

It was reduced to a cipher. I should like to refer for a moment and quote from the President's special message to the Congress on health and education in which under special programs for special needs educating poor children, and I will excerpt:

Let us begin new efforts like the Headstart, Follow-Through program which can carry forward into the early grades the gains made under Headstart.

There is no provision made for "Follow through" in this budgetary analysis. As a matter of fact, thence are 50,000 youngsters in New York City who have gone through a prekindergarten program, a Headstart program and are drop outs because there has been no provision for a continuation into kindergarten for them.

Mr. SCHEUER. Do you have any figures on the percentage of children in New York City or New York State who are eligible for kindergarten—in a State where kindergarten is mandated to be available if a parent wished to place his child in kindergarten—but who are not there even though their parents prefer that they be there?

Mrs. LEVIN. I do not have it but I can find out.

Mr. SCHEUER. Almost half of the children in my district are not in kindergarten and I have had repeated reports from parents who have taken their children to kindergarten and are told there are no facilities available.

Under the State law there is a mandate for all children to be in first grade and a mandate for all children to be in kindergarten if their parents so desire. To me this is an outrageous situation.

Mrs. LEVIN. We concur absolutely.

A further analysis of these figures indicate that the upper grades get a disproportionate flow of funds and prekindergarten and early childhood education are left short changed.

No. 2. We ask that you strengthen the role of community participation to provide checkpoints on title I allocations.

When the veto was eliminated from the original act, the community action agencies were left powerless.

In New York City, the Council Against Poverty, beginning August 8, 1966, asked specific questions of the board of education about 1966-67 proposals; they renewed their request for information on subsequent dates in August, September, and October.

The information was still lacking on October 20 when everybody agreed that this should not happen, but, in point of fact, the programs had already been put into effect as of the September opening of schools, so it was all rather meaningless.

I should like to make a final point with regard to the reduced effectiveness of the New York City community action agency with the removal of the veto:

The Council Against Poverty's Education Committee reviewed the latest title I tentative projects just this past week. A letter dated March 14 was addressed to the president of the board of education in which the council went on record criticizing the lack of meaning in its consultative role for programs had actually started prior to the requested endorsement of the Council Against Poverty. For example, they were consulted in regard to a pilot education program for pregnant school-age girls. Endorsement was sought at the end of February for this program which had been started in January.