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# A Bill to Ban Contact Football in all K-12 Schools

1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS HERE ASSEMBLED THAT:
2. Section 1. The United States federal government will make it illegal for publically funded K-12
3. schools to participate in or field a full contact football team. Under no circumstances may a
4. school participate in or support in any way the playing of full contact American Football.
5. Section 2. This law will nullify and void any previous law in conflict.
6. Section 3. The Department of Education and the Department of Justice will work in conjunction
7. to enforce this law.
8. Section 4. Schools found in violation of this new law will be subject to a $ 500,000 fine upon
9. the first offense with the fine doubling for each additional offense. A third offense will also
10. include a loss of academic accreditation for the school in violation.
11. Section 4. This bill will be enacted January 1st 2017.

#

# Pro:A Bill to Ban Contact Football in all K-12 Schools

**Schools should ban football because of dangerous concussions.**

**Steven H. Miles, MD and Shailendra Prasad, MD. Pre-print posting for the January 2016 issue of the American Journal of Bioethics**. MEDICAL ETHICS AND SCHOOL FOOTBALL. <http://www.bioethics.net/2015/10/medical-ethics-and-school-football/>

**Health professionals should call for ending public school tackle football programs.** We disagree with the perspective and the argument of a recent report by the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) that supports the current organization of reforms of youth tackle football. About 1.1 million students play on junior and high school football teams. Another three million play in non-school programs. Youth football is slowly dying. The number of players on junior and high school football teams has fallen 2.4% over the last 5 years. Pop Warner Football, the largest non-school based program has seen its number of student athletes fall 9.5% (23,612 athletes) from 2010 to 2012. Data is not available for other youth leagues.

We agree with the AAP that the rare deaths (seven through October 2015) or catastrophic neck injuries do not, of themselves, tip the balance against school football. Tragedies occur in other sports and activities that young people pursue. Youth football also brings high risks of sprains, strains, ligamentous tears and fractures but these risks are roughly comparable to other sports.

**Public schools should end their football programs because of the high prevalence of concussions. Five to twenty percent of students experience at least one concussion in a season of play. Nine to twelve year old players experience an average of 240 head impacts per season; high school players average 650 head impacts per season. An initial football concussion increases the risk of a subsequent concussion three or four fold** not simply for the balance of that season but for the following season as well. Catastrophic brain injuries, though rare, are far more common in high school and college players who have experienced a previous non-catastrophic concussion. **The brains of children are more susceptible to long-term damage from concussion than adults**. Although the frequency of concussion in football is about the same as in hockey, fifty times as many students play football than hockey; football causes far more brain injuries. **The brain is an irreplaceable organ, the health of which is foundational for the ability to learn, socialize and for fully realizing life’s physical and vocational opportunities**.

**Rule changes don’t do enough to stop the injuries from football.**

**Steven H. Miles, MD and Shailendra Prasad, MD. Pre-print posting for the January 2016 issue of the American Journal of Bioethics**. MEDICAL ETHICS AND SCHOOL FOOTBALL. <http://www.bioethics.net/2015/10/medical-ethics-and-school-football/>

**A downward trend for deaths and for head and neck injuries is attributed to 1976 bans on head butting and spear and facemask tackles. However, these illegal tactics persisted despite bans. Students however do not reliably accept information about concussion and often fail to report concussive symptoms. Coaches inconsistently evaluate for signs of concussion and often fail to remove injured players from games.**

Inevitably, lawsuits are being filed against youth football in the wake of the successful suit against the National Football League. In 2015, an Iowa court awarded a player a million dollars for negligence in diagnosing and acting on a concussion four years after the state had implemented legal reforms to reduce football injuries from head trauma. Pop Warner Football is being sued for the suicide a young player. A young athlete who suffered a severe concussion sued the Illinois High School Association (IHSA), asked a court to order medical testing of former high school players going back to 2002. The judge dismissed the suit paradoxically noting, “IHSA is simply a governmental entity charged with safeguarding student athletes . . . (Imposing) broader liability on this defendant would certainly change the sport of football and potentially harm it or cause it to be abandoned.” In other words, the potential harm to the athletic program itself counterbalanced the failure to protect against an actual severe concussion. At least three high schools in the country discontinued football programs this year due to concerns for player safety.

**School football is caught between worsening scientific findings, evidence showing that new rules of play or coaching or equipment have a modest effect on concussions, parents who are not allowing their children to play, and lawsuits aimed at leagues and school personnel. Anecdotally, many prominent professional players, including Mike Ditka and Joe Namath, publically say tht they would not let young relatives play football**.

#

# Pro:A Bill to Ban Contact Football in all K-12 Schools

**Parental consent doesn’t work because parents do not fully understand the risks.**

**Steven H. Miles, MD and Shailendra Prasad, MD. Pre-print posting for the January 2016 issue of the American Journal of Bioethics**. MEDICAL ETHICS AND SCHOOL FOOTBALL. <http://www.bioethics.net/2015/10/medical-ethics-and-school-football/>

Proponents of school tackle football, including the AAP, propose informed consent as the best way to ensure parents and children understand and accept the risks of school football. However, existing consent forms are deeply flawed. They do not quantify risk or they minimize it with misleadingly contextualization (e.g., “There is a degree of risk in all daily activities.”) The consent forms do not rebut the ungrounded hope of 26% of parents, especially those with economic and educational disadvantages, that their child will turn school participation in to a professional athletic career. Even when parents have been educated by the team and signed consent, many student players do not understand the symptoms or potential consequences of concussion.

**Football puts student athletes at risk of brain damage or worse, death.**

**Steve Almond, author of 11 books of fiction and nonfiction and advice columnist. Oct 15. 2015**. Sack Those Quarterbacks! The Case For Banning High School Football. <http://cognoscenti.wbur.org/2014/10/15/ban-high-school-football-steve-almond>

**A few days ago, something miraculous happened in Caro, Michigan. A high school football coach went to his administrators — not to ask for more money, or a bigger stadium, or increased practice time — but to express fear about the safety of his players. The team, decimated by injury and over-matched, then voted to cancel the remainder of its season**. The accepted wisdom is that football helps certain boys develop discipline and teamwork and gives them a chance to channel their aggression. You hear this argument all the time, often from former players who confuse their own nostalgia for the game with an honest critique of its effects. The superintendent who ratified the decision, Mike Joslyn, explained it this way: “It’s a difficult decision because our players were out there battling hard, but we’re an educational institution, and with our students, safety comes first. These kids have long lives ahead of them, and we need to keep the brains in their heads intact.”

It is a testament to our collective addiction to football that this story ranks as shocking in the first place. But **as a nation, we have come to view the sport as somehow intrinsically a part of the high school experience. More than a million kids play, and entire communities rally around teams.** The accepted wisdom is that football helps certain boys develop discipline and teamwork and gives them a chance to channel their aggression. You hear this argument all the time, often from former players who confuse their own nostalgia for the game with an honest critique of its effects. The question almost no one dares to ask is painfully obvious: What is a dangerous, insanely commercialized form of athletic combat doing in our public schools**? In an era when parents lament rising class sizes, crumbling facilities and underpaid teachers, why are taxpayers underwriting a form of entertainment that quite literally causes students to suffer diminished brain function?** Now is probably the ideal moment for this question to be posed, given what’s transpired over the past few weeks. **This includes the deaths of three teenage players, two of whom died from injuries sustained on the field.**

#

# Pro:A Bill to Ban Contact Football in all K-12 Schools

**Even new rules are not enough. The risk of brain damage and concussions means we should ban football in public schools.**

**MinnPost 11/2/2015**. Football programs at public schools should end, say two U of M professors <https://www.minnpost.com/second-opinion/2015/11/football-programs-public-schools-should-end-say-two-u-m-professors>

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) recently issued new recommendations for making football safer for children and teens: Officials and coaches should have “zero tolerance” for illegal head-on hits, skilled athletic trainers should be on the sidelines during every game, and nontackling leagues should be expanded. "Parents and players will need to decide whether the health risks associated with tackling are outweighed by the recreational benefits of the game,” one of the authors of the new recommendations said in a released statement. “The AAP encourages athletes to continue playing organized sports, while supporting coaches and officials in their work to reduce these injuries.” Two University of Minnesota physicians — Dr. Steven Miles, a professor of medicine and bioethics, and Dr. Shailendra Prasad, an associate professor of family medicine and community health — believe the AAP does not go far enough. In a commentary that will appear in the January issue of the American Journal of Bioethics (but is already posted online), they say the AAP and other health professionals should be calling for an end to tackle football — at least, in publicly funded schools. Here’s why: We agree with the AAP that the rare deaths (seven through October 2015) or catastrophic neck injuries do not, of themselves, tip the balance against school football. Tragedies occur in other sports and activities that young people pursue. Youth football also brings high risks of sprains, strains, ligamentous tears and fractures but these risks are roughly comparable to other sports. Public schools should end their football programs because of the high prevalence of concussions. Five to twenty percent of students experience at least one concussion in a season of play. Nine to twelve year old players experience an average of 240 head impacts per season; high school players average 650 head impacts per season. An initial football concussion increases the risk of a subsequent concussion three or four fold not simply for the balance of that season but for the following season as well. Catastrophic brain injuries, though rare, are far more common in high school and college players who have experienced a previous non-catastrophic concussion. The brains of children are more susceptible to long-term damage from concussion than adults. Although the frequency of concussion in football is about the same as in hockey, fifty times as many students play football than hockey; football causes far more brain injuries. The brain is an irreplaceable organ, the health of which is foundational for the ability to learn, socialize and for fully realizing life’s physical and vocational opportunities. In the short term, football-related concussions — even mild or moderate ones — can lead to “impaired school academic performance, memory disturbances, headaches and absenteeism,” Miles and Prasad write. But, as the two physicians also point out, concussions pose serious long-term risks for young people, too. The cognitive problems can become permanent, particularly if the trauma to the head is repeated. Informed consent and dual loyalties In its recommendations, the AAP suggests that parents be given an informed consent form to sign before their child plays football, so that all the risks associated with the game are known to them.

#

# Con:A Bill to Ban Contact Football in all K-12 Schools

**A review of the data shows that anti-football research is deeply flawed. Kids should be allowed to play.**

**Ed Riley, 56, is the younger brother of Oregon State football and works as a professor of anesthesia at Stanford University. Portland12/4/2014**.  Tribune. High school football's benefits outweigh the risks. <http://portlandtribune.com/lor/49-opinion/242681-109622-high-school-footballs-benefits-outweigh-the-risks>

I understand the concerns and share them, but I have concluded those concerns are misplaced. My children are the most important part of my life. I am a widower, and when my son wanted to play football his freshman year, every mom and my in-laws chastised me for considering it. Even President Obama wondered whether he’d let his theoretical son play. **I’m a physician and medical researcher at Stanford, and I only decided to let my son play after reviewing the medical research. The study that best elucidates the risk of football-related brain injury comes from the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDCP officials studied 3,439 former National Football League players with at least five years of pension-credited playing seasons between 1959 and 1988.** This is arguably the highest-risk group of players available for study. **Among these players, the incidence of neurodegenerative disease is three times higher than in the general population. However, the risk of death from neurodegenerative disease was relatively low in both groups: 3 percent in NFL players, and 1 percent in the general population**. The risk associated with a long NFL career is not insignificant but remains small. **The high-profile research that is regularly cited as connecting the dots between football-related concussions and dementia in NFL players lacks sufficient data to establish a causal link. Most of the cases considered focus on former NFL players involved in a lot of high-risk behavior other than football, and none of these studies included a control group. Research like this is typically filed away as “interesting, but we need better data.”**

**High school football is no more dangerous than soccer or even the glee club.**

**Ed Riley, 56, is the younger brother of Oregon State football and works as a professor of anesthesia at Stanford University. Portland12/4/2014**.  Tribune. High school football's benefits outweigh the risks. <http://portlandtribune.com/lor/49-opinion/242681-109622-high-school-footballs-benefits-outweigh-the-risks>

**The key here is that high school football is not the NFL. The Mayo Clinic found that the risk of high school football players developing degenerative neurological diseases later in life is no greater than if they had been in the band, glee club or choir**.

**The data suggests that the normal life of adolescents puts them at risk for brain injury all the time. What would be the alternatives to my son playing football? Sports such as soccer, skiing, rock climbing or lacrosse have similar risk profiles to high school football.** My late wife rode horses competitively growing up. As an anesthesiologist at a hospital that treats more horse-related trauma accidents than any other in the country, I’m glad my son went with football.

**The social benefits of football greatly outweigh the risk.**

**Ed Riley, 56, is the younger brother of Oregon State football and works as a professor of anesthesia at Stanford University. Portland12/4/2014**.  Tribune. High school football's benefits outweigh the risks. <http://portlandtribune.com/lor/49-opinion/242681-109622-high-school-footballs-benefits-outweigh-the-risks>

I believe the benefits of playing high school football are worth the risks. Football is an equal-opportunity sport. All different types of athletes make up a football team, the skills needed don’t require years of practice, and there is no real advantage for kids with private coaches. A healthy, average athlete who shows up to all the team’s practice sessions and attends off-season weight training can usually find a spot on the team. My son’s teammates are from the whole socioeconomic and racial spectrum. The only reason that his team was able to make a contest out of each game, despite that they had so few players to work with, is that the boys learned how to build on what they had in common instead of focusing on their differences. As Jack Kemp, the former pro quarterback and congressman, once said, “The huddle is color-blind.” In an increasingly diverse world, opportunities to learn how to work together with a wide range of people who start out on equal footing should not be lightly dismissed.

#

# Con:A Bill to Ban Contact Football in all K-12 Schools

**Concussion awareness and education helps to reduce the problems associated with football.**

**Sadler Sports. Com 1/5/15** Concussion Awareness and Treatment on the Rise <http://www.sadlersports.com/blog/concussion-awareness-treatment-rise/>

As we recently reported, **diagnosis and treatment for concussion-related injuries in youth athletes have increased dramatically now that all 50 states and the District of Columbia have enacted concussion treatment regulations. Also boosting this increase is a much more heightened awareness due to ongoing media coverage of concussion concerns**. The University of Michigan School of Kinesiology studied insurance data dated 2006 to 2012 of insured 12 to 18-year-olds. The study focused on the effect of concussion laws. The results show that the number of children seeking treatment for concussions increased 92 percent in states with concussion legislation in place and an increase of 75 percent in states without regulation. The results of the study emphasize how important public education is and that legislation is working. **The hope is that increased diagnoses and awareness will have a an impact on sitting athletes out until their injuries are fully healed. “**The fact that we didn’t see inpatient visits and emergency department visits increase in states with the legislation, but we saw office-based procedures go up, suggests that the legislation is having the intended effect on these injuries,” said Teresa Gibson, co-author of the study. Below are other significant findings from the study: **Treatment rates in states without concussion laws rose approximately 20 percent every year after 2009. Treatment rates in states with concussion laws increased an additional 13 percent. Treated concussion rates in states without legislation increased by 7 percent in 2009-10, 20 percent in 2010-11 and 34 percent** in 2011-12. In states without legislation, office visits for concussion rose 78 percent by 2012 and an additional 17 percent in states with concussion laws. For more information on concussion research and prevention, we encourage you to read our article The Positive Impact of Concussion Awareness and other concussion-related blog posts.

**We need more study to find the best regulations to prevent injury.**

**Sadler Sports.Com 5/10/2015**. The End Of Youth Football? Not so fast <http://www.sadlersports.com/blog/youth-football-fast/>

The risks of these brain injury situations and the required protective responses need to be studied differently in the context of youth, high school, college, and professional athletes. The level of aggression, speed, and strength of the players increases tremendously from youth football to high school football as does the concussion risk. Also, the number of cumulative helmet-to-helmet hits and other head impacts increase significantly after high school football. The cumulative impacts over a college career are more than double those over a high school career and the number of impacts for pro players are significantly higher, even though the NFL has recently changed practice rules to limit helmet-to-helmet contact. Other complicating factors that may result in additional brain damage and in higher suicide rates in the NFL are the past use of steroids, other drug additions, and unstable lifestyles.

**High school football does not create the same risk of NFL football AND structured sports, like high school football, will always be safer than unsupervised play.**

**Sadler Sports.Com 5/10/2015**. The End Of Youth Football? Not so fast <http://www.sadlersports.com/blog/youth-football-fast/>

Here are some thoughts from Joe Galat, president of American Youth Football, Inc. (AYF), the largest youth football andConcussion risk cheer organization in the U.S. with tackle football ages 5 to 15:

“…structured play is always safer than unsupervised activities. Today’s headlines dealing with the very disturbing developments in the National Football League may discourage some parents from allowing their children to play football… However, I am asking you to not compare your child’s participation with those who play in the extreme world of the NFL. Not just yet. The highways are full of safe drivers who don’t compete in “the extreme sport” of NASCAR. Like driving a car, it is important that kids learn safe techniques while playing youth football. When fundamental techniques are ingrained in a young player they become habits; safe play is the end result. When President Theodore Roosevelt instructed Knute Rockne to make the game safer, the players wore leather helmets and very little padding. Many of today’s safety issues are being solved through research, technology and rule changes. The leather-heads would hardly recognize today’s game.”

#

# Con:A Bill to Ban Contact Football in all K-12 Schools

**Concussions from football are not much greater than concussions from other sports.**

**Sadler Sports.Com 5/10/2015**. The End Of Youth Football? Not so fast <http://www.sadlersports.com/blog/youth-football-fast/>

My primary interest is studying the concussion risks in youth tackle football. so my comments will be limited to that context.

Are the concussion rates in youth tackle football significantly worse than those in youth baseball, softball, basketball, and soccer? And if not, why are we not hearing anything about the end of those other sports or all youth sports, for that matter?

According to my injury database, the percentage of concussions to total injuries of athletes ages 5 to 15 are as follows:

Youth football 5.64%, Youth baseball 3.1%,Youth softball 2.43%.

According to Pat Pullen of Pullen Insurance Services, Inc., the percentage for youth soccer is 4.5%. I don’t have the percentage on basketball, but it is likely to be similar to baseball. In other words, how can you single out youth football without including the other sports?

**New regulations make football safer.**

**Sadler Sports.Com 5/10/2015**. The End Of Youth Football? Not so fast <http://www.sadlersports.com/blog/youth-football-fast/>

All 50 states and the District of Columbia have enacted concussion laws that protect youth athletes. Some state laws only apply to school sports or youth sports organizations that use school property, whereas others apply to all youth sports organizations, even if not affiliated with a school. Little League Baseball, Inc. provides information regarding the these laws. Youth football organizations must follow the concussion rules of their state and/or their governing/sanctioning body. Failure to follow state law or an organization’s own rules can be a prima facie case of negligence, assuming that requirements 3 and 4 above are met. If a youth football organization is not part of a sanctioning/governing organization, it must follow nationally-accepted risk management practices which may lead back to the rules of the sanctioning/governing body. Furthermore, certain national sanctioning/governing bodies for youth football may instruct members to follow their state’s version of the rules of the National Federation Of State High School Associations.

**The science is not in yet, it is too soon to ban football because it has a big value to society.**

**Sadler Sports.Com 5/10/2015**. The End Of Youth Football? Not so fast <http://www.sadlersports.com/blog/youth-football-fast/>

The media has been practically salivating about a potential end of football. There’s no end to high profile articles outlining doomsday prophesies of the chain of events that could force the cancellation of football programs on every level due to lack of liability insurance (see Concussions and the Future of Football), connecting NFL player suicides to brain injuries, and lawsuits against colleges and high schools for second-impact syndrome injuries early return to play. These worst-case scenarios are certainly sensational, but I say not so fast. I have recently been flooded with media requests for interviews on this topic. I am responding with this blog posting as I don’t have time for all the requests. What follows is my first take based on the present information at hand. We need stay away from decisions made out of fear arising from sensationalism. Instead we should make calm decisions based on science. If there is no scientific research on an issue, new studies should be immediately launched and carefully reviewed before conclusions are drawn and changes made. There are three types of brain injuries that require specific risk management response strategies: The initial concussion The more dangerous second-impact syndrome due to “too early return to play”. The cumulative less-than-concussion events known as chronic traumatic encephalopathy or CTE (ex: helmet to helmet contact) that may result in brain damage over the long term. The risks of these brain injury situations and the required protective responses need to be studied differently in the context of youth, high school, college, and professional athletes. The level of aggression, speed, and strength of the players increases tremendously from youth football to high school football as does the concussion risk. Also, the number of cumulative helmet-to-helmet hits and other head impacts increase significantly after high school football. The cumulative impacts over a college career are more than double those over a high school career and the number of impacts for pro players are significantly higher, even though the NFL has recently changed practice rules to limit helmet-to-helmet contact. Other complicating factors that may result in additional brain damage and in higher suicide rates in the NFL are the past use of steroids, other drug additions, and unstable lifestyles.

#

#

# A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS HERE ASSEMBLED THAT:
2. Section 1. Corporal punishment will be prohibited as a tool of discipline in American schools.
3. Subsection A. Corporal Punishment will be defined as any physical punishment used to modify
4. student behavior including but not limited to spanking, slapping, hitting or paddling.
5. Subsection B. Under no circumstance will corporal punishment be allowed in a school setting even
6. With parental permission.
7. Section 2. Any school official or teacher found employing corporal punishment will be fined five 9.
8. thousand dollars for a first offense. Any school official found guilty of two or more offenses will be 10.
9. subject to 5 years in prison and fined one hundred thousand dollars .
10. Section 3. This bill will be overseen by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice.
11. Section 4. This bill will be enacted immediately upon passage.
12. Section 5. All conflicting legislation on the federal and state level is null and void.

# Pro: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Corporal punishment should be banned based on 40 years of study.**

**The Financial Express Jan 27, 2014**. American school psychologist on corporal punishment

The Primordial Violence, written by Professor Murray Straus, brought together research of more than 40 years, and concluded that corporal punishment (in schools and homes) is harmful and should be abolished. "Ending corporal punishment will not only reduce the risk of delinquency and mental health problems, it also will bring to children the right to be free of physical attacks in the name of discipline, just as wives gained that human right a century and a quarter ago," said Professor Straus, founder and co-director of the Family Research Lab and professor emeritus of sociology at the University of New Hampshire.

**School children should be free from violence.**

**The Financial Express Jan 27, 2014**. American school psychologist on corporal punishment

Now, renowned American school psychologist Nadine A. Block, who has spent 25 years campaigning against corporal punishment in America shares her wisdom, knowledge and expertise in a facts-filled warts-and-all book on the subject to short-circuit the decay in modern society. In her book, Breaking The Paddle: Ending School Corporal Punishment, she asserts that children should have the same right that all adults have - the right to be free from physical harm. The book is written for educators, parents, child advocates, policy makers, and members of helping professions, such as doctors, nurses, and psychologists and speaks openly and direct about the horrific dangers of inflicting corporal punishment on children.

"I want to shed light on one of the darkest aspects of the education system. I want to share my experiences and knowledge gained over the years and to inspire others to help end it in all schools," said Ms. Block, who is seeking zero-tolerance of the appalling abuse. "Corporal punishment leads to physical injuries of children, psychological problems, alienation from school, school drop-outs and loss of self esteem, to name a few. It's inhumane, ineffective, and archaic," she added.

**21 states allowed 223,190 students to receive corporal punishment.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

According to the Office for Civil Rights at the US Department of Education, 223,190 students nationwide received corporal punishment at least once in the 2006-2007 school year, including 49,197 students in Texas alone, the largest number of any state. In Mississippi, 7.5 percent of public school students were paddled during this period, the highest percentage in the nation. The actual numbers almost surely are

higher: Human Rights Watch interviewees reported that corporal punishment is often administered in a chaotic environment in which many instances of the practice are not recorded. One administrator reported that 37 students in a single day were sent to his office for corporal punishment. A high school student in another district estimated that as many as 60 students a day are paddled at her school. Today 21 US states permit corporal punishment to be used in schools.

# Pro: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Narrative about victim of corporal punishment.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

On August 18, 2003, 10-year-old Tim L. started the fifth grade at his public elementary school in rural east Texas. On the fourth day of school, Tim refused to run in gym class because he did not have his asthma medication. When the gym coach confronted him, Tim said, “coach sucks.” The coach then took a wooden paddle and beat Tim severely on the buttocks. Faye L., Tim’s mother, reported, “There was blood

in his underpants…. I had to pull the underwear off his behind from the dried blood.”1

Though Tim had always been an enthusiastic student, he begged his mother not to make him get on the school bus the next day. Three days later, with his bruises still fresh, Tim was hit again, this time by a teacher, for playing with a pen during band class. His genitals were bruised and swollen. With her son physically injured and terrified of school, Faye decided she could not risk sending him back. She began to

teach him herself, at home.

Faye wanted school authorities to hold the teachers accountable. They reminded her, however, that corporal punishment is legal in their district, and refused to take disciplinary action against the two teachers who had hit her son. When she tried to file assault charges, the police dissuaded her, saying she had to “follow school procedure.” Next, she attempted to pursue private litigation, but her claims were

dismissed in court because the law provides immunity for teachers who paddle.

Faye was left feeling that she had no way to seek justice for the injuries her son had already sustained, and no way to protect him from future harm. Though Tim asked to go back to school, Faye felt she could not offer him a guarantee of safety in their public school district. “The law is supposed to be there to protect you. How do you explain this to your son, after this? ‘Well, I’m sorry, honey.’ That’s all you can say.”2

**Hundreds of school districts allow children to be beaten in schools and they protect educators that injure students.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

Tim’s mother’s tenacity and commitment to protecting her son’s rights make this story extraordinary. Yet in other ways, Tim’s story is far from unique. In school districts in many states, students of all ages are routinely subjected to corporal punishment.3 Though some states have outlawed the practice, it is permitted by some federal and state laws. Hundreds of school districts allow students to be beaten, and state legislatures provide specific legal protection for educators who injure students when using corporal punishment.

# Pro: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Corporal punishment destroys trust, creates a hostile environment and is used disproportionately on African-Americans.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

Studies show that beatings can damage the trust between educator and student, corrode the educational

environment, and leave the student unable to learn effectively, making it more likely he or she will leave school. African-American students are punished at disproportionately high rates, creating a hostile environment in which minority students struggle to succeed.

**Corporal punishment is inhuman, degrading and most countries have banned it.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

The United States is out of step with international practice and jurisprudence on the use of corporal punishment in schools. Today 106 countries outlaw the practice, including the United Kingdom and other European countries, following rulings on corporal punishment by the European Court of Human Rights. Experts charged with issuing definitive interpretations of international human rights treaties also

consistently have concluded that corporal punishment by school officials and teachers violates governmental obligations to protect children from physical violence and cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment. The disproportionate use of corporal punishment against African-American students in particular violates the right to nondiscrimination in accessing education.

**There are many more effective approaches to discipline in school.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

Better approaches to school discipline are available. Effective discipline does not require paddling of students. Nationwide, teachers and administrators increasingly have been using positive discipline methods that foster nurturing school cultures, which allow students to thrive. With appropriate funding, training, and support, teachers and administrators can implement discipline systems that respond to

students’ fundamental needs and do better at producing environments in which every student can maximize his or her academic potential.

**Corporal punishment should be explicitly banned in US schools.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

• The president of the United States, the US Congress, state legislatures, and governors should take all necessary steps to ban explicitly the use of corporal punishment in schools. There should be no exceptions for “reasonable” force or corporal punishment “to maintain discipline.”

# Pro: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Small behavior problems can be used to justify corporal punishment and it creates a climate of fear.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

Students can be physically punished for a wide range of misbehavior, including minor infractions such as chewing gum, being late, sleeping in class, talking back to a teacher, violating the dress code, or going to the bathroom without permission. Even students who are not punished find themselves in a hostile, violent environment designed to instill fear. One student told us that “licks would be so loud and hard you could hear it through the walls.” A teacher reported that a principal turned on the loud speaker while paddling a student: “It was on the intercom in every class in the school…. He was trying to send a message … [l]ike, ‘you could be next.’”

**Corporal punishment violates human dignity and leaves students feeling helpless, which can cause academic failure.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

For hundreds of thousands of school children in the US, violence inflicted by those in authority is a regular part of their experience at school. All corporal punishment, whether or not it causes significant physical injury, represents a violation of each student’s rights to physical integrity and human dignity. It is degrading and humiliating, damaging the student’s self-esteem and making him or her feel helpless.

A number of teachers told us that as students are beaten, or see those around them beaten, the trust between administrators, teachers, and students is often destroyed. Over time, students may become less engaged in school and less interested in exploring and discovering new academic concepts. Corporal punishment may result in the student failing to thrive academically and may contribute to school drop out.

**Corporal punishment causes students to become more aggressive and lash out.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

Research suggests that children who are physically punished are more inclined to engage in aggressive conduct toward their siblings, parents, teachers, and schoolmates. As a consequence of the helplessness and humiliation felt by students who experience corporal punishment, some students become angry: students told Human Rights Watch that it only makes them want to lash out against teachers or

other students. Others become depressed or withdrawn; still others become immune to the constant violence, accepting it as a part of their daily lives. Some parents are concerned that the use of corporal punishment in schools could also legitimize domestic violence in the home. One mother observed: “What are we teaching our young women when a school principal can swat … on the behind? We’re saying that it’s okay for a man to beat a woman … [that’s] something we don’t want in our families.”

# Pro: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**African American students are discriminated against under the use of corporal punishment.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

Corporal punishment in the US disproportionately affects African-American students, and in some areas, Native American students. In the 2006-2007 school year, African-American students made up 17.1 percent of the nationwide student population, but 35.6 percent of those paddled. In the same year, in the 13 states with the highest rates of paddling, 1.4 times as many African-American students were paddled as might be expected given their percentage of the student population. Although girls of all races were paddled less than boys, African-American girls were nonetheless physically punished at more than twice the rate of their white counterparts in those 13 states during this period. These disparities violate students’ right to nondiscrimination in access to education, making it harder for these students to

succeed and undermining the social fabric of schools.

**Special education students receive corporal punishment at disproportionate rates.**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

Special education students—students with mental or physical disabilities—also receive corporal punishment at disproportionate rates. For instance, in Texas, the number of special education students who were beaten in the 2006-2007 school year amounted to 18.4 percent of the total number of students who received corporal punishment statewide. However, special education students made up only 10.7

percent of the Texas student population, meaning almost twice as many were beaten as might be expected. Corporal punishment damages these students’ education as much as other students, and it may also adversely affect some students’ underlying physical or psychological conditions.

**Parents have limited options and no legal recourse**

**Human Rights Watch/ACLU August 2008** A Violent Education Corporal Punishment of Children in US Public Schools https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/aviolenteducation\_report.pdf#page=6

Parents in some school districts are given methods of “opting out” of the use of corporal punishment on their children. However, these mechanisms are inadequate: parents report that opt-out forms are ignored and that their children are beaten anyway. Parents have virtually no legal recourse when opt-out forms are ignored, or when their children are beaten severely with or without an opt-out form. Human Rights Watch investigated several cases in which parents said school districts were unwilling to provide adequate responses, police were reluctant to investigate, and courts were unable to offer redress. Some parents we interviewed, like Faye L., felt they had no recourse but to withdraw their children from school and teach them at home.

# Con: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Calhoun Elementary was turned around completely by corporal punishment.**

Time 4/29/09 Did Corporal Punishment Save A Struggling School?

http://www.newsweek.com/did-corporal-punishment-save-struggling-school-77227

The wooden paddle on principal David Nixon's desk is two feet long, with a handle wrapped in duct tape that has been worn down by age and use. He found it in a dusty cabinet in his predecessor's office at John C. Calhoun Elementary in Calhoun Hills, S.C., where Nixon has been the principal since 2006. He has no idea if the old principal ever used it, but now it sits in plain view for all visitors to see, including children who have been dismissed to his office. As punishment for a "major offense," such as fighting or stealing, students are told to place both hands on the seat of a leather chair and brace for what Nixon calls "a whippin'." Before he begins, though, he sits the child down for a quiet talk about why he, or she, is in trouble. He tries to determine if a deeper issue, such as a problem at home, might warrant a meeting with a counselor. If the child shows remorse, Nixon will often send him or her back to class without a spanking. Otherwise, he makes sure he is calm, and he makes sure his elbow is still. Then he delivers "three licks" to the child's rear end. If the child is a girl, then a female administrator does it. Some of the kids cry. Some are silent. Some want a hug. And after the child is sent back to class, still stinging, Nixon sits alone in his office and thinks about what the child has done, and what he has done. "If I could burn that paddle in my stove," Nixon says, "I would. This is the worst part of my job."

Before Nixon took over "John C," student behavior had gotten so bad that one teacher described it as "chaos." She eventually quit in disgust, pulled her own child from the school, and moved to a different one 45 minutes away. John C is located in a rural stretch of South Carolina near the Georgia border where all but one of the major textile plants have closed, and where the leading local employer is the school system. Nearly 90 percent of the kids at John C live below the poverty line. When Nixon went to his first PTO meeting, only about a dozen parents showed up at a school with 226 students. He still has trouble reaching many families by phone because they can't afford to put down a deposit on a landline. And yet Nixon has managed to turn John C around. It recently earned three statewide Palmetto awards, one for academic performance and two for overall improvement—the school's first such honors in its 35-year history. Not everyone agrees with his methods, but most parents and teachers will tell you he couldn't have pulled off such a turnaround without his wooden paddle.

#

# Con: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Parents can support corporal punishment and it has been used to greatly reduce discipline problems.**

Time 4/29/09 Did Corporal Punishment Save A Struggling School?

http://www.newsweek.com/did-corporal-punishment-save-struggling-school-77227

Thirty minutes into his first day of school at John C, a father walked into Nixon's office and said, "I want to give you the authority to whip my son's butt." Nixon was surprised, but after he thought it over, he decided to give every parent the same option. The year before he arrived, students made more than 250 visits to the principal's office; order had to be restored. While suspensions take kids out of the classroom for days, paddling could be done in 15 minutes. "What are we here to do? Educate," Nixon says. "This way there's an immediate response, and the child is right back in the room learning." According to school statistics, referrals to the principal's office have dropped 80 percent since 2006. So far this school year, there's been fewer than 50. "I've had parents say 'thank you for doing this'," says fifth-grade teacher Devada Kimsey. "And look at the behavior charts now—there's nothing on them." Corporal punishment is still legal in portions of 21 states, including South Carolina, but it is rarely practiced anymore. Most education scholars consider it abusive, helpful only in the short term and even predictive of future violence. "This is not a practice for the 21st century," says Nadine Block, executive director of the Center for Effective Discipline in Ohio. "Maybe for the 18th century. An atmosphere of fear is not going to increase learning. Maybe temporarily. But over time, it does not work."

**Corporal punishment prevents children from acting up. Parents need to give permission, and it needs to be a last resort, but it can be very effective.**

Time 4/29/09 Did Corporal Punishment Save A Struggling School?

http://www.newsweek.com/did-corporal-punishment-save-struggling-school-77227

Kids at the school say the paddle definitely makes them think twice about acting up. Asked if he's afraid of it, second-grader Nathan Hoover says, "Yes! It really hurts." The policy, he explains, is three strikes and you're struck. "I know if I got [paddled at school]," Nathan says, "my mom would whip me, too." Hoover's mother says she would give Nixon permission to paddle her child—parents only get the form if their child commits a major offense—but she's relieved that corporal punishment is only a "last resort." "Some kids see too much of that at home," Hoover says. They're no longer seeing much of it anymore at John C. According to Nixon, the last time he paddled a student was more than a month ago: March 16, after a fourth-grader swore in the cafeteria. Corporal punishment, it would seem, has worked so well at John C that perhaps the need for it no longer exists. Given Nixon's ambivalence toward the practice—indeed, he would not even allow NEWSWEEK to photograph the paddle—could it be that he's already delivered his last whipping? "I hope so," he says. But he quickly adds that there will always be "new kids who need to learn the limits at school." And one way or another, Nixon will make sure they get the message.

#

# Con: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Major studies have found that children receiving corporal punishment perform better in countless areas.**

**NewsMax Jan 7, 2010** Pro-Spanking Studies May Have Global Effect http://www.newsmax.com/US/spanking-studies-children-spock/2010/01/07/id/345669/

Two recent analyses – one psychological, the other legal – may debunk lenient modern parenting the way the Climategate e-mail scandal has short circuited global warming alarmism. A study entailing 2,600 interviews pertaining to corporal punishment, including the questioning of 179 teenagers about getting spanked and smacked by their parents, was conducted by Marjorie Gunnoe, professor of psychology at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Gunnoe’s findings, announced this week: “The claims made for not spanking children fail to hold up. They are not consistent with the data.” Those who were physically disciplined performed better than those who weren’t in a whole series of categories, including school grades, an optimistic outlook on life, the willingness to perform volunteer work, and the ambition to attend college, Gunnoe found. And they performed no worse than those who weren’t spanked in areas like early sexual activity, getting into fights, and becoming depressed. She found little difference between the sexes or races.

**Banning corporal punishment causes an increase in crime.**

**NewsMax Jan 7, 2010** Pro-Spanking Studies May Have Global Effect http://www.newsmax.com/US/spanking-studies-children-spock/2010/01/07/id/345669/

Another study published in the Akron Law Review last year examined criminal records and found that children raised where a legal ban on parental corporal punishment is in effect are much more likely to be involved in crime. A key focus of the work of Jason M. Fuller of the University of Akron Law School was Sweden, which 30 years ago became the first nation to impose a complete ban on physical discipline and is in many respects “an ideal laboratory to study spanking bans,” according to Fuller. Since the spanking ban, child abuse rates in Sweden have exploded over 500 percent, according to police reports. Even just one year after the ban took effect, and after a massive government public education campaign, Fuller found that “not only were Swedish parents resorting to pushing, grabbing, and shoving more than U.S. parents, but they were also beating their children twice as often.” After a decade of the ban, “rates of physical child abuse in Sweden had risen to three times the U.S. rate” and “from 1979 to 1994, Swedish children under seven endured an almost six-fold increase in physical abuse,” Fuller’s analysis revealed.
“Enlightened” parenting also seems to have produced increased violence later. “Swedish teen violence skyrocketed in the early 1990s, when children that had grown up entirely under the spanking ban first became teenagers,” Fuller noted. “Preadolescents and teenagers under fifteen started becoming even more violent toward their peers. By 1994, the number of youth criminal assaults had increased by six times the 1984 rate.”

# Con: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Corporal punishment has been proven through global study to not cause detrimental effects and children that who weren’t spanked had more behavior problems.**

**NewsMax Jan 7, 2010** Pro-Spanking Studies May Have Global Effect http://www.newsmax.com/US/spanking-studies-children-spock/2010/01/07/id/345669/

Gunnoe’s findings are being largely ignored by the U.S. media, but made a splash in British newspapers. It is not the first time her work has been bypassed by the press. Her 1997 work showing that customary spanking reduced aggression also went largely unreported. Nor is she alone in her conclusions. Dr. Diana Baumrind of the University of California, Berkeley and her teams of professional researchers over a decade conducted what is considered the most extensive and methodologically thorough child development study yet done. They examined 164 families, tracking their children from age four to 14. Baumrind found that spanking can be helpful in certain contexts and discovered “no evidence for unique detrimental effects of normative physical punishment.”  She also found that children who were never spanked tended to have behavioral problems, and were not more competent than their peers.

**Corporal punishment can be used as a last resort for the biggest problem students with parental consent.**

**Sydney Morning News July 15, 2014** Head of curriculum review Kevin Donnelly says corporal punishment in schools 'was very effective' <http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/head-of-curriculum-review-kevin-donnelly-says-corporal-punishment-in-schools-was-very-effective-20140715-3bz7p.html#ixzz3BTJLuT6N>

The head of the Abbott government's national curriculum review has backed the use of corporal punishment for ill-disciplined children in schools if it is supported by the local school community.

Kevin Donnelly, co-chair of the national curriculum review and a widely published commentator on educational issues, said on Tuesday that corporal punishment was effective during his childhood and still has some merit. Mr Donnelly was appearing on 2UE radio to comment on Fairfax Media reports that [NSW students are being suspended and expelled from public schools at record rates](http://www.smh.com.au/nsw/big-increase-in-student-expulsions-suspensions-20140714-zt6n4.html). Over 18,000 NSW students were suspended in 2012 - 1300 more than in 2011. "What would you, as you've been involved with this for so long, describe as the best punishment you can come across even if it is one that has gone away?" asked 2UE host Justin Smith. "I'm not alluding to the strap here. I don't think you would ever resort to that. You would never advocate bringing that back surely?" Dr Donnelly responded by saying, "Well" followed by a pause – an answer that surprised Mr Smith. Dr Donnelly continued: "I grew up in Broadmeadows, a housing commission estate in Melbourne, and we had a Scottish phys-ed teacher.

"Whenever there were any discipline problems he would actually take the boy behind the shed and say, 'We can either talk about this or you can throw the first punch'. "That teacher would probably lose his job now but it was very effective. He only had to do it once and the kids were pretty well behaved for the rest of the year." Dr Donnelly went on to say "those days are gone". But questioned further on the merits of corporal punishment, he said: "If the school community is in favour of it then I have got no problem if it's done properly. "There are one or two schools around Australia that I know where it actually is approved of and they do do it. I'm sure they only do it very rarely." Dr Donnelly contrasted corporal punishment with "time out" zones which he said do not work because children can relax and avoid class work.

# Con: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Occasional corporate punishment can be effective.**

**Dr Barry Maley is a Senior Fellow at the Centre for Independent Studies. Online Opinion Feb 15, 2001.** http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=1975&page=0

Some studies show that frequent smacking may be counter-productive. But selective or infrequent smacking or spanking is not necessarily contra-indicated and can be effective. Most experts would agree that the form and context of punishment are important. A substantial body of opinion is consistent with the commonsense view of most parents that a slap with the hand for a naughty child, or one whose behaviour is endangering itself, may sometimes be the best immediate course of action under certain circumstances. However, *reliance* on physical punishment, to the exclusion of other measures such as warning, explaining, withdrawal of affection, etc., may lead to less compliance and lagging development.

**Corporal punishment can work if it’s limited and accompanied with explanation.**

**Dr Barry Maley is a Senior Fellow at the Centre for Independent Studies. Online Opinion Feb 15, 2001.** http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=1975&page=0

Evidence from surveys indicates that slaps with the hand on legs or bottom are the common forms of physical punishment and peak in the critical ‘socialising’ period between 18 months and 4 years of age. As children get older, physical punishment declines noticeably. Evidence suggests, further, that most parents would agree with the experts that severe and frequent punishment is morally wrong, counterproductive and conducive to aggressiveness as children grow up, and an admission of parental failure. They would also agree with the experts that physical punishment should be accompanied by an explanation to the child of the reasons for it. Indeed, this seems to be a crucial element in the internalised accretion of generalised rules of proper conduct and considerate behaviour, and that ‘children themselves believe that the combination of reasoning and some power assertion works best’. Severe and frequent punishment, on the other hand, although it may induce situational compliance, is associated with failure to *internalise*moral rules, with reduced likelihood to resist temptations without external constraints, with less willingness to confess and accept responsibility, with greater aggressiveness, and with increased likelihood of delinquency.

# Con: A Bill to Ban Corporal Punishment in Schools

**Corporal punishment used in the right circumstances can be effective.**

**Dr. Barry Maley is a Senior Fellow at the Centre for Independent Studies. Online Opinion Feb 15, 2001.** http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=1975&page=0

In sum, there is virtual unanimity to be found in expert opinion and the evidence that harsh or frequent punishment – quite apart from its moral repugnance – is less effective, and even counterproductive, in the development of desirable personal and social conduct, and is psychologically damaging. On the other hand, there is support by some experts, and more widely by the population in general, for the view that infrequent, mild punishment, accompanied by explanation and reasoning, and less frequently resorted to as children get older, has a useful role in discipline and control, has no harmful consequences, is not inherently wrong, and should remain a parental option. Those parents and others who totally oppose physical punishment on either, or both, moral and effectiveness grounds, are not left resourceless, however, in maters of discipline and shaping of child conduct. There are many other means – reasoning, privileges, approval and rewards for desirable conduct, and so on – available to them, and the evidence is that they are effective if used consistently and firmly in socialising young children.

**Corporal punishment and child abuse are separate issues.**

**Dr. Barry Maley is a Senior Fellow at the Centre for Independent Studies. Online Opinion Feb 15, 2001.** http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=1975&page=0

It is sometimes argued that there is a causal relationship between the incidence of smacking and child abuse. However, both the incidence of child abuse, and violence by juveniles, have risen noticeably over recent years as moderate corporal punishment has become less widely accepted by Australians and abandoned by some public school authorities. This clearly indicates that growing child abuse is not the result of a more punitive environment in the ordinary home or school; although it is consistent with the view, although not proof of it, that deteriorating juvenile behaviour may be in some part due to lack of discipline. Moreover, there is evidence that abusive and neglectful parents present completely different behavioural and emotional profiles compared to parents who only occasionally resort to mild, disciplinary smacking.

# A Resolution to Improve School Lunch

1. Whereas, students develop healthy eating habits at school, and
2. Whereas, school lunches are often sub-standard and only meet the most basic nutritional
3. requirements, and
4. Whereas, the basic nutritional requirements that do exist are being phased out and rolled back
5. by the Trump administration, and
6. Whereas, students who are well fed are statistically proven to be better students, and
7. Whereas, eliminating competitive food sales like snack machines and candy sales increases the
8. likelihood a student will make healthy choices, and
9. Whereas, schools could do a much better job of providing healthy locally sourced food for
10. school lunches, and
11. Whereas, mandating that schools buy local food would create a huge market for local farmers,
12. and decrease our reliance on industrial agriculture,
13. THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Student Congress here assembled that the Federal
14. Government mandate and provide funding for Farm to School programs that significantly
15. increase servings of fresh vegetables and fruits in secondary and elementary schools in the
16. United States and make competitive food sales illegal.

# Pro: A Resolution to Improve School Lunch

#### The rollback of nutrition standards disproportionately impacts low income and minority students access to healthier options.

Hasson, Assistant Professor @ The University of Michigan, 5/2/2017

Rebecca, “Low-Income and Minority Students to Suffer Most Under Relaxed School Lunch Standards” http://www.newswise.com/articles/low-income-minority-students-to-suffer-most-under-relaxed-school-lunch-standards

“Our high income kids, even our middle income kids, they are not eating meals in school,” said Rebecca Hasson, assistant professor at the University of Michigan and director, Childhood Disparities Research Laboratory. “They eat breakfast at home and bring lunches.” Primarily, it’s the low income and minority students who eat school meals, Hasson said. These kids are already the least healthy, and the newly relaxed nutrition guidelines for whole grains, salt and milk could further worsen their diets. “Some of these kids eat as many as two-thirds of their meals at school,” Hasson said. “This is also the group with the highest rates of obesity, the highest consumption of sugar sweetened beverages, and the highest sodium intake and hypertension, both in youth and as they age. To relax the sodium and milk restrictions and allow for sugar sweetened milk and increased sodium in meals will disproportionately affect these kids in youth and into adulthood. “We have evidence that suggests there is a direct link between sodium and sugar, and obesity and diabetes and a whole slew of diseases that Michelle Obama was trying to impact.”

#### Farm to school programs creates quality, healthy food in school lunches.

Becky Domokos-Bays, October 10, 2016. Becky Domokos-Bays is the School Nutrition Association President and Supervisor of School Nutrition Services for Loudoun County Public Schools, Va. Domokos-Bays earned a doctorate in adult and continuing education and a master's in human nutrition and foods from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Her bachelor of science degree in dietetics is from Marshall University. (“Schools Celebrate National School Lunch Week with Farm Fresh Produce” http://www.farmtoschool.org/news-and-articles/schools-celebrate-national-school-lunch-week-with-farm-fresh-produce)

School nutrition professionals have always been passionate about serving students healthy meals that contribute to academic success. Now that federal nutrition standards require every school meal to include larger portions of fruits and vegetables, we are utilizing more creative methods to encourage students to eat and enjoy these nutritious choices. As president of the School Nutrition Association (SNA), I've been thrilled to witness farm to school initiatives taking root in school cafeterias nationwide as part of this ongoing effort to help students adopt healthier lifestyles. School nutrition professionals have embraced farm to school programs as an effective way to source more farm fresh, local produce and to get kids to try these choices by teaching them about the healthy foods grown in their communities. A recent SNA survey of nearly 1,000 school meal program operators revealed that 57% of school districts offer locally sourced fruits and vegetables with school meals - up from 52% just two years ago. Meanwhile, nearly 50% of respondents have implemented farm to school initiatives to promote healthier choices in the cafeteria, up from 37.5% in the 2014 survey. School nutrition professionals also reported widespread use of student taste tests, chef partnerships, and salad or produce bars – all effective methods for increasing consumption of fruits and vegetables. During National School Lunch Week (October 10-14), schools nationwide will showcase these ongoing efforts. At Loudoun County Virginia’s Kenneth Colbert Elementary, students will have the chance to meet Ellen Polishuk, a farmer from nearby Potomac Vegetable Farms. Ellen will autograph her farmer trading cards for students as they enjoy their school lunches. Our school nutrition department worked with the Loudoun County Department of Economic Development to design twelve different farmer trading cards, which were released on the opening day of baseball season – also declared the first day of growing season! The cards have offered a fun way to teach students about the people who grow the local produce served in the cafeteria. These cards have also helped to get kids excited about working and learning in Loudoun County’s school gardens. Local farmers are key partners in this effort too - Wegmeyer Farms in Hamilton, Virginia generously donated over 400 strawberry plants to our gardens this year, allowing students in 17 schools to learn outdoors with their teachers in the process of garden planting, tending and harvesting. The School Nutrition Services Team did our part to continue the learning in the cafeteria by hosting a “Taste it Thursday” strawberry taste test with students. As a parent and a dietitian, I know kids sometimes need to try a new fruit or vegetable many times before they decide they like it, and that’s why partnerships between school nutrition professionals, farmers, teachers and parents are so important. Working together through farm to school initiatives, school garden projects, taste tests and nutrition education programs, we can all help promote life-long healthy eating habits for children.

# Pro: A Resolution to Improve School Lunch

#### Trump’s rolling back the Hunger-Free Kids Act is leading to less nutritious school meals and undermines students’ academic performance by impeding student’s cognitive, physical, and behavioral development.

Brody, Health Columnist at NYT, 6/5/2017

Jane, “Feeding Young Minds: The Importance of School Lunches” https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/05/well/feeding-young-minds-the-importance-of-school-lunches.html

But current problems with school lunch go far beyond shaming innocent children. After major improvements championed by the Obama administration in the nutritional value of school meals were already underway, the Republican-dominated House of Representatives and now the Trump administration have begun to undermine them. In 2010, spurred by the advocacy of Michelle Obama, Congress enacted the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, revamping the nation’s school lunch program to increase servings of vegetables, fruits and whole grains, provide age-appropriate calories, remove dangerous trans fats and limit levels of sodium. Schools were given incentives in the form of meal reimbursement funds to prompt them to participate. Alas, in the fiscal-year 2015 Agriculture Appropriations bill, the House included waivers allowing schools that had a six-month net loss of revenue for any reason to opt out of providing the healthier meals outlined in the 2010 act, Dr. Jennifer Woo Baidal, a pediatrician affiliated with Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, wrote in The New England Journal of Medicine. Now, just days into his tenure as Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, former governor of Georgia, rolled back the timetable by at least three years for reducing the high levels of salt in school lunches. The rollback will also allow schools to serve refined grains and 1-percent-fat flavored milk, instead of nonfat. Will progress on vegetables and fruits, calories and other fats be next on the chopping block? Providing adequate amounts of nutritious food in schools is more important than many realize. “Students who eat regular, healthy meals are less likely to be tired, are more attentive in class, and retain more information,” Sean Patrick Corcoran, associate professor of economics and education policy at New York University’s Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development, told The Atlantic. In fact, well-designed studies have demonstrated that “students at schools that contract with a healthy school lunch vendor score higher” on statewide achievement tests, Michael L. Anderson of the University of California, Berkeley, and colleagues reported in April. They showed a 4-percentile improvement in test scores above those achieved in schools with less healthy meals. “While this effect is modest in magnitude, the relatively low cost of healthy vendors when compared to in-house meal preparation makes this a very cost-effective way to raise test scores,” the researchers concluded. In Minnesota, where 10 percent of households are considered “food insecure” and one child in six risks hunger, Wilder Research reported in 2014 that improved school nutrition is a “major component of Minnesota’s Statewide Health Improvement Program.” The Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, in St. Paul, described studies showing that simply providing free breakfast can result in better school attendance, improved behavior and concentration and better academic performance. Clearly, an expansive food program at schools like Harding Senior High bears replication nationwide, not cutbacks. “Nutrition can affect learning through three channels: physical development (e.g., sight), cognition (e.g., concentration, memory), and behavior (e.g., hyperactivity),” the Berkeley team wrote. For example, they explained, diets high in trans and saturated fats have a negative impact on learning and memory, reducing substances in the body that support cognitive processing and increasing the risk of neurological dysfunction.

# Pro: A Resolution to Improve School Lunch

#### Fixing school lunches key to combat food injustice – access is harder for poor and minority students

U.C.S. 16 – Union of Concerned Scientists [Working Toward a More Equitable Food System, February 23, 2016, <http://www.ucsusa.org/food-agriculture/expand-healthy-food-access/working-toward-more-equitable-food#.WQdxdtIrL4s>]

Policies to promote healthier food and farms must address the needs of marginalized communities The broken U.S. food system is a problem for all Americans. But like many of our national problems, it hits communities of color and low-income communities hardest of all. African-Americans, Latinos, and low-income Americans disproportionately lack access to healthy food—and as a result, they are more likely to suffer from diet-related chronic diseases like diabetes, hypertension, and heart disease than the average American. They are also more likely to work at food system jobs that feature some of the lowest wages in our economy as well as unsafe and unhealthy working conditions. These inequities are propped up by agricultural policies that promote the production and distribution of unhealthy processed foods while putting obstacles in the way of making healthy food more available and affordable for everyone. So fixing our food system is not only a matter of health and sustainability—it’s also a matter of justice.

Overcoming barriers to healthy food access

Recent research has confirmed what food activists and journalists have been saying for years: all Americans do not enjoy equal access to healthy food. Inequities in food availability and affordability operate along both racial and income lines, with low-income communities of color facing a double disadvantage. The solution is not as simple as “more supermarkets.” Transportation, affordability, and other food access barriers need to be overcome as well. Communities across America are coming up with innovative ways to meet these challenges locally, as profiled in our 2016 report Fixing Food: Fresh Solutions from Five U.S. Cities. But local governments and community groups shouldn’t have to work so hard to overcome obstacles put in place by the current system and the federal policies that drive it. We need a national food policy, coordinated across all relevant federal agencies, aimed at promoting healthy food, economic opportunity, and environmental sustainability. As part of this effort, we need to ensure that the most reliable food source for many American children—the school cafeteria—can be counted on to serve healthy food to nourish growing bodies and minds. Childhood obesity, a problem with serious, lifelong potential health consequences, continues to grow at a faster pace for African American and Latino children than for the population as a whole. So maintaining high standards for healthy school food is also a matter of food justice.

# Con: A Resolution to Improve School Lunch

#### School lunch changes insignificant – must change the culture

Haskins 05 - senior fellow at Brookings [Ron Haskins, The School Lunch Lobby, 2005 / VOL. 5, NO. 3, <http://educationnext.org/the-school-lunch-lobby/>]

The school-lunch reauthorization bill enacted by Congress last year contained a host of measures to improve nutrition, such as encouraging the Department of Agriculture to make more fresh fruits and vegetables available to local schools, creating an initiative to encourage partnerships between schools and local produce farms, and increasing the availability of whole grains in school meals. Of course, Congress and school administrators must face the fact that students will not necessarily make the food choices that are best for their health. Children will choose a salad over a juicy cheeseburger about as often as they choose educational TV over MTV. It is hard to argue with any of these good food initiatives, but expectations about how much school food programs can contribute to increasing the consumption of nutritious foods and reducing the national problem with childhood obesity should be modest. There are after all, around 120,000 elementary and secondary schools in the United States, and more than 90 percent of them participate in the school-lunch program. Trying to move all these facilities in the same direction is a huge undertaking. What’s more, even if school food met every guideline for fat, saturated fat, and sugar, the impact on children’s weight would probably be modest because children’s consumption of food at home and in fast-food pens would continue unabated. By the time they reach middle and late childhood, students seem determined to maximize consumption of their two favorite food groups: fat and sugar. Children’s preference for foods that are bound to make them fatter is established outside the school system. Unless we are prepared to remove all unhealthy foods from the schools–to minimize consumption of sugars and fats–there are obvious limits to the strategy of giving kids food choices. Schools can and should fight to improve the consumption of nutritious foods, and even to change students’ eating habits, but unless the nation’s food culture, food advertising, and patterns of food consumption at home and in fast-food restaurants undergo massive change, the schools will be waging little more than a rear-guard action. Even so, given the level of federal spending on the school food programs, it is reasonable to expect both Congress and the Department of Agriculture to put pressure on schools to aggressively implement wellness policies that minimize the consumption of fat and sugar on school property. To do so, schools may well be forced to reduce some food choices that have minimal nutritional value. Expect school lunch to continue moving inexorably along its well-traveled path of slow change and modest improvement while relying on its friends inside and outside Congress to fight off big shocks and spending cuts. At this very moment, as in 1981 and 1995, Washington is gearing up to make serious cuts in social programs to balance the budget. Will school lunch, and that 20 cents per meal middle-class subsidy, be on the menu? Fat chance.

# Con: A Resolution to Improve School Lunch

#### School lunch regulations aren’t followed – too expensive

Fox News 1 – 25 – 17 [Republicans look to scrap Michelle Obama school lunch plan, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2017/01/25/republicans-look-to-scrap-michelle-obama-school-lunch-plan.html>]

Since 2012, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has implemented the requirement – tied to the 2010 law – that schools include either a fruit or vegetable for lunches subsidized by the federal government. However, a report published in August 2015 by researchers at the University of Vermont found even though students added more fruits and vegetables to their plates, “children consumed fewer [fruits and vegetables] and wasted more during the school year immediately following implementation of the USDA rule.” Titled “Impact of the National School Lunch Program on Fruit and Vegetable Selection,” the report noted that average waste increased from a quarter cup to more than one-third of a cup per tray. Observing students at two northeastern elementary schools during more than 20 visits to each, researchers took photos of students’ trays after they chose their items, as they were exiting the lunch line and again as they went by the garbage cans. The study's conclusions comport with widespread complaints from school officials and parents that the program encourages food waste. It also has drawn criticism for cost, implementation difficulties and unpopularity with students. Further, since the restrictions on calories, fat, sugar, sodium, whole grains, fruits and vegetables went into effect, it is estimated that over 1.2 million students have stopped eating school lunches, according to EAGnews.org. School systems also dropped out of the program because it led in some cases to compliance costs exceeding the amount of federal subsidies received.

#### Food injustice inevitable under capitalism

Smith 16 – Truthout News Analyst [Rory Smith, The Future of the Food Justice Movement, May 07, 2016, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/35915-the-future-of-the-food-justice-movement>]

The work of Coalition of Immokalee Workers, Fair Food Standards Council and Growing Power have not only provided concrete results but also blueprints and models that are being emulated across the United States and internationally, both within and outside of the food movement. Japan is looking to implement Coalition of Immokalee Workers' model in order to provide a "sweat-free Olympics" in 2020 (i.e. an Olympics whose paraphernalia and other amenities aren't produced using exploitative or unlawful labor arrangements). And construction workers in Texas are already utilizing the same worker-based enforcement model. Growing Power is pushing the limits of the possible in urban agriculture and racial justice. These are all promising examples of the reach and potential of food justice. However, changing the food system ultimately requires transforming the capitalist system. The free market has proven time and time again that it is incapable of creating a just food system that can equitably feed the world's population. And while the food justice movement has been able to right various wrongs, can this movement -- which often utilizes the same market-based methods and negotiates with the same corporate entities that caused these same injustices -- be successful in catalyzing wide-scale national and international change? Or are these merely temporary Band-Aids while something more revolutionary could take place? The "Unknown Unknown" The food sovereignty movement -- a movement of peasants, landless people, women farmers and rural youth primarily from the global South and united under the banner of Via Campesina -- might have an answer. Food sovereignty proponents advocate for the rights of each country's people to decide their food system, ensuring that the land and production processes stay in the hands of the people and out of the hands of the corporate sector. The movement has begun to collaborate with the food justice movement and both of these movements have begun to mutually inform each other's strategies. "This is part of the larger convergence that you would expect within the countermovement," Holt-Giménez said. If there is one thing that the food justice movement can and should learn from food sovereignty, it is the importance of including American farmers in the debate; their role as change-makers is indispensable to the success of the food movement. They are the ones who have suffered the most at the hands of agribusiness and liberal economic policy, and they are the ones whose connection to and knowledge of the land can guide us toward a more equitable and sustainable food system. "We don't know what this is going to look like. It hasn't been done before in this way, but we are going to have to learn how to do it," Holt-Giménez said. "Like the Panthers said: 'survival pending revolution.' I think survival pending transformation is what food justice is doing."

# Con: A Resolution to Improve School Lunch

#### Federal school lunch programs backfire – burdensome and create opt out

Klein 3 – 15 – 17 - reporter covering the first family, politics, and pop culture for CNN [Betsy Klein, Michelle Obama's healthy school lunch program in jeopardy?, <http://www.cnn.com/2017/03/14/politics/michelle-obama-healthy-hunger-free-kids-act/>]

With a Republican administration in the White House (and a President who is known to enjoy fast food), the School Nutrition Administration hopes to earn the support to scale back the regulations. "Overly prescriptive regulations have resulted in unintended consequences, including reduced student lunch participation, higher costs and food waste. Federal nutrition standards should be modified to help school menu planners manage these challenges and prepare nutritious meals that appeal to diverse student tastes," the association said in its recommendations. Republican lawmakers are also likely eager to make the change, led by House Freedom Caucus Chairman Mark Meadows. The North Carolina congressman compiled a list of over 300 rules, regulations and executive orders the new administration should consider rolling back in its first 100 days, including the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act. "The federal government involving itself in what is served in school lunches is the epitome of government overreach," Meadows told the Washington Examiner, calling the federal lunch program standards "overly burdensome." "Districts that have chosen to opt out have been able to provide more options to students and better-quality services ... It's the perfect example of how government interference generally makes a small problem far worse."

# A Bill to Establish Free College Tuition at All Public Colleges

1. BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS HERE ASSEMBLED THAT:
2. **SECTION 1.** Citizens and permanent residents of the United States who attend an accredited
3. public college, university, community college, or trade or vocational school shall be entitled
4. to a refundable tax credit equal to the cost of in-state tuition and fees for all credits
5. completed.
6. **SECTION 2**. Individuals have two options for claiming this tax credit.
7. **A.** Individuals may elect to receive the credit as part of their ordinary tax refund
8. or to have it paid directly to the school.
9. **B.** An individual may claim the tax for no more than the equivalent of four years
10. of full-time enrollment.
11. **SECTION 3**. The Department of the Treasury and the Department of Education shall be
12. responsible for enforcing the provisions of this bill.
13. **SECTION 4.** The provisions of this bill shall take effect January 1, 2018.
14. **SECTION 5.** All laws in conflict with this legislation are hereby declared null and void.

# Pro: Free College Tuition

**Free tuition improves high school performance and the rate of graduation from college.**

**Campaign for Free College Tuition June 2016** <http://www.freecollegenow.org/two_problems_one_solution>

When higher education seems attainable and guidance is provided, students better understand how their actions affect their future, leading to better academic and behavioral outcomes. This is certainly the case in Kalamazoo, Michigan where the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research has extensively studied the Kalamazoo Promise. Their research has found that the guarantee of free college tuition has led to a significant decrease in high school suspensions and a dramatic increase in the GPAs of African American students, ranging from 0.17 to 0.60 standard deviations after controlling for “fixed effects”. In addition to improved high school achievement, the impact on college enrollment and outcomes has also been largely positive for Kalamazoo students. Since the program started with the class of 2006, more than 90 percent of KPS graduates continued on to college, compared to the two-thirds of high school graduates who enroll in college nationwide. Today, 41 percent of Promise scholars from the class of 2006 hold a bachelor’s degree compared to 37 percent of all U.S. high school graduates between the ages of 25 to 29 -- a significant difference especially after taking into account the demographics of Kalamazoo.

**The biggest obstacle to college completion is cost.**

**Campaign for Free College Tuition June 2016** <http://www.freecollegenow.org/two_problems_one_solution>

One of the most critical obstacles to making progress on this challenge is the increasingly unaffordable nature of a college education. The latest report from the Institute for Research on Higher Education shows that college has become increasingly unaffordable since 2008 in 45 of the country’s 50 states. One of the report’s authors, Joni E. Finney from the University of Pennsylvania, said the study, “shows how the deck is stacked against low- and middle-income Americans when it comes to paying for college. Without policy changes, the data point toward a problem that will only worsen.” Fortunately, there is one proven public policy change that can be undertaken that will alter the current trajectory of college completion rates while SIMULTANEOUSLY improving learning outcomes in high school. Promise programs, or place-based scholarships that make college tuition free for graduates of public schools in a given community, can help solve both problems at once. The Upjohn Institute’s rigorous study of the ten-year effect on college completion by those promised a free college tuition if they attended Kalamazoo’s public primary and secondary schools found that college completion rates increased by over one-third--with eighty percent of the improvement from students earning a bachelor’s degree. Meanwhile, other studies of the impact on promise programs showed statistically significant improvements in test scores among African-American students in Kalamazoo’s high schools and in low income third through eighth graders El Dorado, AR, as defined by their eligibility for in the National School Lunch Program. El Dorado was also the second community to establish a promise program after Kalamazoo.

**Student debt dramatically harms students after college including preventing people from saving for retirement, and can cost over $200,000 in life time earnings.**

**Mark Huelsman Senior Policy Analyst Demos August 2015** http://www.demos.org/publication/case-debt-free-college

Beyond access and completion, though, student debt presents a burden to post-college financial prospects that could carry long-term economic consequences. Young households (those 40 years old or younger) with student debt have far less wealth than those without student debt. In fact, households with student debt and a college degree have less wealth than those with no debt and no degree. While the value of a college degree is high in the long-term, reducing the ability of student borrowers to save for retirement and create a nest egg prevents them from leveraging the years in which saving is most valuable – early in their career. Demos has found that average levels of student debt can lead to over $200,000 in lost lifetime wealth, relative to those who do not have to borrow for college.

# Pro: Free College Tuition

**We have the means and the moral obligation to pay for college for everyone.**

**The American Prospect, April 2016** <http://prospect.org/article/argument-tuition-free-college>

If the nation can provide hundreds of billions of dollars in subsidies to the oil and gas industry and billions of dollars more to Wall Street, we can afford to pay for public higher education. A tax on financial transactions like derivatives and stock trades would cover the cost. Building a truly affordable higher education system is an investment that would pay off economically. Eliminating student loan debt is the first step, but it’s not the last. Once we ensure that student loan debt isn’t a barrier to going to college, we should reframe how we think about higher education. College shouldn’t just be debt free—it should be free. Period. We all help pay for our local high schools and kindergartens, whether or not we send our kids to them. And all parents have the option of choosing public schools, even if they can afford private institutions. Free primary and secondary schooling is good for our economy, strengthens our democracy, and most importantly, is critical for our children’s health and future. Educating our kids is one of our community’s most important responsibilities, and it’s a right that every one of us enjoys. So why not extend public schooling to higher education as well?

**Tuition should be free for everyone, rich and poor. It would build an ethic of education.**

**The American Prospect, April 2016** <http://prospect.org/article/argument-tuition-free-college>

Some might object that average Americans should not have to pay for students from wealthy families to go to school. But certain things should be guaranteed to all Americans, poor or rich. It’s not a coincidence that some of the most important social programs in our government’s history have applied to all citizens, and not just to those struggling to make ends meet. Universal programs are usually stronger and more stable over the long term, and they’re less frequently targeted by budget cuts and partisan attacks. Public schools have stood the test of time—let’s make sure public colleges and universities do, too. The United States has long been committed to educating all its people, not only its elites. This country is also the wealthiest in the history of the world. We can afford to make college an option for every American family.

**Student loans limit access to college and create crushing debt for college drop outs.**

**Mark Huelsman, Senior Policy Analyst, Demos, August 2015** http://www.demos.org/publication/case-debt-free-college

While loans ostensibly help meet the sizeable gap that students face when confronted with high net prices, the overreliance on them to cover college costs is having a deleterious effect. First, it hampers our ability to broaden access to college. Evidence suggests that concerns about high college costs are limiting the ability of college-qualified students to both apply to and enroll in four-year colleges. The prospect of considerable borrowing could be impacting the educational ambitions of students, either by pushing academically-qualified students toward two-year institutions or by limiting their ability to go to college at all.11 In the face of high net prices, low-income high school graduates attend college at far lower rates than their high-income peers. The lowest-achieving students from wealthy families attend college at rates equal to that of the highest-achieving students from poorer families, indicating that financial burdens are artificially lowering college-going rates for students from non-wealthy households. Beyond access, our reliance on debt has massively increased the negative consequences of dropping out of college. Whereas previous generations could leave college before graduating and only face the lost earnings and money already committed to college, today’s students who do not complete are far more likely to take a substantial student loan bill with them, only without the credential.

# Pro: Free College Tuition

**Free tuition is not a giveaway to the wealthy. It helps everyone.**

**Mark Huelsman, Senior Policy Analyst, Demos August 2015** http://www.demos.org/publication/case-debt-free-college

Some have argued that since the percentage of the American population with a college degree tends to be wealthier—and conversely, those without a college education tend to have lower incomes and experience higher unemployment—offering a subsidy to college-goers through a debt-free guarantee would be a giveaway to wealthier families. Evidence offered to support this argument often includes the statistic that only 40 percent of the American population holds at least a two-year degree. But this figure severely underestimates who stands to benefit from affordable higher education, and indeed misses much of the point of debt-free college entirely. In fact, most young Americans do enter higher education at some point: 64% of those age 25-29, and 58% of all Americans over 25, have attempted college.22 Additionally, 66 percent of high school graduates transition to college immediately, and half (49%) of low-income students. That many of these students do not receive a college credential can be explained in part by rising costs, the need to work excessive hours while in college, take care of a family with limited resources, and other financial concerns. Debt-free higher education would allow these students to focus more on academics, and provide them with more financial flexibility so that cost is no longer a determinant of non-completion. This argument is also tautological: If college is affordable only for wealthy families, wealthy families will send their children to college at higher rates. The promise inherent in debt-free higher education is that the net price that students face will be manageable regardless of family income. A wealth of literature exists noting the impact of reducing the net cost of college on enrollment, persistence, and completion, particularly for low-income students that currently attend college in lower rates. In short, the families who already have access to debt-free higher education—those with substantial wealth—have very little issue attending and graduating from college. Offering the same chance to all Americans, it stands to reason, would expand access and completion.

**Current targeted aid is too difficult. A universal tuition waiver would make the program stronger and fairer.**

**NPR, July 2016** http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016/07/28/487794394/hillary-s-free-tuition-promise-what-would-it-cost-how-would-it-work

On the other hand, the current means-tested financial aid program requires low-income students to jump through lots of hoops, like dealing with the daunting FAFSA form, to prove their status and maximize their aid. Many can't navigate the system and fall out along the way. "Free tuition" is a simple promise that some researchers, like Sara Goldrick-Rab at Temple University, believe would motivate more working-class students to dream of college and actually make it through. The maxim for generations of policy wonks is that "programs for the poor are poor programs," while those with more universal eligibility enjoy broader support. In embarking on a promise of free tuition for 83 percent of families, Clinton's campaign seems to be banking on the idea that the appeal to middle-class parents and millennials will outweigh the protests of other taxpayers who ask, "What's in it for me?"

**Current targeted college aid programs are divisive and have proven ineffective.**

**Time, July 2016** <http://time.com/money/4423584/debt-free-college-investment-cory-booker-dnc/>

There are certainly some experts who are supportive of a Sanders-like free tuition plan, including Sara Goldrick Rab, a prominent professor of higher education policy now at Temple University. “Targeted financial aid isn’t getting the job done,” she wrote in the New York Times. “It’s time for universal public higher education.” Goldrick-Rab, who researches financial aid and college access, also said that grant programs have lost their purchasing power, and targeted financial aid is divisive, pitting those who get help against those who don’t qualify.

# Con: Free College Tuition

**Tuition free is not enough. There are too many other expenses that make college unaffordable.**

**Tyler Kingkade, national reporter who covers higher education, Huffington Post July 2016** http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/debt-free-college-tuition\_us\_578fd6d0e4b00c9876cdc8b6

Dominick Suvonnasupa, a senior at the University of California San Diego, paid no tuition last year. His tuition was covered through a scholarship for low- and middle-income students. He was elected student body president for 2015-16, which provided a salary that worked out to about $6 an hour. And he had about $20,000 that he’d saved up before college to pay for school. But still, Suvonnasupa, who is 28 and a first-generation college student, couldn’t avoid taking out a loan to pay for the cost of college. He tried hard not to spend more than $600 in rent on an apartment near campus, which would have kept him within the estimated cost of attendance for UC San Diego. But the campus is located in the expensive La Jolla area of San Diego, and the best he could find was an apartment for $750 a month ― and that was after he was essentially homeless for several weeks, couch surfing with friends while looking for a good deal. “A lot of people don’t account for everything,” Suvonnasupa said. “There are so many factors to how college is affordable or not affordable. You have tuition, campus-based fees, systemwide fees and the external cost beyond tuition. It really can add up.” The biggest plank of Clinton’s plan is making community colleges free and eliminating tuition bills at in-state four-year public universities for students whose families make less than $125,000 a year. Year-round Pell Grants would also be restored. That’s a start, but it wouldn’t cover the majority of the cost of college. If you’re an in-state student living on campus today at a public four-year university, 61 percent of your educational cost is due to mandatory expenses besides tuition. Housing alone is a bigger financial burden for in-state students than tuition, on average. If you’re a community college student, tuition is just one-fifth of the cost of school, according to the College Board. “There really needs to be a recognition that the cost of attending college is far more than just tuition fees,” said Mark Huelsman, a senior policy analyst at the progressive think tank Demos.

**Free tuition is just a giveaway to people who don’t need it. The rich would benefit most.**

**Time, July 2016** <http://time.com/money/4423584/debt-free-college-investment-cory-booker-dnc/>

While popular for obvious reasons with the highly desired voting population of college students and young debt-holding graduates, the variations of free college introduced so far have been met with skeptical reactions from many economists and higher education wonks. “Tuition-free college is way less help than some people need and way more than others require,” wrote former college presidents William G. Bowen and Michael S. McPherson in a op-ed on Vox.com last week. Even Clinton’s vice presidential pick, Tim Kaine, has expressed doubts about free college, writing in The Huffington Post earlier this year that making all public university education free gives away “a college education to richer Americans who don’t need the assistance paying for it.” There’s little disputing that families in the top income tier of Clinton’s plan would benefit the most from a free tuition policy in terms of sheer dollars.

**Free tuition dose not solve the college dropout problem.**

**Time, July 2016** http://time.com/money/4423584/debt-free-college-investment-cory-booker-dnc/

Finally, dramatically reducing the cost of college won’t solve one of the toughest student debt problems, either. That’s because increasing access is only one half the college affordability issue. The other half is increasing completion rates. Currently, four out of every 10 students at four-year public colleges don’t finish within six years. So while there is a subset of college graduates with expensive student debt that they can’t afford, that’s actually a smaller issue than the borrowers with relatively little debt (less than $10,000) who left college without earning a degree. New data released by the White House last week shows that dropouts are three times as likely to default on their loans.

# Con: Free College Tuition

**Free tuition is not same as free college and paying for tuition would trade off with targeted aid to the most needy.**

**Time, July 2016** http://time.com/money/4423584/debt-free-college-investment-cory-booker-dnc/

There’s also the issue that free tuition is not the same thing as free college attendance. Tuition and fees equaled less than half the total price of college in 2015, according to an annual College Board report. Chingos writes that free tuition still leaves families at the bottom half of the income distributions with $17.8 billion in annual college costs. “Devoting new spending to eliminating tuition for all students involves an implicit tradeoff with investing the same funds in targeted grant aid that would cover more of the total costs of attendance for students from lower-income families,” he writes. Michael J. Pretrilli, president of the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, and Catharine Bond Hill, an economist who specializes in financial aid, have made similar arguments that instead of free college for all, the limited resources should be invested in grant aid to help the families that need it most.

**Free tuition dose not solve our larger issues with affordability.**

**US News and World Report, July 2016** <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-07-06/hillary-clinton-pitches-tuition-free-college>

But Clinton's tuition-free plan, like Sanders', stirred a tepid reaction from some higher education policy experts who advocate for increased access and affordability. One reason: While myriad circumstances factor into increasing college costs, at least one of the drivers has been the availability of federal funding to cover tuition hikes. "The bigger problem is the fact that we have turned on the spigot of debt financing and allowed people to attend whatever program at whatever cost in the hope and belief that the choice will pan out economically," says Barmak Nassirian, director of federal relations and policy analysis at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

**Free tuition would hurt private colleges like HCBU’s**

**Politico, August 2016** http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/colleges-free-tuition-clinton-226585

Elite private colleges such as Ivy League schools aren’t at risk. But some other types of private colleges — including women’s colleges, religiously affiliated institutions, and historically black colleges and universities — rely heavily on tuition. If Congress were to enact the free public college proposal, a sudden, steep drop in enrollment could put private schools like that out of business, McGuire said. And a wounded private college sector could mean fewer choices. Of course, congressional approval of Clinton’s plan is a big “if,” given Capitol Hill Republicans’ rejection of President Barack Obama’s more modest proposal for tuition-free community college.

**Free tuition is a boon for the rich.**

**NPR, July 2016** http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016/07/28/487794394/hillary-s-free-tuition-promise-what-would-it-cost-how-would-it-work

Eliminating four-year college tuition would inevitably mean handing free money to some families that can afford to pay. That's already been seen in states like Georgia that created statewide scholarship programs with entrance requirements. Studies found that wealthier students were more likely to have the grades and family support to take advantage of free tuition.

# Con: Free College Tuition

**Free community college is the better option.**

**NPR, July 2016** http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016/07/28/487794394/hillary-s-free-tuition-promise-what-would-it-cost-how-would-it-work

But within Clinton's higher-ed proposals, there is a less dramatic, cheaper and more targeted alternative to free four-year tuition for all, and that's free community college. Around half of America's college graduates spend some time at our public two-year colleges. Since the Obama administration first proposed the idea a few years ago, several states, including Tennessee, Oregon and Minnesota, have started free-community-college programs, and others are considering it.

**Free tuition will make costs run rampant**

**Boston Globe, July 2016** https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2016/07/12/making-college-free-will-only-make-worse/YVonfawas70nG1CPZy8ctJ/story.html

A promise of “free” tuition is merely a promise to stick someone else with the tab. At half a trillion dollars or more, the tuition tab is already pretty enormous. But if there’s anything we should have learned from 40-plus years of government efforts to keep higher ed affordable, it is that the more Washington pours into holding down the cost of college, the more expensive college becomes. Uncle Sam has tried everything — grants and loans, subsidized work-study jobs, tax credits and deductions. Result? The price of tuition, room, and board at an in-state, public college has soared from $1,405 in 1971 to $19,548 today — an increase of 1,300 percent. Unlike food, clothing, and energy, the cost of college has raced far ahead of inflation. As economic studies, including recent work at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, have repeatedly shown, the government aid meant to quell the flames has succeeded only in fanning them. If the Clinton/Sanders pledge becomes law, it is virtually certain that college will become even more costly. Perhaps that explains why 20 out of 22 economists surveyed by NPR judged Sanders’ proposal a bad idea.

**The overconsumption of college is already a problem and making tuition free will only degraded higher education.**

**Boston Globe, July 2016** https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2016/07/12/making-college-free-will-only-make-worse/YVonfawas70nG1CPZy8ctJ/story.html

The overconsumption of higher education is already pronounced. Just 59 percent of college students at four-year institutions manage to earn a degree within six years. “Today’s college students learn a lot less than college students once did,” writes economist Thomas Sowell. “If college becomes ‘free,’ even more people can attend college without bothering to become educated and without acquiring any economically meaningful skills.” “Free” K-12 education is replete with problems. To turn a famous Hillary Clinton phrase, it requires a willful suspension of disbelief to conclude that “free” tuition will improve higher education. It may be good for politics, but making college free will only make it worse.

# A Resolution to Increase the Minimum Wage

1. Whereas, the minimum wage is not a living wage and people who work full-time are living in
2. poverty, and;
3. Whereas, corporate profits and CEO wages have been soaring for decades, meanwhile the
4. minimum wage has not even kept pace with inflation, and;
5. Whereas, an increase in the minimum wage would increase economic activity because workers
6. would have more money to spend, and;
7. Whereas, millions of Americans would lead better lives if their wages were increased and raising
8. the minimum wage is simply the right thing to do.
9. THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Student Congress Assembled that: the United States
10. federal government should substantially increase the minimum wage.

# Pro: A Resolution to Increase the Minimum Wage

#### Wage laws shows that higher minimum wages increase income without reducing jobs.

**National Employment Law Project. May 2015**. City Minimum Wage Laws: Recent Trends and Economic Evidence <http://campaign.nelp.org/page/-/rtmw/City-Minimum-Wage-Laws-Recent-Trends-Economic-Evidence.pdf?nocdn=1>

Economic evidence indicates that the higher city minimum wages enacted in U.S. cities to date have boosted earnings without slowing job growth or causing business relocations. These findings are consistent with the bulk of modern research on higher state minimum wages, which has generally found no statistically significant evidence of job losses resulting from minimum wage increases passed over the last 20 years in the United States. This is partly because the bulk of the low-wage positions affected by city minimum wages are in fields such as restaurants, retail, building services, home health care, and child care – jobs that serve city-based customers such as residents, office workers, and tourists at city locations. As a result, most cannot practically be moved by their employers to locations outside of the city while still retaining their customer bases

#### Increasing the minimum wage would help 45 million families in need.

**US Daily Review July 17, 2013** Over 100 Economists Agree: Raise The Minimum Wage To $10.50

The petition, signed by economists from dozens of universities and research institutes, explains how a minimum wage employee working full time at the current rate earns $15,080 a year — 19 percent below the poverty line for a

family of three. Raising the minimum wage to $10.50 would 'deliver much needed living standard improvements to 45 million U.S. workers and their families.'

#### The growing and un-just wage gap makes increasing the minimum wage a moral imperative.

**Catholic News Service | Feb. 21, 2014**. Addressing income inequality: A higher minimum wage is just the start

Raising the minimum wage from the current $7.25 an hour to $10.10 an hour would give an automatic raise to an estimated 16.5 million workers, according to a Congressional Budget Office study issued Tuesday. Other studies have pointed to a spillover effect that could ultimately help 28 million workers in all, as those already making $10 an hour or a bit more would likely get raises as well. **It's a moral issue, according to Thom Shellabarger, a former domestic policy adviser to the U.S. bishops who is now a Washington-based public policy associate for Interfaith Worker Justice.**

**In 1982, CEO pay in the United States was about 42 times what their employees made on average, Shellabarger said. "And in 2012**, just a few years ago, the last number I recall **it's now over 400-to-1,** 440-to-1**. That type of movement further and further off the norm distorts the whole economic picture, particularly if you know that wages for the average family are flat and have been going down (in real terms) since 1982.**" "As productivity and profits go up," he said, "only a few are benefiting from that, not the general population. So we're concerned about how that inequality is growing." **The gap, according to American Enterprise Institute resident scholar Norman Ornstein, is the greatest it's been since 1929, the year of the stock market crash that spawned the Great Depression**. The CBO study said the proposed minimum wage hike -- there are companion bills in the House and Senate -- would pull 900,000 people out of poverty. The bills also would index the minimum wage to inflation, and raise the minimum hourly pay for "tipped workers" such as waiters and baggage handlers from $2.13 to 70 percent of the minimum wage.

#### Raising the minimum wage will not cause large consumer price increases.

**US Daily Review July 17, 2013** Over 100 Economists Agree: Raise The Minimum Wage To $10.50

Third, the petition rebuts those who attempt to connect a moderate minimum wage increase with huge consumer price increases, explaining how, for example, the fast-food industry would only see a 2.7% rise in costs. These cost increases, note the economists, can be paid for through negligible price increases, small productivity gains or more equal distribution of companies' total revenues.

# Pro: A Resolution to Increase the Minimum Wage

**United States Department of Labor. 2015**. Minimum Wage Mythbusters. <http://www.dol.gov/minwage/mythbuster.htm>

#### Myth: Raising the minimum wage will only benefit teens.

**Not true**: The typical minimum wage worker is not a high-school student earning weekend pocket money. In fact, 88 percent of those who would benefit from a federal minimum wage increase are age 20 or older, and 55 percent are women.

#### Myth: Increasing the minimum wage will cause people to lose their jobs.

**Not true**: A review of 64 studies on minimum wage increases found no discernable effect on employment. Additionally, more than 600 economists, seven of them Nobel Prize winners in economics, have signed onto a letter in support of raising the minimum wage to $10.10 by 2016.

#### Myth: Small business owners can't afford to pay their workers more, and therefore don't support an increase in the minimum wage.

**Not true**: A June 2014 survey found that more than 3 out of 5 small business owners support increasing the minimum wage to $10.10. Small business owners believe that a higher minimum wage would benefit business in important ways: 58% say raising the minimum wage would increase consumer purchasing power. 56% say raising the minimum wage would help the economy. In addition, 53% agree that with a higher minimum wage, businesses would benefit from lower employee turnover, increased productivity and customer satisfaction.

#### Myth: Raising the federal tipped minimum wage ($2.13 per hour since 1991) would hurt restaurants.

**Not true**: In California, employers are required to pay servers the full minimum wage of $9 per hour - before tips. Even with a recent increase in the minimum wage, the National Restaurant Association projects California restaurant sales will outpace the U.S. average in 2014.

**Myth: Raising the federal tipped minimum wage ($2.13 per hour since 1991) would lead to restaurant job losses. Not true**: Employers in San Francisco must pay tipped workers the full minimum wage of $10.74 per hour – before tips. Yet, the San Francisco restaurant industry has experienced positive job growth over the past few years according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

#### Myth: Raising the federal minimum wage won't benefit workers in states where the hourly minimum rate is already higher than the federal minimum.

**Not true**: Only 23 states and the District of Columbia currently have a minimum wage higher than the federal minimum, meaning a majority of states have an hourly minimum rate at or below the federal minimum. Increasing the federal minimum wage will boost the earnings for some 28 million low-wage workers nationwide. That includes workers in those states already earning above the current federal minimum. Raising the federal minimum wage is an important part of strengthening the economy. A raise for minimum wage earners will put more money in more families' pockets, which will be spent on goods and services, stimulating economic growth locally and nationally.

#### Myth: Younger workers don't have to be paid the minimum wage.

**Not true**: While there are some exceptions, employers are generally required to pay at least the federal minimum wage. Exceptions allowed include a minimum wage of $4.25 per hour for young workers under the age of 20, but only during their first 90 consecutive calendar days of employment with an employer, and as long as their work does not displace other workers. After 90 consecutive days of employment or the employee reaches 20 years of age, whichever comes first, the employee must receive the current federal minimum wage or the state minimum wage, whichever is higher. There are programs requiring federal certification that allow for payment of less thanthe full federal minimum wage, but those programs are not limited to the employment of young worke

# Pro: A Resolution to Increase the Minimum Wage

**United States Department of Labor. 2015**. <http://www.dol.gov/minwage/mythbuster.htm>

Minimum Wage Mythbusters.

#### Myth: Restaurant servers don't need to be paid the minimum wage since they receive tips.

**Not true**: An employer can pay a tipped employee as little as $2.13 per hour in direct wages, but only if that amount plus tips equal at least the federal minimum wage and the worker retains all tips and customarily and regularly receives more than $30 a month in tips. Often, an employee's tips combined with the employer's direct wages of at least $2.13 an hour do not equal the federal minimum hourly wage. When that occurs, the employer must make up the difference. Some states have minimum wage laws specific to tipped employees. When an employee is subject to both the federal and state wage laws, he or she is entitled to the provisions of each law which provides the greater benefits.

#### Myth: Only part-time workers are paid the minimum wage.

**Not true**: About 53 percent of all minimum wage earners are full-time workers, and minimum wage workers contributed almost half (46 percent) of their household's wage and salary income in 2011. Moreover, more than 88 percent of those who would benefit from raising the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $10.10 are working adults, and 55 percent are working women.

#### Myth: Increasing the minimum wage is bad for businesses.

**Not true**: Academic research has shown that higher wages sharply reduce employee turnover which can reduce employment and training costs.

#### Myth: Increasing the minimum wage is bad for the economy.

**Not true**: Since 1938, the federal minimum wage has been increased 22 times. For more than 75 years, real GDP per capita has steadily increased, even when the minimum wage has been raised.

#### Myth: The federal minimum wage goes up automatically as prices increase.

**Not true**: While some states have enacted rules in recent years triggering automatic increases in their minimum wages to help them keep up with inflation, the federal minimum wage does not operate in the same manner. An increase in the federal minimum wage requires approval by Congress and the president. However, in his call to gradually increase the current federal minimum wage to $10.10 per hour, President Obama has also called for it to adjust automatically with inflation. Eliminating the requirement of formal congressional action would likely reduce the amount of time between increases, and better help low-income families keep up with rising prices.

#### Myth: The federal minimum wage is higher today than it was when President Reagan took office.

**Not true**: While the federal minimum wage was only $3.35 per hour in 1981 and is currently $7.25 per hour in real dollars, when adjusted for inflation, the current federal minimum wage would need to be more than $8 per hour to equal its buying power of the early 1980s and more nearly $11 per hour to equal its buying power of the late 1960s. That's why President Obama is urging Congress to increase the federal minimum wage and give low-wage workers a much-needed boost.

#### Myth: Increasing the minimum wage lacks public support.

**Not true**: Raising the federal minimum wage is an issue with broad popular support. Polls conducted since February 2013 when President Obama first called on Congress to increase the minimum wage have consistently shown that an overwhelming majority of Americans support an increase.

#### Myth: Increasing the minimum wage will result in job losses for newly hired and unskilled workers in what some call a “last-one-hired-equals-first-one-fired” scenario.

**Not true**: Minimum wage increases have little to no negative effect on employment as shown in independent studies from economists across the country. Academic research also has shown that higher wages sharply reduce employee turnover which can reduce employment and training costs.

#### Myth: The minimum wage stays the same if Congress doesn't change it.

**Not true**: Congress sets the minimum wage, but it doesn't keep pace with inflation. Because the cost of living is always rising, the value of a new minimum wage begins to fall from the moment it is set.

# Con: A Resolution to Increase the Minimum Wage

**Raising the minimum wage will not do nearly enough. Wage disparity between the rich and poor is so high it will barely make a dent.**

**Nikelle Snader. Writer/Assistant Editor at The Cheat Sheet May 15, 2015.** Why Raising the Minimum Wage Is Not Going to Fix the Problem [http://www.cheatsheet.com/business/why-raising-the-minimum-wage-isnt-a-silver-bullet.html/?a=viewall#ixzz3hnGonl00](http://www.cheatsheet.com/business/why-raising-the-minimum-wage-isnt-a-silver-bullet.html/?a=viewall&amp;ixzz3hnGonl00)

**Dr. Michael Ungar**, [a writer for Psychology Today,](https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/nurturing-resilience/201401/will-higher-minimum-wage-make-people-happier) **puts it like this: “A higher minimum wage may help families**

 **avoid the food banks, but it won’t make them any happier unless their wages hit a level where they feel fairly compensated** for the work they do and their wages are positioned well when compared with the paychecks [sic] of others. **In other words, more money does not equal happiness unless it brings with it social justice**.” Ungar advocates that raising the minimum wage does help families in need, and gives everyone who is affected more buying power. But they won’t be *happy* unless they also feel they’re being compensated fairly compared to others, either within the company or in similar positions elsewhere. The study from the National Academy of Sciences backs up this idea. Life evaluation will continue to increase with income, it said. But emotional well-being (happiness) stops increasing with any

significance around the $75,000 salary mark. That’s the level at which most basic needs can be met without significant trouble, the study suggests, therefore not having as much of an affect on well-being. Perhaps this is where conversation about the disparity of pay between executives and typical employees becomes relevant. One [recent study suggests that](http://www.cheatsheet.com/business/why-big-companies-are-driving-income-inequality.html/) [larger firms,](http://www.cheatsheet.com/business/why-big-companies-are-driving-income-inequality.html/) often with highly paid CEOs, are one of the main contributors to wage inequality in the United States. **The Economic Policy Institute reports that** [**CEO wages increased by 937%**](http://www.epi.org/publication/ceo-pay-continues-to-rise/) **between 1978 to 2013. A typical worker’s compensation grew just 10.2% over that same period.** Referencing the Psychology Today article once more, if employees’ overall happiness depends on perceived equity and worth of their work, not just a higher dollar figure, then the goal of looking out for America’s well-being becomes even more difficult than convincing people to meet in the middle on minimum wage. It also becomes necessary to decrease the pay gap company-wide. Not too many CEOs are willing to take the pay cut that Dan Price just did, and critics argue he might end up paying himself more anyway through bonuses and other means. But **the bottom line is this: Raising the minimum wage will likely help those at the very bottom, which would undoubtedly bring about a sense of relief. But as long as wage disparities in companies**

#### like [Disney, Microsoft, and Oracle](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/12/business/despite-federal-regulation-ceo-worker-pay-gap-data-remains-hidden.html) are the difference of millions of dollars per year, minimum wage workers could realize that the unhappiness persists even with a slightly bump in their paycheck.

# Con: A Resolution to Increase the Minimum Wage

**Raising the minimum wage would decrease jobs.**

**Caroline Baum, Bloomberg View columnist, Charleston Gazette** (West Virginia**) September 7, 2013**

Why not a $50 minimum wage?; A higher wage is not so good for the workers not hired

A higher wage is great for the workers who keep their jobs; it isn't so great for those who wouldn't get hired because McDonald's starts asking its existing workforce to do a bit more. With a higher minimum wage, the cost of automating certain tasks suddenly becomes more affordable. Raising the minimum wage to lift people out of poverty has the opposite effect.

#### Raising the minimum will cause companies to replace workers with machines.

**The Daily Signal. Jan 23, 2014**. <http://dailysignal.com/2014/01/23/bill-gates-raising-minimum-wage-can-destroy-jobs/>

 **Microsoft founder Bill Gates said yesterday that raising the minimum wage can “cause job destruction**.” Gates’s comment in an appearance on MSNBC’s “Morning Joe” surprised some because of his generally liberal political leanings. [Here’s what](file://localhost/C%3A/Users/andersene/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/ww.youtube.com/embed/VLHwMlfximg) **Gates said** when co-host Mika Brzezinski asked his thoughts on raising the minimum wage, including paying employees “a lot more”: “Well, jobs are a great thing. **You have to be a bit careful: If you raise the minimum wage, you’re encouraging labor substitution and you’re going to go buy machines and automate things** — or cause jobs to appear outside of that jurisdiction. And so within certain limits, you know, it does cause job destruction. **If you**

####  really start pushing it, then you’re just making a huge trade-off.”

**Raising the minimum wage defies the law of supply and demand.**

**Caroline Baum, Bloomberg View columnist, Charleston Gazette** (West Virginia**) September 7, 2013**

Why not a $50 minimum wage?; A higher wage is not so good for the workers not hired

So why does an idea that violates the most basic principle of economics keep coming back to haunt us? It may appeal to our humanitarian instincts, but as social policy, it fails the test. Let's start with the basics. **As with any good or service, there is a supply of, and demand for, labor. Supply and demand meet at what's known as the equilibrium price. The unintended consequences of setting a cap or a floor on prices have been well documented. Many economics textbooks use New York City's rent-control laws to demonstrate the effect of price caps: a supply shortage as landlords keep apartments off the market rather than lease them at a below-market rate.** The lack of supply also gives them the power to charge above-market rates on apartments that aren't subject to rent control. **The effect of price floors is just the opposite: a surplus. More people - an increase in the supply of labor - want to work at McDonald's at a rate of $15 an hour than $7.25. That leads to an influx of workers into the labor force and higher unemployment as new entrants fail to find a job.** (You have to be looking for work to count as unemployed.) **The higher the price of labor, the lower the demand.** This is so basic that it defies logic to claim otherwise.

# Con: A Resolution to Increase the Minimum Wage

#### Increasing the minimum wage will cause job losses.

**Doug Bandow. Fellow at the CATO Institute. Jan 14, 2014**. <http://www.cato.org/blog/minimum-wage-immoral-inefficient>

The first question is the minimum’s impact on employment and price levels. The answer is clear: the cost of higher wages will be borne in varying degrees by customers, workers, and investors. [As I wrote in the American Spectator:](http://spectator.org/articles/57409/immoral-and-inefficient)

 **as Nobel Laureate Milton Friedman observed, there ain’t no such thing as a free lunch. Arbitrarily raising the cost of labor—**there is no principled basis for choosing any particular government minimum **—will increase prices, reduce investor returns, and cut employment levels**. **Most vulnerable are workers with the least education, experience, and skills, who tend to be young and minorities. Forcing up wages will not only reduce overall employment, but shift jobs toward higher-skilled workers who are more productive and thus warrant higher pay**. The minimum wage also encourages mechanization, since it makes economic sense for companies to invest more in machines to spend less on labor. In effect, the minimum wage is a tax on labor-intensive companies. No surprise, then, as [explained by Mark](http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/negative-effects-minimum-wage-laws) [Wilson of Applied Economic Strategies in a Cato Institute Policy Analysis](http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/negative-effects-minimum-wage-laws): “**The main finding of economic theory and empirical research over the past 70 years is that minimum wage increases tend to reduce employment**.”

#### Raising the minimum wage is not a practical way to stimulate the economy and if it was we could set the minimum at $100 per hour.

**Doug Bandow. Fellow at the CATO Institute. Jan 14, 2014**. <http://www.cato.org/blog/minimum-wage-immoral-inefficient>

The strangest claim may come from the *Financial Times*, which editorialized: “a higher wage would stimulate the economy without adding a dime to federal spending.” However, **to the extent raising the minimum increases the total amount of wages, it does so by *redistributing* the money from other people, who end up with less to spend on consumption.** No doubt, the employment impact of a small increase, especially if salary levels have been rising, would be modest, which explains recent economic studies demonstrating lesser job loss. But the less significant the increase, the less meaningful any potential benefit. In contrast, those who claim that raising today’s minimum would have no impact on employer behavior fail to demonstrate the courage of their convictions. **If government can hike wages without harm, why stop at $10 or $15 an hour? Why not go to $1000 or $1500? Then everyone in America could be rich at no cost to anyone!**

# A Resolution to Provide Universal Healthcare

1. Whereas, single-payer national health insurance, also known as “Medicare for all,” is a system in which a
2. single public agency organizes health care financing, but the delivery of care remains largely in private
3. hands, and
4. Whereas, under a single-payer system, all residents of the U.S. would be covered for all medically
5. necessary services, including doctor, hospital, preventive, long-term care, mental health, reproductive
6. health care, dental, vision, prescription drug and medical supply costs, and
7. Whereas, a single payer program would be funded by the savings obtained from replacing the current
8. inefficient, profit-oriented, multiple insurance payers with a single streamlined, nonprofit, public payer,
9. and by modest new taxes based on ability to pay, and
10. Whereas, in a single payer system insurance costs would be eliminated and 95 percent of all households
11. would save money, and
12. Whereas, patients would no longer face financial barriers to care such as co-pays and deductibles, and
13. would regain free choice of doctor and hospital and,
14. Whereas, doctors would regain autonomy over patient care, and
15. Whereas access to health care is a human right;
16. THERFORE BE IT RESOLVED by this congress assembled that the United States move immediately to a
17. single payer system of health care delivery by expanding the Medicare program to everyone.

# Pro:A Resolution to Provide Universal Healthcare

Single Payer healthcare will cost less and stabilize the economy.

Richard Master is founder and CEO of MCS Industries The (Allentown, Pa.) Morning Call, August 1, 2017 <http://www.pnhp.org/news/2017/august/a-businessman-makes-the-case-for-a-single-payer-health-care-system>

Single payer — centralized public financing of a continued privately operated health system — will not "bankrupt the United States." In fact, the opposite is true. Single payer is the only internationally proven strategy to transition the U.S. out of its current crisis of runaway health care costs to economic sustainability, where overall system cost growth is consistent with overall economic growth and inflation. At one-sixth of our economy and over 25 percent of the federal budget, health care will continue to be a focus in Congress until real progress is made and the angst of the American people about the system is resolved. It is clear to most Americans that runaway health care costs translate into flat wages and also a deterioration of real disposable income that drags down our 70 percent consumer-driven economy.

Canadian health care proves that the single payer model is best.

Richard Master is founder and CEO of MCS Industries The (Allentown, Pa.) Morning Call, August 1, 2017 <http://www.pnhp.org/news/2017/august/a-businessman-makes-the-case-for-a-single-payer-health-care-system>

We do not need to reinvent the wheel. Single payer is the recognized best practice. Warren Buffet points out that, in the 1970s, Canada and the U.S. had roughly equivalent health system expense — 7 percent of gross domestic product. Canada went the single-payer route; the U.S. did not. Canada covers all of its citizens, has better health outcomes and today spends 11.4 percent of GDP. Our cost went to 18 percent of GDP. France, the highest ranked health system in the world, spends 11.8 percent of GDP, and Japan, 8.5 percent We need to investigate and follow the examples of successful health systems operating throughout the world where all citizens are covered, public health outcomes are measurably superior and the overall cost to society is less. We need to also review closely the many in-depth studies by prominent American economists reporting overall system savings from a transition to centralized financing. Consider in particular the May study, "[Economic analysis of the healthy California single-payer health care proposal (SB-562)](https://www.peri.umass.edu/publication/item/996-economic-analysis-of-the-healthy-california-single-payer-health-care-proposal-sb-562)." That study, from four economists at the University of Massachusetts, demonstrated how single payer would reduce California's overall health care expense by 10 percent, even with universal care for all residents and assuming comprehensive benefits. (The bill has been referred to a legislative committee.)

# Pro: A Resolution to Provide Universal Healthcare

Our current health care system is broken and failing millions of Americans.

Dr. Carol Paris is a psychiatrist and president of Physicians for a National Health Program Common Dreams, July 28, 2017 http://www.pnhp.org/news/2017/july/its-time-for-the-adults-in-this-nation-to-talk-seriously-about-medicare-for-all

Hundreds of people slept overnight in cars, or camped for days in a field. They [told stories](https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/virginia-politics/thousands-flock-to-free-medical-clinic-as-washington-dithers-on-health-care/2017/07/21/07b7d1f2-6d80-11e7-96ab-5f38140b38cc_story.html?utm_term=.3d5a8c5f4683) of yanking out their own teeth with pliers, of reusing insulin syringes until they broke in their arm, of chronic pain so debilitating they could hardly care for their own children. At daybreak, they lined up for several more hours outside a white tent, waiting for their chance to visit a doctor. For many, this was the first health care provider they’ve seen in years. Is this a place torn by war, famine or natural disaster? No, this charity medical clinic was last weekend in southwest Virginia, in the wealthiest country in the world, where we spend nearly three times as much money on health care as other similar countries. And what do we get for our money? **The very definition of health care rationing:** 28 million Americans without insurance, and millions more insured, but avoiding treatment because of sky-high deductibles and co-pays. [Compared](http://www.commonwealthfund.org/interactives/2017/july/mirror-mirror/) to ten other wealthy countries, the U.S. ranks dead last for life expectancy, and access to care. We even have the lowest number of [hospital beds](http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-healthcare-comparison-20170715-htmlstory.html) per capita, a way that health experts measure the capacity of a nation’s health system. It’s as if our system was designed to deny care. America does hit the top of the list in some areas. Compared to other nations, American doctors and patients waste the most hours on billing and insurance claims. We have the highest rate of infant mortality, and the highest percentage of avoidable deaths—patients who die from complications or conditions that could have been avoided with timely care. Clearly, this system is broken. Like a cracked pipe, money gushes into our health care system but steadily leaks out. Money is siphoned into the advertising budgets of insurance companies and the army of corporate bureaucrats working to deny claims. Even more dollars are soaked up by the pockets of insurance CEOs who have collectively earned $9.8 billion since the Affordable Care Act was passed in 2010. Nearly a third of our health care dollars go to something other than health care.

# Pro: A Resolution to Provide Universal Healthcare

Single payer model of health care financing will save billions of dollars and deliver better care then the current broken system.

Dr. Carol Paris is a psychiatrist and president of Physicians for a National Health Program Common Dreams, July 28, 2017 http://www.pnhp.org/news/2017/july/its-time-for-the-adults-in-this-nation-to-talk-seriously-about-medicare-for-all

The good news is that we already have a proven model for health financing that is popular among both patients and physicians. It provides medically-necessary care to the oldest and sickest Americans with a fraction of the overhead of private insurance. It’s called Medicare, and I can tell you as a physician that it has worked pretty darn well for more than 50 years. Not only do we have a model, we have a bill that would expand Medicare to cover everyone and improve it to include prescriptions, dental, vision, and long-term care. It’s called [H.R. 676, the Expanded and Improved Medicare for All Act](https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/676), a single-payer plan that would provide comprehensive care to everyone living in the U.S. The bill would yield about [$500 billion annually](http://org.salsalabs.com/dia/track.jsp?key=-1&url_num=2&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.pnhp.org%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2FHR676_Summary_042517.pdf) in administrative savings while covering the 28 million currently uninsured. Medicare for all is gaining steam with a record 115 co-sponsors, a majority of House Democrats. Now that Republican senators have finally worn themselves out, Sen. Bernie Sanders plans to file his own single-payer Medicare for all bill. Senators from both parties will be asked to choose a side: Do you support the current system of health care rationing, medical bankruptcies and unnecessary deaths; or a program proven to work both here and in every other developed country? A [majority](http://apnorc.org/PDFs/July%202017%20Health%20Care/July%20Omnibus%20Topline_FINAL.pdf) of Americans now believe that health care is a human right, and that it is our government's responsibility to achieve universal coverage. We’ve tried everything else except Medicare for all. What are we waiting for?

# Con: A Resolution to Provide Universal Healthcare

The single payer system will lead to over use of health care.

Paul Bloustein, M.D., Cincinnati, Ohio The Hill May 2017

<http://thehill.com/opinion/letters/332440-the-problem-with-a-single-payer-healthcare-system-in-the-us>

While a single-payer healthcare system may relieve progressive dyspepsia, it will leave others with extreme distress. All doctors are familiar with distortions of care associated with insurance for all paid for by some. My favorite story involves an emergency room stint one day while serving in our military. I saw a woman who qualified for free care by virtue of her husband’s military status. I introduced myself and asked what brought her to the base hospital’s emergency room. She asked me to check her throat. When I inquired when it began to hurt, she answered that it didn’t hurt but that it was Tuesday and she always does grocery shopping at the commissary on Tuesday and thought she would have her throat checked. I asked, so like checking the oil in your car? Yes, she answered. I dutifully looked at her throat, pronounced it the finest I had seen that day and sent her on her satisfied way.

When single-payer healthcare arrives in our fair land and everything is “free,” we should anticipate an epidemic of throat checks.

The Canadian health care is not something we should model. They have incredibly long wait periods to receive care.

National Review April of 2017 <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/446689/canada-single-payer-health-care-system-failures-cautionary-tale>

When it comes to the final metric, quality of care, Canada lags behind most other developed Western nations. A 2014 report by the Commonwealth Fund ranked Canada tenth out of eleven wealthy countries (ahead of only the United States) in health-care quality, and dead last in timeliness of care. The report showed that 29 percent of adult Canadians who fell ill and needed to see a specialist waited two months or longer, and 18 percent waited four months or longer, compared with 6 percent and 7 percent of Americans, respectively. Canada’s quality of care is poor, and it continues to deteriorate in the face of a looming fiscal crunch and further rationing. In Canada’s single-payer system, citizens cannot pay directly for procedures, and they cannot purchase private insurance to cover services provided by the CHA. They must instead wait in line or seek health-care services outside the country.

# Con: A Resolution to Provide Universal Healthcare

Single payer system would fail for many reasons.

Heritage Foundation 2009

<http://www.heritage.org/health-care-reform/report/single-payer-why-government-run-health-care-will-harm-both-patients-and>

This concentration of government power over health care would have a profound impact on all Americans, especially members of the medical profession. Such government control would: Result in substantially lower payments to physicians and other health care providers compared to a multiple-payer system; Reduce the quality of care by limiting the ability of physicians to invest in advanced medical equipment that takes advantage of new technology; Limit access to care in the near term, as current physicians and other professionals retire earlier or otherwise leave the profession; Limit access to care even more substantially in the long term, as the prospect of lower lifetime earnings reduces the incentive for talented people to choose careers in health care; and Reduce the rate of medical progress, because fewer talented people receiving medical training decreases the supply of talented medical researchers.

Single payer system would lead to fewer health care providers leading to the need to ration care. Also the lack of competition will destroy our standard of care.

Mediscape December 2015 http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/855271

One critic noted that single-payer systems in Canada, the United Kingdom, and other developed countries have to impose strict central planning. Rather than leave healthcare choices up to individual physicians, their patients, and free-market forces that could balance supply with demand, the government sets the rule. This would inevitably result in shortages of some services and gluts of others. And with no competitors, central planners could arbitrarily decide what physician payments should be. Studies of countries with universal coverage show that their doctors earn up to 70% less than doctors here. Another disturbing aspect of a single-payer system is the lack of competition among payers, which would reduce physicians' control over standards of care and reimbursement. In a multipayer system, doctors can choose which insurers to work with—even opting out of Medicare and Medicaid, as doctors are increasingly choosing to do. They couldn't in a pure single-payer system. Critics also point to waiting lists so long in the much-vaunted Canadian single-payer system that some Canadians choose to come to the United States or other countries to receive timely care. Britain's National Health Service, often held up as model of how single-payer can work, is plagued by chronic problems in the quality of care that put some patients at life-threatening risk. The closest analogue we have to a single-payer system here, the Veterans Health Administration, has been rocked by scandals about untimely access and is staffed by too few doctors, who, one critic charges, "work shorter hours just punching a clock."

# Con:A Resolution to Provide Universal Healthcare

Single payer health care encourages over consumption of services and leads to rationing and decreased quality of care.

Real Clear Policy February 2016 <http://www.realclearpolicy.com/blog/2016/02/19/single_payer_is_inherently_problematic_1558.html>

The second issue with single-payer health care is that it encourages overconsumption. While it’s emotionally satisfying to attack those who make money off the sick, "free" health care incentivizes people to use it unnecessarily. According to Health Affairs, people who are newly insured tend to consume twice as much health care due to their insurance. But while demand for health care rises under single-payer, supply drops. Single-payer advocates argue that the government, as the sole buyer of health care, could use its buying power to drive down prices. The problem is that lower prices set by government lead to reduced output. This can also be seen in Medicare today, as 9,539 physicians opted out of Medicare in 2012. In a single-payer health-care system, some of these would leave the market, leading to shortages. Advocates of single-payer nevertheless claim that it works: Just look at other countries. It is true that health care is often less expensive in single-payer countries, but with health care you get what you pay for. In countries with single-payer, advanced medical technology is often hard to come by. The United States has four times as many MRI machines per capita as Canada and five times as many as Britain. Similar shortages are found in CT scanners. Fewer women get mammograms in single-payer countries, which leads to lower five-year cancer survival rates. Advanced procedures are often rationed. In 2010, Norway, Sweden, and Canada reported that over half of patients waited more than four weeks for specialist appointments.

Even basic care is rationed, as “free” health care creates a mismatch between supply and demand. Patients in Canada, for instance, wait an average of 13 weeks for surgical and diagnostic treatment. Compare that to three weeks for Americans. Rationing often hits the poor hardest, because the wealthy have more freedom to wait (they can take time off work, for instance) and can often afford to travel abroad or obtain additional private health-care coverage. The lack of profit incentive also leads to mistakes. The U.K. and other single-payer countries have higher mortality rates within 30 days of hospital admission for a heart attack, as well as increased risk of postoperative complications. Half of Canadian discharged patients are not given post-treatment instructions on follow-up care, contacts, or treatment options. Compare that to only about a quarter of patients in the U.S. Profit-maximizing hospitals work hard to decrease complications, because complications are expensive.