

If persons start rejecting something based upon the fact that it does not afford quality, then the competing systems have to accelerate and improve their offerings in order to again maintain their position.

I am not one who thinks that the public school system is in such desperate shape that it can't continue to attract on the basis of quality students in competition with other systems.

To take your theory and your hypothesis, let us suppose we have a classroom of 30 children in which, well, everything is in a classroom with equality and the 10 most motivated parents decide to remove 10 of the children and put them in a competing system.

Well, two things can happen. One the children left behind will continue to experience lack of quality or it is just possible that seeing the 10 children are leaving, the teacher, the superintendent, and the principal will work together to install and to assist in every degree possible in giving a better education to the 20 who are left.

That is the way the competitive system has worked in my experience. When you lose a customer you start improving your quality. At the same time I would not look at this as a one way street.

If there is a superior education in a competing system I would expect in return for the recognition that the parent has a right to hope for that and get the same quality and the same parameters would be introduced into the public system and there would be a cross over in both ways.

What I am referring to here again is not a subsidy where every parent regardless of means has the opportunity to move in and have his children subsidized in any school of his choice.

I am suggesting only in this regard where we have disadvantaged parents who are a burden in the sense that they do not have the means to do any of the things necessary to maintain a family unit, and that is get a better home, get adequate housing, adequate transportation to jobs, adequate benefits, socioeconomic benefits, and most important education that we recognize that education is the No. 1 route of the dilemma.

In this regard the tuition or the assistance payment would go to the family so that it would come into the quality school program not as much—not as an admitte from the poorfarm, one who is coming in with the stigma of a disadvantaged child.

The family would bring with it an input into the quality of that system which would be a gain and the children would be accepted on the basis as all other children in the system so there would be no disparity.

Again I would go back to my same point. Competition would be certainly better than what we have now which would be merely a myriad in which poorer quality would be replaced by poorer quality as the middle denominator moves down. At this sign of hope, no sign of rescue for these children should be abandoned.

I would point to the distinguished panel that is gathered by the task force on education and by all of the people in the chamber of commerce. I certainly want to associate my overall socioeconomic views with this.