

VANCE'S PLAN FOR STAY-AT-HOME PAY

Rachel Greszler, Senior Research Fellow

Joel Griffith, Senior Fellow

SEPTEMBER 11, 2026



TOPLINE: Vice President Vance is proposing a poorly designed expansion of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) benefit to include stay-at-home parents (currently, only working single parents and dual-income households are eligible).

Conservatives should oppose this expansion, which would expose the sanctity of the family to government intrusion, discourage work, and create new avenues for fraud.

CCDF Background:

- CCDF was created during welfare reform in the 1990s to help low- and moderate-income parents afford childcare so they could develop the skills to move off welfare.
- [870,000 families](#)—80 percent of whom are single parents, predominantly mothers—receive a total of \$12 billion in subsidies to help pay for childcare.
- CCDF is already stretched beyond capacity: nearly 400,000 children are currently on [wait lists](#).

Vance's Draft Proposal:

- **Stay-at-home parent families making less than state income limits could reportedly receive the same benefit, averaging \$9,000 per child per year.**
- To qualify, one spouse must work 35+ hours a week, while the other earns *nothing*.

Forced to Pick: Invasive Government Scrutiny or Rampant Fraud?

- Treating parenting as a “childcare service” requires government oversight.
 - *Without proper oversight*, the expansion opens the door to significant fraud.
 - *With proper oversight*, bureaucrats will need to inspect families' homes and scrutinize their tax returns.

Punishing Work, Imposing Childcare Arrangements:

- Stay-at-home spouses receiving benefits would be prevented from performing *any* remote, part-time, or gig work.
 - Welfare's goal is to get people *into* work and *off* of welfare.
 - **This proposal would do the opposite**, using already limited resources.
- The government should not use taxpayer money to direct family arrangements.

BOTTOM LINE: American families need the freedom and flexibility to make the decisions that work best for them—not taxpayer-funded subsidies that reward one family's arrangement over another. Conservatives are already familiar with the danger of expanding the welfare state. Just because a proposal seeks to assist a segment of society that conservatives are favorable toward doesn't make it good policy.

