

quality, and enrolled their children in schools based only on geographical proximity, would nonetheless know that their schools had survived the competitive test. The uninformed parent would be served in much the same way as the hasty shopper in a supermarket: even the shopper who pays little attention to unit prices or to other indicators of value is well-served by the market \hat{G} by the informed choices of millions of shoppers and the competitive pressures on producers to serve those shoppers best. This is not to say that some uninformed parents would not be taken advantage of by some schools in the short-run. But in the long run, competitive pressures would tend to force out of the market schools that did not serve parent needs relatively well. Uninformed parents would not be served as well as informed ones, however. Those parents who care most about education would strive harder to match their children with the most appropriate schools. Of course this happens in today's educational system too. Parents who value education choose their homes based on the quality of local schools or, if they can afford to do so, send their children to superior private schools. But the inequities in the current system are no excuse for inequities in a new system. To reduce inequities in a system of competition and choice, the government