

Great Society Programs Would Face Dismantling

By JOHN HERBERS
Special to The New York Times

JAN 23 1971

WASHINGTON, Jan. 22—President Nixon's proposal to divert about one-third of the federal domestic grant programs into broad categories of revenue sharing would dismantle some of the major Great Society programs enacted by Democratic administrations.

However, over-all aid to the state and local governments would rise in the next fiscal year because of \$5-billion proposed in new money for general revenue sharing and other increases.

Under the plan, about \$10-billion now being spent in a multiplicity of special grants and programs and \$1-billion in new funds would be put in a revenue-sharing fund and dispersed to the state and local governments for expenditures

under six broad categories—urban development, rural development, education, transportation, manpower training and law enforcement.

President Nixon did not specify tonight in his State of the Union Message which programs he would propose for diversion.

This is to come later in a special message to Congress. They have been chosen, however, and officials in the White House and the departments disclosed some of them.

About 100 of what Mr. Nixon called "narrow purpose aid programs" are scheduled for diversion. All but about 25 of these are in education.

Under the proposed change, roughly the same amount of

Continued on Page 13, Column 6

Continued From Page 1, Col. 7

money would be appropriated by Congress, but the governments receiving the money could spend it as they wished under a general, federally specified purpose and under requirements of the civil rights laws.

All titles of the Secondary and Elementary education Act of 1965, one of President Johnson's chief Great Society efforts, would go into the proposed revenue sharing fund for education.

Now, for example, Title I—amounting to about \$1-billion a year—is prescribed for schools with a large number of disadvantaged students. Under the proposed change, the local governments could continue to spend the money in the same way they are now, or they could completely change the distribution, philosophy and purpose in use of the funds.

Most of the \$575-million a year now going into Model Cities, one of the major urban programs of the Johnson Administration, would be diverted to the urban development fund of revenue sharing. Model cities would remain largely an administrative device.

The cities could keep their Model Cities agencies operating as a special impact program for the poverty in the inner-cities; the plan calls for no city to get less money in Federal aid than it is now receiving. But they would not be required to pour special funds into the poverty areas.

Other major urban programs, such as urban renewal and water and sewer grants, would be trimmed under the proposal, but not as much as Model Cities.

Other Programs Covered

Other programs to be placed under the revenue sharing package include the following: ¶Most of the manpower training programs administered by the Labor Department.

¶The anticrime funds appropriated under the Safe Streets Act of 1968 and administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in the Justice Department.

¶Rural development programs administered by the Agriculture Department.

¶Urban mass transit programs administered by the Transportation Department.

"Under this plan," Mr. Nixon said tonight, "the Federal Government will provide the state and localities with more money and less interference, and, by cutting down the interference, the same amount of money will go a lot further."

The Nixon Administration has been skeptical of many of the programs involved ever since it took office two years ago. Model cities, for example, has had an on-again-off-again existence for the last two years.

Title I of the education act has been criticized both inside and outside the Administration, largely because some school districts have misused the funds, spreading them among the affluent as well as the poor.

For a number of reasons, the plan is certain to arouse considerable opposition, even though state and local officials have consistently demanded less Federal controls.

At stake is whether Congress is willing to give up the right to specify the purpose for which Federal funds are to be spent. Some of the programs that would be diverted to revenue sharing are in block grants—those that give the local governments wide latitude in expending them for a particular goal. Model Cities and Safe Streets are included in this category.

But most are in categorical grants—that is, for specific purposes under somewhat strict Federal guidelines.

When Mr. Nixon asked last year to take the restrictions off a proliferation of manpower training programs and allow them to be administered under one flexible fund, Congress balked and specified precisely how much could be spent—and how—in each program.