who attended a federal center. And she interviewed parents and teachers to find out how successful they thought the Lanham centers were. She found that 80 percent of the children had made good or excellent progress physically, emotionally, socially, and mentally, according to the program’s metrics — and overwhelming approval rates among all participants.

#### Prefer evidence specific to the US, where UCC will happen.

#### Quebec doesn’t prove that UCC harms children.

Haspel 21 - Elliot Haspel[early childhood and K-12 education policy expert and writer, Master’s in Education Policy & Management from Harvard’s Graduate School of Education, co-founder of the nonprofit Education Success Network], 2-5-21, "Opinion: Here Come The Tired Arguments Against Universal Child Care," Early Learning Nation, http://earlylearningnation.com/2021/02/opinion-here-come-the-tired-arguments-against-universal-child-care-reject-them/

Stevens and Erickson use two pieces of evidence to try to paint the picture that lots of time in external child care is bad for kids: Quebec’s experience, and a 2003 report from a cohort of U.S. children followed over many years. The problem is, this evidence doesn’t show what they want to bend it to show. The actual conclusion is, as any child care advocate or researcher worth their salt will tell you, low-quality child care can hurt child development, while high-quality child care can help. Indeed, their assertions are almost predicated on a hope no one takes the time to go back to the source material. As Steven Barnett, co-director of the National Institute for Early Education Research, wrote in an email: “Yes, children are harmed by disorganized, stressful environments — which is why we must ensure child care is high quality. Other studies find positive impacts of higher quality programs and also that maternal employment is not a negative.” Take Quebec. As Pierre Fortin, an economist at the University of Quebec-Montreal and someone who has deeply studied the province’s child care system, noted in 2017, child development outcomes differ massively depending on whether the kids are in high-quality programs (generally public centers called CPEs) or low-quality programs (generally private ones). Fortin writes: “Notably, based on the Quebec Longitudinal Survey of Child Development, 12-year-olds (grade 6) from low socioeconomic status families who had been in centre-based care (mostly CPEs in the sample) had cognitive outcomes that were (1) significantly better than if they had not attended CPEs, (2) even better if attendance had been intensive (around 40 hours/week), and (3) similar to those from adequate socioeconomic status families if the CPEs had been attended early (from 18 months old). Further analysis suggested that early participation in centre-based childcare can eliminate the social inequalities in academic performance at least up to early adolescence.” (Oh, and the flashy “more child care leads to more crime!” study, it will probably not shock you to learn, has been deeply criticized as flawed by other researchers.) As you can see below, Quebec certainly has quality issues and their experience speaks to the need to scale up carefully and with enough public money to ensure quality across the board. The cautionary tale, then, is not about a child care boogeyman — it’s about the impossibility of building a high-quality system in the U.S. without tremendous new investments, because wages are so pathetic that between one-third and one-half of the workforce turns over every year. Turning to the 2003 report, here Stevens and Erickson are basically pointing to a molehill and calling it a mountain. The study authors themselves note that “The magnitude of quantity of care effects were modest and smaller than those of maternal sensitivity and indicators of family socioeconomic status.” The very same edition of the journal had two commentaries arguing that those modest findings reveal not an inherent flaw in external care, but the need to improve different elements of care (features like how groups are structured, and how peer interactions are managed). As Barnett puts it, “This is a very complex story.” Indeed, in the intervening two decades since research like this came out, the child care field has broadly adopted more evidence-aligned practices. Galinsky added that, “Since [these] studies were conducted, the science has advanced, becoming even more explicit about how we can ensure that children thrive at home and in child care.”

### AT: Less Maternal Connections

#### Evidence from the Lanham Act proves that there is VERY small effects on family relations. Only

Chris M. Herbst, Universal Child Care, Maternal Employment, and Children’s Long-Run Outcomes: Evidence from the U.S. Lanham Act of 1940. December 2013. IZA DP No. 7846 http://ftp.iza.org/dp7846.pdf

There were few systematic evaluations during and immediately following the war of children and parents using Lanham Act centers. Perhaps the best evidence comes from a descriptive analysis of children attending two centers in Bellflower, California, located in Los Angeles County (Koshuk, 1947). The study examined administrative records generated by the centers on a sub-set of 500 12 children and parents from 1944 to 1946.9 Results from this analysis are illuminating. Perhaps the biggest concern from critics of the Lanham Act was that long hours in institutional care might fray the mother-child relationship. However, parent reports of children’s behavior and family relationships suggest that such concerns were premature. Upon departure from the center, only 5.2 percent of mothers reported that the child was less willing to “obey or cooperate with adults;” 0.6 percent claimed that the child became “less affectionate;” and 1.7 percent felt that family relations were “less close.” In addition, analyses of the teacher observations indicate that children made reasonable progress in specific developmental domains. For example, over 80 percent of children made “excellent” or “good” mental progress, relative to their status at entry, and about 75 percent of children made “excellent” or “good” social progress. Finally, despite parents’ initial skepticism about institutional care, fully 100 percent of mothers reported that the “child enjoyed nursery school,” and 81 percent had a “generally favorable” opinion of “early childhood education.”

### AT: No Education Impact

#### Childcare provides longterm benefits.

Piper 18 - Kelsey Piper (Vox staff writer, former head of Stanford Effective Altruism). “Early childhood education yields big benefits — just not the ones you think.” Vox. 16 October 2018. JDN. <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/16/17928164/early-childhood-education-doesnt-teach-kids-fund-it>

There’s a bizarre-seeming paradox sitting at the heart of research into early childhood education. On the one hand, there’s a sizable body of research suggesting that kids who go through intensive education at the ages of 3 and 4 don’t really come out ahead in terms of academic abilities. By kindergarten much of their advantage has receded, and by second grade researchers typically can’t detect it at all. On the other hand, there’s an equally substantive body of research suggesting that early childhood education produces a profound, lifelong advantage. Kids who enter intensive preschool programs are less likely to be arrested, more likely to graduate, and less likely to struggle with substance abuse as adults. One study with a followup when the students were in their mid-30s found that they were likelier to have eventually attended and completed college. This is an area where research is fiercely debated — and really important. In 2017, the US spent $9 billion on Head Start, the flagship early childhood education program launched in the 1970s. If one set of studies is wrong, that has profound implications for how we should be spending that money instead. Here’s an explanation that makes sense of all the research: The benefits of early childhood education aren’t coming from the academic skills they teach students. Early childhood education helps because it’s reliable daycare.

### AT: Low Quality

#### Mandating minimum caregiver-to-child ratios can ensure quality childcare

Howes 95 - Carollee Howes (Research professor, UCLA), Ellen Smith (Clinical Associate Professor at the UW- Madison School of Social Work), and Ellen Galinsky (president and cofounder of the nonprofit Families and Work Institute). “The Florida Child Care Quality Improvement Study. Interim Report.” Howes, C., Smith, E., & Galinsky, E. New York: Families and Work Institute. 1995. JDN.

An ongoing child care improvement study is being conducted of approximately 150 licensed child care providers in 4 Florida counties. The study is assessing the impact of state legislation, which mandated lower caregiver-to-child ratios and increased credentialing. Thus far, the study has found the following effects: (1) children's emotional and intellectual development is improving; (2) teachers are more responsive and receptive since the increase in ratios; (3) negative management styles have become less frequently used; (4) global quality improved significantly from 1992-1994; (5) the number of children in child care has remained constant, but the number of staff has increased slightly; (6) teachers' salaries and parent fees have increased slightly; and (7) teacher turnover increased slightly. (Includes 15 tables, some of which are appended; and contains 46 references.) (JW)

### AT: Costs/Tradeoff

#### Childcare decreases welfare dependency that would cost even more.

Havnes and Mogstad 11 - Tarjei Havnes (Department of Economics, University of Oslo) and Magne Mogstad (Research department, Statistics Norwa). “No Child Left Behind: Subsidized Child Care and Children's Long-Run Outcomes.” American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, Vol. 3, No. 2 (May 2011), pp. 97-129. JDN. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41238095?seq=1

For welfare dependency, we find results mirroring those for low and average earnings. Specifically, the expansion in child care caused a reduction in the probability of being on welfare by almost 5 percentage points, which is a very large effect when compared to the pre-reform mean of about 16 percent.

#### Universal childcare promotes economic security and growth

Schochet 19 - Leila Schochet (Policy Analyst at the Center for American Progress). “The Child Care Crisis Is Keeping Women Out of the Workforce.” Center for American Progress. 28 March 2019. JDN. https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/early-childhood/reports/2019/03/28/467488/child-care-crisis-keeping-women-workforce/

Greater access to child care would promote family economic security and spur economic growth Overall, paying less out of pocket for child care, coupled with mothers’ increased ability to work, would help promote greater family economic stability and, in turn, child well-being. In addition to child care, families with young children face many expenses associated with raising a child, often at a time when parents are early in their careers and financially vulnerable.47 Policies that help cover the cost of child care enable parents to use more of their earnings for other necessities and can reduce the number of children living in families that are struggling to make ends meet. Ensuring that all children have access to the supports, resources, and stability they need to thrive sets them on a path to healthy development and positive long-term outcomes such as increased educational achievement and consistent employment.48 Beyond the benefits to families, affordable child care is critical to expanding and sustaining the nation’s workforce and growing the economy. Providing child care assistance to all low- and middle- income working families would enable an estimated 1.6 million more mothers to enter the workforce.49 Another estimate posits that capping child care payments at 10 percent of a family’s income would yield $70 billion each year and increase women’s labor force participation enough to boost U.S. gross domestic product by 1.2 percent.50 Supporting access to child care would also save employers money on lost revenue associated with losing parent employees due to child care problems, as well as the costs to train and hire new employees.51

#### Affirming would result in billions of dollars in saving.

**Wisman & Pacitti 17**, Jon D. Wisman (Professor of Economics, American University) and Aaron Pacitti (Associate Professor of Economics and Douglas T. Hickey Chair in Business, Siena College), “GUARANTEED EMPLOYMENT AND UNIVERSAL CHILD CARE FOR A NEW SOCIAL CONTRACT,” Working Paper, 2017, https://tinyurl.com/y44jsjeo

Using data from both the U.S. Census Bureau and the OECD, we present a rough estimate of what it would cost to fully fund universal child care and early education at current private and public expenditure levels. 20 In constant 2010 dollars, the average family with an employed mother spends $7,176 per year on child care, assuming a 52 week work year (United States Census Bureau 2011a). Per-child public expenditures on care and early education are $794 and $4,660, respectively. Total private and public expenditures for child care and early education sum to $12,630 per child per year.21 Our estimates provide universal care to all children aged 0-11, and are show in Table 1. We use population by age data from the U.S. Census Bureau and multiply by the costs referenced above to arrive at our estimates. There are approximately 24 million children in the U.S. aged between 0 and 5, and to provide them with child care and pre-education would cost $302 billion.22 To provide child care only to children aged 6-11 would cost an additional $197 billion. The total cost to provide universal child care and early education to all children under the age of 12 would amount to $499 billion, or 3 percent of GDP. Blau (2001) estimates that public expenditures on these programs—TANF, child-care subsides, and child-care tax credits and exemptions—would fall by $137 billion in inflation adjusted dollars.Applying this savings to our estimates, **the final net cost of our universal program would be $362 billion, or 2 percent of GDP**. **When coupled with guaranteed employment, this figure would be even lower since public expenditures on income-assistance programs like unemployment insurance and nutrition assistance would also fall.**

#### Lack of universal childcare has cost the US economy nearly $60 billion annually in lost salaries for mothers.

**Lyons 20**, - J’Taime Lyons (is a dual degree MBA/MPP at the University of Michigan from Rocky Mount, North Carolina), “Narrowing the Gender Wage Gap with Universal Child Care,” Michigan Journal of Public Affairs, April 10, 2020, http://mjpa.umich.edu/2020/04/10/narrowing- the-gender-wage-gap-with-universal-child-care/

Fifteen years ago, it was possible for male and female lawyers to graduate from the University of Michigan Law School and get hired with identical salaries. Now, the gap between the salaries of men and women lawyers continues to grow, requiring many female lawyers to alter their career dreams. What happened over the last decade and a half? It’s simple. Child care has grown prohibitively expensive. After World War II, the steady increase of women’s labor force participation signaled a revolution. Yet that progress stalled in the 1990s, and so has momentum that narrowed the gender wage gap. This is largely because child care has become too expensive, causing women to reduce their working hours or change their jobs altogether. **Over the last 30 years, child care costs have increased by 70 percent, which is inconsistent with median wage growth**. **Mothers, more often than fathers, have to choose between a career and parenthood; many leave the labor force.** Some mothers may intentionally switch to more flexible, but often lower- paying jobs. **This is not an issue just for women, but for the U.S. economy. Salary reductions for women cost the U.S. $57 billion dollars annually. The majority of this loss could be prevented if the U.S. had universal child care like most developed nations**.

#### It pays for itself in Quebec because of increased women in the workforce. Covert 20

Covert 2020, Bryce Covert (is a contributor at The Nation and a contributing op-ed writer at The New York Times), “We Can’t Save the Economy Without Universal Child Care,” The Nation, April 17, 2020, https://www.thenation.com/article/economy/child-care-economy-coronavirus/

We don’t normally think of public school as child care, but schools are generally a safe place for children when their parents go to work. We have lots of evidence that offering something similar for children at younger ages would allow even more people to be employed. And now we’re witnessing the terrifying opposite: what happens to parents—and the economy—when free, accessible, quality child care is yanked away. One of the older examples of the economic benefits of offering inexpensive, universal care for young children comes from Canada. After the province of Quebec instituted a universal child care program in 1997, its share of working women ages 26 to 44 reached close to 85 percent, the highest in the world. The increased number of women in the workforce elevated tax revenues so much that the program essentially pays for itself now.

## AT: Other Alternatives are Better

### AT: Tax Credits

#### Tax deduction for childcare is insufficient to solve for the inadequate supply of childcare.

Covert in 2018, Bryce Covert (is a contributor at The Nation and a contributing op-ed writer at The New York Times), “A New Deal for Day Care,” The New Republic, May 1, 2018, https://newrepublic.com/article/147802/new-deal-day-care-america-change-care-kids

The extent of the economic damage has forced politicians from both parties to alter their views of child care. Within the last five years, some Republicans, who have typically hewed to traditional ideas about families and households, have adopted more modern ideas about how to help parents find care for their children: During the presidential campaign, Donald Trump put forward a plan that he said would tackle the high cost of child care via a tax deduction. Rand Paul and Marco Rubio have also called for expanding tax breaks to help with the price parents pay. But a tax deduction is a very long way from a comprehensive solution, given the cost and the struggle to find adequate care. There is a growing willingness to address the problem, though, which leaves Democrats with an opening to put forward something better. But in September, when the party unveiled the child care plank of its “Better Deal” agenda, it consisted of a punishing maze of technical details. To qualify, a parent would first have to look up her state’s median income—about $80,000 in Maryland; less than $42,000 in Mississippi—and then calculate 150 percent of that number. If she fell below the threshold, she would be asked to put 7 percent of her annual income toward child care. If she made it past the technicalities, she might realize it wasn’t all that much better a deal, either: Democrats ended up excluding parents who make too much to qualify or can’t afford their share of the cost, keeping down the total price tag but failing middle-class families that need help. In Maryland, for example, a single mother who qualifies for help would still pay more than $5,500 a year; if her income were above the cutoff, she’d get nothing at all.

#### Tax credits are insufficient to provide enough childcare for working families.

Kashen & Hamm in 2019, Julie Kashen (Director, Women’s Economic Justice and Senior Fellow) and Katie Hamm (Contributor), “Child Care for All: A Blueprint for States,” The Century Foundation, August 8, 2019, https://tcf.org/content/report/child-care-blueprint-states/?agreed=1

To date, child care policy in the United States has focused on providing financial assistance to a small fraction of working families with low wages, providing a small tax credit for those with higher incomes, and largely ignoring the low wages that early educators are paid.2 These policies have been inadequate to meet the growing need for high-quality child care options that don’t break the bank. In recent years, members of Congress have stepped up to propose solutions. In 2017, Senator Patty Murray (D-WA) and Representative Bobby Scott (D-VA) first introduced the Child Care for Working Families Act, which would ensure no family pays more than 7 percent of their annual income on child care, raise compensation levels for the child care workforce, increase high-quality child care options and hours, and expand preschool options. This June, Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) and Representative Debra Haaland (D-NM) introduced the Universal Child Care and Early Learning Act, which is similar to the Child Care for Working Families Act and would extend child care assistance to most families, regardless of income. There has also been some short-term progress: Congress passed the largest-ever funding increase for child care in 2018, with a two-year, $5 billion investment, including $2.4 billion annually for the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG), the largest federal child care program providing financial assistance to low-income families. This new funding has allowed states to increase provider payments and serve more families, but it doesn’t begin to make up for the decades of under-funding that has left the CCDBG serving just one in six eligible families.

#### Child tax credits miss the boat. The problem is two-fold: it’s BOTH expensive AND non-existent, which requires a federal approach. Michels Ph.D. explains:

Sonya Michels [Sonya Michels, Ph.D. U Marylnd. . “The History of Child Care in the U.S.”. xx-xx-xxxx. Social Welfare History Project. https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/programs/child-care-the-american-history/. Accessed 3-6-2021]

Finally, in 1954, Congress found an approach to child care it could live with: the child care tax deduction. This permitted low- to moderate-income families (couples could earn up to $4,500 per year) to deduct up to $600 for child care from their income taxes, provided the services were needed “to permit the taxpayer to hold gainful employment.” The tax deduction offered some financial relief to certain groups of parents, but reformers were not satisfied, for such a measure failed to address basic issues such as the supply, distribution, affordability, and quality of child care. In 1958, building on the experience they had gained in lobbying for postwar provisions, activists formed a national organization devoted exclusively to child care, the Inter-City Committee for Day Care of Children (ICC, later to become the National Committee on the Day Care of Children). The organization was led by Elinor Guggenheimer, a longtime New York City child care activist; Sadie Ginsberg, a leader of the Child Study Association of America; Cornelia Goldsmith, a New York City official who had helped establish a licensing system for child care in that city; and Winifred Moore, a child care specialist who had worked in both government and the private sector. Unlike its predecessor, the National Federation of Day Nurseries (which had been absorbed by the Child Welfare League of America in 1942), the ICC believed that private charity could not provide adequate child care on its own; instead, the new organization sought to work closely with government agencies like the U.S. Children’s Bureau and the U.S. Women’s Bureau to gain federal support.

**Instead of beating a dead horse, the solution is to focus on a new solution that has not historically been insufficient.**

### AT: Targeted

#### Targeted child care is the same thing as the aff because the end goal is everyone getting childcare. Universal is defined as:

Kvist, Jon et al. “Changing Social Equality: The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century” pp. 90, 2012. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YY2CsNCRAoUC&oi=fnd&pg=PA89&dq=universal+childcare+equality&ots=T2avUHWMMb&sig=z3idauQlm95lbXnO4sqEkakY9Yw#v=onepage&q=class%20equality&f=false>

Policies for meeting the care needs of families with children can play an important role in promoting class and gender equality and equality between ethnic groups. The extent to which policy institutions reduce inequality depends on the extent to which measures are (a) **universal (that is, accessible to all citizens according to need),** thereby reducing inequalities arising from differential access to economic resources.

#### **Even if they’re different, universal is a better solution**

Morrissey 20 - Taryn Morrissey[Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration and Policy American University, She received her Ph.D. in developmental psychology at Cornell University, her M.A. in human development and family studies at Cornell University, and her B.S. in psychology and child development at Tufts University.], 2-18-20, "Addressing the need for affordable, high-quality early childhood care and education for all in the United States," Equitable Growth, <https://equitablegrowth.org/addressing-the-need-for-affordable-high-quality-early-childhood-care-and-education-for-all-in-the-united-states/>

A universal plan, particularly one with a sliding income scale to provide progressive benefits, may not pay for itself in the short term, but will likely do so in the long term.48 A universal plan that offers benefits such as mixed-income classrooms may have beneficial peer effects.49 And these kinds of plans have fewer administrative barriers and stigma, and a broader base of political support.50 Further, an analysis of the Infant Health and Development Program estimates that socioeconomic achievement gaps would be substantially narrowed from universal programs.51 Policies should be flexible enough to meet families’ diverse needs, address the overall supply of early care and education, and cope with the gaps that are particularly troublesome for families today, such as care during nonstandard hours and for children with special needs.52 Two examples of universal policy solutions that would improve affordability, quality, and supply are the Child Care for Working Families Act and the Universal Child Care and Early Learning Act. Both of these proposed bills would increase public investment in early care and education to limit families’ out-of-pocket payments to 7 percent of family income (the threshold recommended by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services), increase childcare worker compensation and training, and expand public preschool and the supply of childcare for infants and toddlers. The Child Care for Working Families Act does so by expanding childcare subsidies, nearly doubling the number of children eligible.53 The Universal Child Care and Early Learning Act relies more on public provision, expanding a network of early care and education options through federal-state or federal-local partnerships.54 Both bills, if passed by Congress and signed into law, would lead to substantial increases in the availability of high-quality, affordable early care and education programs. An analysis of the Child Care for Working Families Act estimated that, at full implementation, the availability of new childcare subsidies and reduced childcare costs would lead to 1.6 million more parents joining the labor force, the bill would create 700,000 new jobs in the childcare sector, and pay among teachers and caregivers would increase by 26 percent.55

### AT: Subsidies

#### Childcare subsidies disproportionately go to well-off families—disadvantaged groups don’t get them.

Cornelissen 18

Cornelissen, Thomas (University of York, CReAM and IZA); Dustmann, Christian (University College London and CReAM); Raute, Anna (Queen Mary University of London); Schönberg, Uta (University College London, CReAM, IAB and IZA). “Who Benefits from Universal Child Care? Estimating Marginal Returns to Early Child Care Attendance.” IZA Discussion Papers, No. 11688, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn. 2018. JDN. https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/185148/1/dp11688.pdf

In this paper, we assess the heterogeneity in the effects of universal child care on child development at the age of school entry by estimating marginal returns to early child care attendance. Building on a tighter identification strategy than adopted in the related MTE literature, and using novel administrative data on child outcomes in a context in which all children undergo standardized and mandatory school entry examinations, we document substantial heterogeneity in the returns to early child care attendance with respect to both observed and unobserved child characteristics. For our main outcome of school readiness, we find that when attending child care late, minority children are 12 percentage points less likely to be ready for school than majority children. Attending child care early, however, nearly eliminates the differences between minority and majority children. Yet despite these larger returns from treatment, minority children are substantially less likely than majority children to enter child care early, pointing to a pattern of reverse selection on gains based on these observed child characteristics. We document a similar pattern for unobserved child characteristics: children with unobserved characteristics that make them least likely to enter child care early benefit the most from early child care attendance. We also provide evidence that these children may be disproportionally drawn from disadvantaged family backgrounds. Overall, our results show not only that heterogeneity in children’s responses to early child care attendance and parental resistance to child enrollment are key when evaluating universal child care programs but also that parents’ choices on behalf of their children may differ from those that the children themselves would make. They further suggest that the universal child care program which we study disproportionally subsidizes advantaged families whose children have the least to gain from early child care attendance. At the same time, it does not sufficiently reach minority and disadvantaged families whose children would benefit the most.

### AT: Child Allowance

#### Child allowance is not as good as childcare because the allowance could be spent in ways that would not benefit the child. With universal childcare, we know where resources are going.

#### Even if a child allowance is good, that does not mean that the government does not also have an obligation to provide universal childcare. A child allowance would not provide women equal opportunity to work because women would still have the burden to provide childcare. And a child allowance would not solve for the problems of lack of quality childcare because when some families chose to not send their children to childcare, there becomes less of a market for childcare and quality decreases.

#### The government could even put more money into a child allowance if it established also universal childcare, because universal childcare would increase tax revenue for the government, giving it more resources to spend on helping families. Canada has both.