

Table 1. Side-by-Side Comparison of Current Law (Title IV-B of the Social Security Act) and Explanation of Changes Proposed in the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 (H.R. 5640, as introduced)

(Unless otherwise noted, references to certain Titles, parts, subparts, or sections of law are to the Social Security Act.)

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
Section 1 - Short Title		
<i>Short title</i>	Not applicable	The short title of bill is the “Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006.”
Section 2 - Reauthorization of the Safe and Stable Families Program		
<i>Elimination of Findings</i>	Contains Congressional findings related to the need for and importance of each of the service categories supported by the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) program (Title IV-B, Subpart 2).	Would strike this findings subsection.
<i>Limitation on Administrative Cost Reimbursement</i>	Requires states (as a condition of approval of their state plan for the PSSF program) to assure that they will spend no more than 10% of the federal funds they receive for this program on administrative costs.	Would add language to prohibit the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) from making any payment of PSSF funds to a state for administrative costs that are above 10% of the total PSSF expenditures of the state.
<i>Funding of Mandatory Grants</i>	For FY2006, authorizes mandatory appropriation for the PSSF program of \$345 million.	Would extend this authorization level for mandatory appropriation of \$345 million for each of FY2007–FY2011.
<i>Funding of Discretionary Grants</i>	For each of FY2002-FY2006, authorizes discretionary appropriations up to \$200 million for the PSSF.	Would extend this authorization level for discretionary appropriations of \$200 million through each of FY2007–FY2011.
<i>Increase in Set-Asides for Indian tribes</i>	For each of FY2002-FY2006, provides that 1% of the mandatory funds authorized and 2% of any discretionary funds appropriated must be set-aside for tribal child and family services programs. (The minimum funding available to tribes is \$3.45 million and the maximum is \$7.45 million)	Would increase the set-aside for tribal programs to 3% of any discretionary funds appropriated and 3% of the mandatory funds authorized [and which remain after the separate reservation of funds for monthly caseworker visits is made (see additional provisions in Section 3 of the proposed bill described below)]. (The minimum funding available to tribes would be \$9.15 million and the maximum funding would be \$15.15 million.)

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
<i>Collection of Information About Tribal Promoting Safe and Stable Families Programs</i>	To receive PSSF funding, tribes must meet the same plan requirements that states must meet (which are generally related to planning and reporting on the planned use of the funds, provision of these services, and administration of the funds received). However, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) may exempt an Indian tribe from any of the plan requirements that it determines is inappropriate for that tribe (after taking into account the resources, needs, and other circumstances of the tribe).	Would eliminate the ability of HHS to exempt tribes from any of the PSSF plan requirements.
<i>Authority of Intertribal Consortia to Apply for Grants</i>	Out of the funds reserved for tribal child and family services programs, allotments are made to each eligible tribe based on the tribe’s relative share of individuals under the age of 21. However, no tribe may have an approved PSSF plan (i.e., eligible for PSSF funding) if its allotment, under this formula, would be less than \$10,000.	Would clarify that an intertribal consortia (a group of tribes) can together submit a single PSSF plan for approval.
<i>Technical Correction</i>	For the purposes of Title IV-B Subpart 2, defines “Indian tribe” as any Indian tribe and any Alaska native organization as they were defined in a certain section of the JOBS program (Title IV-F) of the Social Security Act and as it was in effect on August 22, 1986. The JOBS program was repealed as of the enactment (on August 22, 1996) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (P.L. 104-193).	Would strike the incorrect reference to “1986” and replace it with “1996”.
Section 3 – Targeting of Increased Safe and Stable Families Program Resources to Support Monthly Caseworker Visits		
<i>Reservation and Use of Funds</i>	Out of the annual mandatory funds authorized for PSSF, reserves certain amounts for Indian tribes, the Court Improvement Program, and for research, evaluation, training and technical assistance related to the PSSF program.	<p>Would provide that out of the \$345 million in mandatory funds authorized for PSSF in each of FY2006-FY2011, \$40 million must be reserved annually to support monthly caseworker visits of children in foster care (“with a primary emphasis on activities designed to improve caseworker retention, recruitment, training, and ability to access the benefits of technology”).</p> <p>States receiving an allotment of PSSF funds to support monthly caseworker visits of children in foster care must not use these funds to supplant any federal funds already paid to the state for these purposes under the Title IV-E foster care program and which could be used to accomplish the same purposes.</p>
<i>Effect on Amounts Reserved for Indian Tribes</i>	One percent of all mandatory funds authorized for PSSF must be reserved for tribal funding. The determination of the amount to reserve must be made before other set-asides or allotments of PSSF funds are made.	Three percent of mandatory funds [as provided in Section 2 of the proposed bill] would be set aside for tribal programs. The determination of the amount to reserve would be made after the set-aside of \$40 million to support monthly caseworker visits, but

CRS-3

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
		before any other reservations or allotments of PSSF funds are made.
<i>Allotment of Funds</i> (re-allotment)	A state, tribe, or territory may certify that it will not need some or all of the PSSF funds allotted to it for a given fiscal year and HHS must re-allot those funds (using the regular program allotment methodology) to the other states, tribes, or territories.	The re-allotment provisions do not apply to the allotment of funds made out of the \$40 million in funding that is reserved for support of monthly caseworker visits.
<i>Allotment of Funds</i> (to support monthly caseworker visits)	No provision.	<p>For FY2006 and any succeeding year, funds reserved for monthly caseworker support would be distributed to each territory or state that meets the specific requirements for this funding.</p> <p>PSSF funds to support monthly caseworker visits would be allotted first to eligible territories as they are currently allotted for the Child Welfare Services program, <i>except</i> that there would be no minimum allotment of \$70,000.</p> <p>The remaining PSSF funds to support monthly caseworker visits would be allotted to each eligible state (including the District of Columbia) that meets the specific requirements for the funding, and based on each state's relative share of the average monthly number of children receiving food stamps (among all states eligible to receive these funds).</p>
<i>Allotment of funds</i> (special rules applicable to funds reserved to support monthly caseworker visits)	No provision.	<p>[There would be no specific requirements made of states to receive their allotment out of this \$40 million in FY2006. However, states would need to meet the general rules related to these funds, which would provide that the state may not use the funds to supplant federal Title IV-E funds available for the same purpose. Moreover, to receive its full allotment of these funds, a state must provide at least 25% of the expenditures on activities to support monthly caseworker visits.]</p> <p>For FY2007, in order for a state or territory to receive an allotment from the PSSF funds reserved for the support of monthly caseworker visits, that state or territory would be required to provide data to HHS that show, (for the most recent fiscal year that the information is available), the percentage of children in its foster care caseload that received at least one visit per month from their assigned caseworker and, what percentage of those visits occurred at the place where the child was living.</p>

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
		<p>For FY2008 and succeeding fiscal years, in order for a state or territory to receive an allotment from the PSSF funds reserved for the support of monthly caseworker visits, that state or territory must provide data to HHS showing that in the preceding fiscal year, 90% of the children in its foster care caseload were visited at least monthly, and that the majority of those visits occurred at the place where the child was living; or the state or territory must be making “requisite annual progress” (as determined by HHS) to enable it to meet those standards no later than October 1, 2011. In addition, HHS would need to have determined that the state or territory has policies and standards in effect that enable it to determine whether it has met those standards for monthly caseworker visits. Finally, the state or territory would also need to provide documentation to HHS demonstrating that it has not used these PSSF funds to supplant any federal Title IV-E funding available for the same purposes.</p>
<i>Payments to States</i>	<p>A state, tribe, or territory is entitled to receive its full allotment of mandatory PSSF funds or an amount equal to 75% of its total expenditures for activities under the PSSF plan (whichever is less).</p>	<p>A state, tribe, or territory is entitled to receive its full allotment of the mandatory PSSF funds, which are not provided to support monthly caseworker visits, or an amount equal to 75% of its total expenditures for activities under the PSSF plan (whichever is less). Separately, a state or territory would also be entitled to receive its full allotment of mandatory PSSF funds to support monthly caseworker visits, or an amount equal to 75% of its total expenditures for activities designed to support these visits (whichever is less).</p>
<p>Section 4 – Improvements to the Child Welfare Services Program</p>		
<i>Funding</i>	<p>Authorizes annual discretionary appropriations up to \$325 million for the Child Welfare Services program (Title IV-B, Subpart 1) on an indefinite basis (no year limitation). Provides that funding for this program must be made as an advance appropriations (that is provided in the appropriations cycle immediately preceding the year in which states are allotted the funds). Includes language permitting two years of appropriations for this program in one appropriations bill to permit a transition to an advance appropriation. These provisions are contained in Section 420.</p>	<p>Would maintain the annual discretionary authorization level of \$325 million but would limit that authorization to each of FY2007–FY2011 (and would move this provision to a different section of Title IV-B, Subpart 1). Would eliminate the language regarding advance appropriations, including the provision related to making the transition from regular to advance appropriations.</p>
<i>Purpose of Program</i>	<p>States that the purpose of the program is to enable the United States, through HHS, to cooperate with state public welfare agencies to</p>	<p>Would strike all of these provisions (contained in Sections 420 and 425). Would create a new section stating the purposes of Title IV-</p>

CRS-5

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
	<p>establish, extend and strengthen child welfare services. Defines child welfare services for all of Title IV-B of the Social Security Act as “public social services” that aim to achieve the following purposes: 1) protect and promote the well-being of all children, including handicapped, homeless, dependent, or neglected children; 2) prevent, remedy or assist in the solution of problems that might result in neglect, abuse, exploitation, or delinquency of children; 3) prevent the unnecessary separation of children from their families by identifying family problems, assisting families in resolving their problems, and preventing breakup of the family (where this is desirable and possible); 4) reuniting families in which children have been removed by the provision of services to the children and their families; 5) placing children in suitable adoptive homes (in cases where restoration to the biological family is not possible or appropriate); 6) and assuring adequate care of children away from their homes, (in cases where a child cannot be returned home or placed for adoption).</p> <p>Further specifies that money spent by states to comply with certain child protections and certain reporting requirements, or to provide reimbursement to families for non-recurring expenses related to the adoption of children (who meet the federal eligibility criteria of Title IV-E) are to be understood as having been spent on child welfare services.</p>	<p>B, Subpart 1 is to promote state flexibility in the development and expansion of a coordinated child and family services program (that utilizes community-based agencies and that ensures all children are raised in safe and loving families, by 1) protecting and promoting the welfare of all children; 2) preventing the neglect, abuse, or exploitation of children; 3) supporting at-risk families through services which allow children, where appropriate, to remain safely with their families or return to their families in a timely manner; 4) promoting the safety, permanence and well-being of children in foster care; and 5) providing training, professional development and support to ensure a well-qualified child welfare workforce.</p> <p>Would strike this language.</p>
<p><i>Modification of State Plan Requirements</i> [administration and planning requirements]</p>	<p>To be eligible for Child Welfare Services funding, states are required to develop a plan that meets a number of requirements. Among other things, states are required to provide in this plan – that standards and requirements imposed for child care provided under Title XX (Social Services Block Grant) must be applied to day care provided under this program (except for eligibility requirements); and that the state will train and make effective use of paraprofessional staff in administering the program (with particular emphasis on the full or part-time employment of low income individuals as community services aids), and of volunteers (unpaid or partially paid) to provide services and assist any advisory committees established by the state agency;</p> <p>To be eligible for Child Welfare Services funding, states are also required to develop a plan that provides – 1) a description of the services to be provided and the geographic areas where the services will be available; 2) a description of the steps the state will take to</p>	<p>Would eliminate these plan requirements related to child care standards and use of para-professionals and volunteers.</p> <p>Would restate and shorten these provisions. A state would be required to describe the services and activities to be funded under the Child Welfare Services program and how those services will achieve the purposes of Title IV-B, Subpart 1. A state would also</p>

CRS-6

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
	provide child welfare services and to make progress in covering additional political subdivisions; to reach additional children in need of services; to expand and strengthen the range of existing services (including developing new types of services); and 3) a description of the state’s child welfare services staff development and training plan.	be required to describe the steps it will take to provide child welfare services statewide, to expand and strengthen the range of its existing services, and to develop and implement services to improve child outcomes. Further it would be required to describe their child welfare services staff development and training plan.
<i>Modification of State Plan Requirements</i> [child protection requirements]	<p>As a condition of receiving Child Welfare Services funding, states must provide certain protections to any child in foster care. These protections are contained in the state plan requirements and include the requirements that the state agency must (since June 17, 1980) have completed an inventory of all children who had been in foster care for at least 6 months and to have reviewed state policies and judicial procedures regarding children abandoned shortly after birth (including policies related to legal representation of these children); and must be implementing policies and procedures determined (based on this review) to enable permanency decisions to be made expeditiously for abandoned children.</p> <p>NOTE: In addition, under this state plan provision, states are required to be operating (to the satisfaction of HHS) a statewide information system, a case review system (on behalf of every child in foster care and as defined in Section 475(5)), a service program, and a pre-placement services program.</p>	<p>Would delete the provision related to having completed an inventory of children in foster care and would rewrite the provision concerning policies and procedures for children abandoned shortly after birth to simply assert that a state must have in effect administrative and judicial procedures for children who are abandoned (at or shortly after birth) to ensure expeditious decisions can be made for their permanent placement.</p> <p>NOTE: Would retain, as currently written, all of the provisions related to the required state operation of a statewide information system, a case review system to ensure regular review of a foster child’s status and permanency plan, a service program that reunites children with their parents or, where appropriate, places them with adoptive parents or legal guardians; and a pre-placement services program to prevent foster care placements when possible.</p>
<i>Modification of State Plan Requirements</i> [new requirements]	No provision.	As part of its state Child Welfare Services plans, and as a condition of receiving this funding (Title IV-B, Subpart 1), states would be required to provide assurances that no more than 10% of the expenditures made under the Child Welfare Services program will be for administrative costs; and, separately, to outline how the state will ensure that physicians or other appropriate medical professionals are actively consulted and involved in assessing the health and well-being of foster children and in determining appropriate medical treatment for these children.
(Definitions)	Defines child welfare services for all of Title IV-B (as described above in row labeled “Purposes”).	<p>Would strike the definition of child welfare services (see discussion in row labeled “Purposes” above).</p> <p>Would define administrative costs as those costs that the state incurs as part of administering the Child Welfare Services program</p>

CRS-7

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
		(under Title IV-B, Subpart 1), provided those costs are for procurement, payroll management, management, personnel functions (other than portion of salaries of supervisors that can be attributed to providing direct supervision of caseworker services), maintenance and operation of space and property, data processing and computer services, accounting, budgeting, auditing and travel expenses (other than those related to caseworker provision of services or oversight of programs funded under Child Welfare Services).
<i>Provisions Relating to State Allotments</i> [technical/ stylistic changes only]	Funds appropriated for Child Welfare Services are allotted to states (including territories) based on a statutory formula.	Would maintain the current allotment method while making conforming changes (related to moving and renumbering of provisions that would occur with the proposed changes in this bill) along with other stylistic changes, (including adding subsection headings to describe subject matter and replacing “per centum” with “percentage” in each place that it appears).
<i>Provisions Relating to State Allotments</i> (re-allotment of funds)	<p>If a state certifies that it will not need all of its allotment of Child Welfare Services funding to carry out its plan, those funds must be available for re-allotment to other states by HHS.</p> <p>HHS may not re-allot any Child Welfare Services funds that are withheld or recovered from a state because of the state’s failure to meet the foster child protection requirements in the Child Welfare Services plan.</p>	<p>Would maintain the basic allotment provisions but would re-organize them (and include subject headings).</p> <p>Would delete the provision prohibiting re-allotment of funds based on failure of a state to maintain the foster child protections contained in the Child Welfare Services state plan.</p>
<i>Payments to States</i> [use of funds, matching, and maintenance of effort requirements]	<p>States are limited in the amount of federal Child Welfare Services funds that they may spend for foster care maintenance payments, adoption assistance payments and child day care (necessary solely to allow the training or employment of a parent or relative); no state may spend more of its federal Child Welfare funds for these purposes than the amount of the federal funds it received for this program in FY1979 (when total federal funding was \$56.5 million).</p> <p>However, state expenditures on foster care maintenance payments may be counted as child welfare services for purposes of the state meeting the 25% match required to receive its full allotment of Child Welfare Services funds.</p> <p>A state may not receive more federal funding for the Child Welfare Services program than it received in FY1979 (when the total federal</p>	<p>Would prohibit states from spending any Child Welfare Services funding for child day care (for any reason), foster care maintenance payments, or adoption assistance.</p> <p>Would delete provision allowing states to count spending on foster care maintenance payments for purposes of providing matching funds under the Child Welfare Services program.</p> <p>Would provide that in establishing what the required maintenance of effort level is, the state must include the funds it spent in</p>

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
	funding level was \$56.5 million) unless the state maintains at least the level of non-federal (state and local) expenditures for these services in FY1979. In determining both what the state's FY1979 expenditure level was and what the state's current spending level is, states are to exclude all spending for foster care maintenance payments, adoption assistance, and child day care (related to employment or training of a parent or relative).	FY1979 (under this program) for foster care maintenance payments, adoption assistance and child day care. At the same time, for the purpose of determining whether a state is meeting that maintenance of effort requirement in FY2007 (and every subsequent fiscal year), the state must continue to <i>exclude</i> costs for expenditures related to those same activities.
<i>Payments to States</i> [limitation on reimbursement for administrative costs]	No provision.	Would prohibit HHS from making any payment of Child Welfare Services funds to a state for administrative costs that are above 10% of the total expenditures for the program.
<i>Elimination of Obsolete Provision</i>	Section 426(b) authorizes \$4 million for each of FY1988-FY1990 to enable HHS to make grants to public or private nonprofit entities to conduct demonstration projects to develop alternative care arrangements for healthy infants who would otherwise remain in inappropriate hospital settings.	Would delete this provision.
<i>Conforming Amendments</i>	Not applicable.	See below - "NOTE - Certain Technical and Conforming Amendments in Section 4 of the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006"
(Child Welfare Traineeships)	Section 429 authorizes HHS to provide grants to a public or nonprofit institution of higher learning to provide stipends for child welfare worker traineeships.	Would move all of the language in this section to a new subsection of Section 426.
Section 5 - Reauthorization of the Court Improvement Program		
<i>Reauthorization of the Court Improvement Program</i>	For each of FY2002-FY2006, an eligible highest state court (with an approved application) is entitled to a share of funds to assess and make improvements to its handling of child welfare procedures. (These funds are set-aside out of the appropriations provided for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program.) To receive its full allotment of these funds the court, in each of FY2002-FY2006, is required to provide at least 25% of the expenditures for this purpose.	Would extend both the entitlement to payment and the related matching requirement for each of FY2007-FY2011.
Section 6 - Reauthorization of Program for Mentoring Children of Prisoners		
(Program authorization)	For each of FY2002-FY2006, authorizes HHS to make grants to support programs that provide mentoring services to children of prisoners.	Would extend the authority of HHS to make these grants for each of FY2007 to FY2011.

CRS-9

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
(Limitation on Appropriations Authorized)	Provides an indefinite (no year limit) authorization of appropriation of “such sums as may be necessary” for the Mentoring Children of Prisoners program	Would limit the authorization for appropriation of “such sums as may be necessary” for this program to five years (FY2007-FY2011).
Section 7 - Availability of Additional Promoting Safe and Stable Families Resources for Fiscal Year 2006		
<i>Appropriation</i>	In December 2005, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (P.L. 109-149) appropriated what was then the full mandatory funding authorization of \$305 million for the PSSF program for FY2006. Enacted in February 2006, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-171) raised the mandatory funding authorization for the PSSF program to \$345 million for FY2006.	Would provide the full FY2006 mandatory funding authorization for the PSSF program by appropriating an additional \$40 million in FY2006 funds for the program.
<i>Availability of Funds</i>	States may expend PSSF in the fiscal year for which they were appropriated and in the immediately following fiscal year (i.e., FY2006 funds may be spent in FY2006 and in FY2007).	States would be able to expend their allotment of this \$40 million in FY2006 PSSF funds in any of FY2006, FY2007 or FY2008.
Section 8 - Reports		
[Biennial Report on Spending Under Title IV-B]	States are required to develop a five-year plan on their planned use of PSSF (Title IV-B, Subpart 2) funds, including goals established and services to be provided (in a given geographic areas and to how many people). In addition, each state must annually review the services offered and any progress made toward achieving the goals established. The five-year plan, and annual review of services and progress, must be provided to HHS and made available to the public. As part of this same planning and review process states must also submit some information related to their use of Child Welfare Services funds (Title IV-B, Subpart 1).	HHS would be required to prepare a biennial report showing – by state, territory, and tribe – 1) the level of expenditures and the programs and activities funded under the PSSF and Child Welfare Services programs; and 2) the number of children and families served under the programs. In addition, HHS would be required to report on how spending under these programs has helped achieve the child and family services goals established by each state, tribe, and territory, in their required planning processes for these Title IV-B programs. The first such biennial report must be submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee no later than July 1, 2008. Subsequent reports must be submitted not later than July 1 of every other year.
Section 9 – Effective Dates		
<i>Effective Date</i>	No provision.	The amendments made by this act would take effect as of the first day of FY2007, except that the appropriation of FY2006 funds for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program would be effective immediately upon the legislation’s enactment. In addition, if HHS determines that state legislation is required in order for a

CRS-10

Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
		state to meet any new requirement under this act, the state would have until the completion of the first state legislative session after enactment of this act to comply with such new requirements.

NOTE - Certain Technical and Conforming Amendments Proposed by Section 4 of the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006		
<p>The Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 would make numerous technical and conforming amendments to the Child Welfare Services program (Title IV-B, subpart 1) that are related to the re-organization and re-wording of the current law provision it proposes for that program.</p> <p>Any policy changes that would result from these proposed changes (including elimination of any provision) are described in the above side-by-side. However, the rows below sketch what are primarily organizational changes with regard to section content and numbering in Title IV-B, Subpart 1 and with regard to numbering and content of state plan requirements in Section 422 of that subpart. Conforming amendments made within Title IV-B to references of particular Title IV-B, Subpart 1 sections, or paragraphs are not listed here.</p>		
Provision	Current Law	Explanation of Change
<i>Elimination, re-ordering and re-designating of sections related to Child Welfare Services</i>	Section 420 contains a purpose statement and authorizes appropriations for Child Welfare Services. Section 421 describes how funds appropriated for the program are to be divided (allotted) among the states. Section 422 contains the state plan requirements for this program. Section 423 describes how HHS makes payments to states of the funds appropriated for this program. Section 424 describes funding re-allotment procedures; and Section 425 defines child welfare services for the purposes of Title IV-B.	Would eliminate or re-designate these sections to create the following sections in the following sequence: There would be no Section 420. Section 421 would state the purposes of the Child Welfare Services program (Title IV-B, Subpart 1). Section 422 would continue to provide the state plan requirements but would also include definitions for the Child Welfare Services program. Section 423 would describe allotment methods for the Child Welfare Services program, including re-allotment procedures. Section 424 would describe how HHS would make payments to states of the funds appropriated for this program. Section 425 would include the authorization of appropriations for the program.
<i>Elimination, rewriting, amending, and renumbering of state plan requirements in Section 422</i>	Section 422(b) contains 15 paragraphs that are state plan requirements. Paragraph 3 requires certain child day care standards; paragraph 4 supports the use of paraprofessional staff and volunteers in the administration and provision of child welfare services; paragraph 5 requires a description of service to be provided by geographic area; paragraph 6 requires a description of steps the state will take to extend, expand and strengthen child welfare services and to describe its staff development and training plans; paragraph 10 contains certain protections that must be made available to all children in foster care.	Would eliminate provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4; would re-number current paragraphs 5 and 6, as paragraphs 3 and 4 respectively, and would rewrite them (as described above); would retain and re-number all subsequent paragraphs as paragraphs 5 through 13; would amend paragraph 10 (as described above); all other paragraphs would be unchanged (except for their number). Would add new paragraphs 14 and 15 (as described above).
<i>Renumbering and re-ordering of Current Law Sections 426 through Section 429A of Title IV-B, Subpart 1</i>	Section 426(a) authorizes appropriations for research training or demonstration projects; Section 426(b) authorized appropriations for certain demonstration programs related to finding alternative care settings for healthy infants abandoned in hospitals. There is no current law Section 427. Section 428 authorizes direct payment of Child Welfare Services funds to Indian tribes or tribal organizations. Section 429 authorizes child welfare traineeships and Section 429A authorizes the National Random Sample Study of Child Welfare.	Would eliminate current subsection (b) of Section 426. Would eliminate all of the current Section 429 (regarding child welfare traineeships) but would move all of its provisions into a new subsection of Section 426. Would re-designate Section 429A as Section 429. There would continue to be no Section 427, and Section 428 would continue to authorize direct payment of Child Welfare Services funds to Indian tribes or tribal organization.