Both chambers of Congress will be back in Washington following the Labor Day holiday and will have only a few weeks to make progress on the fiscal year (FY) 2019 appropriations bills before adjourning again for the November midterm elections. At the time of this writing, 6 bills have been passed by the full House of Representatives and 9 by the Senate. None have been sent to the President for his signature. FY 2019 begins on October 1, 2018.

Upon returning to work in September, Congress will be faced with a full plate of must-pass spending legislation, not to mention a Supreme Court nomination and several federal agency nominations. Among the countless unknowns surrounding a possible endgame strategy for appropriations is one certainty—the need to pass a stopgap funding measure, known as a continuing resolution (CR), to avoid a partial government shutdown come October 1. The length of a likely CR, though, is still up for debate. With the leadership of the House and possibly the Senate up for grabs in the November elections, we could see a CR as short as a few weeks or a few months or stretching into next calendar year in the event either chamber changes partisan control.

COSSA has been reporting on the status of the FY 2019 appropriations bills over the last several months. The following pages provide a recap of where FY 2019 funding proposals currently stand for federal agencies important to the social science research community. Stay tuned for COSSA’s continuing coverage throughout the fall.

Full details and COSSA’s analysis of the various bills can be viewed on the COSSA website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019 APPROPRIATIONS SNAPSHOT</th>
<th>Enacted FY 2018</th>
<th>President's Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Research Service</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural Statistics Service</td>
<td>191.7</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>174.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Food and Agriculture</td>
<td>1407.8</td>
<td>1257.7</td>
<td>1446.6</td>
<td>1423.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of the Census</td>
<td>2814.0</td>
<td>3800.5</td>
<td>4799.7</td>
<td>3821.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Education Sciences</td>
<td>613.5</td>
<td>521.6</td>
<td>613.5</td>
<td>615.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education and Foreign Language Studies</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>37084.0</td>
<td>35517.0</td>
<td>38334.0</td>
<td>39084.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality</td>
<td>334.0</td>
<td>256.0*</td>
<td>334.0</td>
<td>334.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The National Science Foundation (NSF) would fare only slightly better under the House bill for FY 2019. In May, the House marked up its bill including $8.2 billion for NSF. Compare this to the Senate bill released in June that would provide $8.1 billion for NSF. Notably, both bills enthusiastically reject the Trump Administration’s proposal to drastically cut the agency to below FY 2017 levels ($7.5 billion). The House and Senate bills represent a 5.2 percent and 3.9 percent increase, respectively, over current year (FY 2018) funding.

Unfortunately, the bulk of the proposed increases are not slated for the Research and Related Activities (R&RA) account, which funds NSF’s six research directorates, including the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) Directorate, in either bill. R&RA would be increased by 5 percent in the House bill and 3.5 percent in the Senate bill, while NSF’s Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction (MREFC) account would see increases of 46 percent in the House and 36 percent in the Senate. Still, any increase for research accounts in the appropriations bill in this budgetary environment is a move in the right direction.

Proposals for NSF’s Education and Human Resources Directorate (EHR) is a different story. The House bill proposes flat funding for EHR in FY 2019 while the Senate bill includes a modest 1.4 percent increase.

The biggest takeaway for NSF in the House and Senate bills is the absence of any directives to cut social science funding in order to prioritize funds in other disciplines, as we saw in years past. In fact, in an important sign that sentiment toward SBE funding is improving in Congress, Rep. John Culberson (R-TX), Chair of the Commerce, Justice, Science (CJS) Appropriations Subcommittee in the House, said during his Committee’s consideration of the bill that “[NSF’s] peer review process remains non-political and fully funded so [the agency] can continue to discover new things about our universe and life on earth.” This is a departure from past CJS bills that sought disproportionate cuts to SBE on what can only be assumed to be political grounds. While the House bill does state that “strategic investment in the physical science areas [emphasis added] are vitally important for the United States to remain the global leader in innovation, productivity, economic growth, and good paying jobs for the future,” it stops short of directing NSF to prioritize funding away from the non-physical sciences, like SBE.

FY 2019 will be a transformative year for NSF as it seeks to more fully launch its 10 Big Ideas initiatives, which promise to change fundamental ways that NSF has supported research, especially interdisciplinary “convergence” research. Of course, without major new infusions of funding in FY 2019, support for the Big Ideas will have to come from existing pots of money. To this end, the Senate bill included language stating:

* The President’s budget request proposes to consolidate the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality as an institute within the National Institutes of Health.
“The Committee is supportive of NSF using its position as the lead Federal agency in supporting basic research in all fundamental science areas and expects that as NSF uses the 10 Big Ideas as a focusing tool, the funding for the fundamental scientific disciplines will be maintained.”

It goes on to state:

“The Committee has provided significant funding above the amount provided in fiscal year 2018 and also above the amount requested in fiscal year 2019. Therefore, NSF shall maintain its core research at levels not less than those provided in fiscal year 2017.”

This language appears to clarify that the agency should not reduce funding for its core research activities to support the new 10 Big Ideas, which has been a concern expressed by some.

The outlook for NSF in FY 2019 is positive, assuming Congress agrees on final NSF funding in the coming months. The agency will likely receive a modest budget increase next year. Further, we expect to make it through another year without a direct attack on the SBE directorate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Science Foundation</th>
<th>Enacted FY 2018</th>
<th>Request FY 2019</th>
<th>House FY 2019</th>
<th>Senate FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and Related Activities</td>
<td>6334.5</td>
<td>6150.7</td>
<td>6651.5</td>
<td>6556.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Human Resources</td>
<td>902.0</td>
<td>873.4</td>
<td>902.0</td>
<td>915.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>268.0</td>
<td>249.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Operations and Award Management</td>
<td>328.5</td>
<td>333.6</td>
<td>333.6</td>
<td>328.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Board</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See COSSA’s full analyses for details on FY 2019 NSF funding [House](#) [Senate](#).

**National Institutes of Health**

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) is poised to receive a fourth straight year of one to two billion dollar increases in FY 2019. In an ongoing show of strong bipartisan support for the agency, both the House and Senate bills reject the more than 10 percent cut to NIH proposed by the Trump Administration. The Senate bill includes $39.084 billion for the agency in FY 2019, a $2 billion increase, while the House bill includes $38.334 billion, an increase of $1.25 billion. The Senate bill was recently passed by the full Senate on August 23; the full House has yet to take up its version of the bill. It is unclear whether the House will proceed on its version of the bill or take up the Senate-passed bill that is more generous to NIH.

During Senate consideration, the White House issued a Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) expressing disappointment that the bill exceeds the spending allocations requested by the President and that the bill does not endorse the Administration’s proposals to consolidate a number of non-NIH health agencies into the NIH; the President’s budget request sought to create new NIH institutes by transferring offices and agencies from elsewhere in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS),
including the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). Both the House and Senate bills rejected the move. The SAP stops short at issuing a veto threat on the bill, keeping hopes alive that the increases proposed for NIH will be realized once again in FY 2019.

Both bills include relevant report language and directives pertaining to specific NIH programs, institutes and centers (check out COSSA’s full analyses for details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Institutes of Health</th>
<th>Enacted FY 2018</th>
<th>Request FY 2019</th>
<th>House FY 2019</th>
<th>Senate FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Cancer Institute</td>
<td>5664.8</td>
<td>5626.3</td>
<td>6136.0</td>
<td>6147.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences</td>
<td>742.4</td>
<td>685.1</td>
<td>751.2</td>
<td>806.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health</td>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>143.9</td>
<td>146.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Eye Institute</td>
<td>772.3</td>
<td>711.0</td>
<td>781.5</td>
<td>797.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute</td>
<td>3383.2</td>
<td>3112.0</td>
<td>3423.6</td>
<td>3490.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Human Genome Research Institute</td>
<td>556.9</td>
<td>513.0</td>
<td>563.5</td>
<td>575.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute on Aging</td>
<td>2574.1</td>
<td>1988.2</td>
<td>3005.8</td>
<td>3084.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism</td>
<td>509.6</td>
<td>469.1</td>
<td>515.7</td>
<td>525.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases</td>
<td>5260.2</td>
<td>4761.9</td>
<td>5368.0</td>
<td>5506.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases</td>
<td>586.7</td>
<td>545.5</td>
<td>593.7</td>
<td>605.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering</td>
<td>377.9</td>
<td>346.6</td>
<td>382.4</td>
<td>389.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development</td>
<td>1452.0</td>
<td>1339.6</td>
<td>1469.3</td>
<td>1507.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders</td>
<td>460.0</td>
<td>424.0</td>
<td>465.5</td>
<td>474.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research</td>
<td>447.7</td>
<td>413.2</td>
<td>453.1</td>
<td>462.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases</td>
<td>2120.8</td>
<td>2115.4</td>
<td>2144.3</td>
<td>2030.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute on Drug Abuse</td>
<td>1383.6</td>
<td>1137.4</td>
<td>1400.1</td>
<td>1420.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences</td>
<td>751.1</td>
<td>693.2</td>
<td>760.1</td>
<td>775.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of General Medical Sciences</td>
<td>1862.5</td>
<td>1831.7</td>
<td>1895.8</td>
<td>1856.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Mental Health</td>
<td>1711.8</td>
<td>1612.2</td>
<td>1790.2</td>
<td>1871.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities</td>
<td>303.2</td>
<td>280.5</td>
<td>306.8</td>
<td>314.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke</td>
<td>2145.1</td>
<td>1838.6</td>
<td>2228.8</td>
<td>2275.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Nursing Research</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>159.9</td>
<td>163.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute for Research on Safety and Quality*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>256.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research *</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Medicine</td>
<td>428.6</td>
<td>395.5</td>
<td>433.7</td>
<td>442.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See COSSA’s full analyses for details on FY 2019 NIH funding [House] [Senate].
National Institute of Justice & Bureau of Justice Statistics

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) both fare better in the House spending bill than in the Senate’s, with the House bill proposing 4.8 and 4.2 percent increases, respectively, over FY 2018; the Senate bill maintains FY 2018 levels for both agencies. The House recommends $44 million for NIJ and $50 million for BJS while the Senate recommends $42 million for NIJ and $48 million for BJS.

The House and Senate committee reports also detail different suggested activities for NIJ and BJS. The House report includes specific language directing NIJ to increase funding for research on human trafficking, support comprehensive research on opioid fatalities, and provide a report to Congress on cybercrime against individuals. It also directs BJS to develop data collection processes to accurately count deaths and injuries from police pursuit and high-risk vehicles, to disaggregate the race and ethnicity portion of the National Crime Victimization Survey, and to coordinate with the Census Bureau to better include Puerto Rico in BJS data products.

The Senate report recommends a different set of priorities for NIJ, including $4 million for studying domestic radicalization, $1 million to research school violence, $1 million in competitive grant money for a university to administer the National Juvenile Online Victimization Study, and $3 million for NIJ to establish a National Center on Restorative Justice with the purpose of educating and training the “next generation of justice leaders.” The Senate also recommends transferring $4 million from the Office of Violence Against Women to NIJ for research and evaluation on violence against women and Native American women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enacted FY 2018</th>
<th>Request FY 2019</th>
<th>House FY 2019</th>
<th>Senate FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Justice Statistics</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Justice</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See COSSA’s full analyses for details on FY 2019 Justice funding [House] [Senate].

Census Bureau

The House bill proposes a higher funding level for the Census Bureau, with a total of $4.8 billion compared to $3.8 billion in the Senate bill. Both proposals are more than the amount requested by the Administration. Both bills would hold the Bureau’s Current Surveys and Programs flat and direct the increases to Periodic Censuses and Programs, which includes the 2020 Census and the American Community Survey.

As in previous years, the committee reports include conflicting language related to the American Community Survey (ACS). The House report calls the survey “burdensome,” but stops short of making it voluntary. In contrast, the Senate bill praises the ACS, highlighting its value as a “testbed for innovative survey and data processing techniques” and noting that it is “often the primary or only source of data available to State, local, and Federal agencies that need adequate information on a wide range of topics.”

In order to provide the Bureau with increased funding flexibility as it enters the peak phase of operations for the 2020 Census, the House bill would allow for the funding provided to be used through the first
quarter of FY 2020. The FY 2018 omnibus bill also included this provision, allowing FY 2018 funds to be used for early FY 2019 spending. Neither bill addresses the last-minute addition of a citizenship question to the 2020 Census by the Secretary of Commerce, which could lead to unplanned cost increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau of the Census</th>
<th>Enacted FY 2018</th>
<th>Request FY 2019</th>
<th>House FY 2019</th>
<th>Senate FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Surveys and Programs</td>
<td>2814.0</td>
<td>3800.5</td>
<td>4799.7</td>
<td>3821.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic Censuses and Programs</td>
<td>270.0</td>
<td>249.1</td>
<td>270.0</td>
<td>270.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See COSSA’s full analyses for details on FY 2019 Census funding [House][Senate].

**Centers for Disease Control and Prevention**

Both the House and Senate bills are more generous to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) top line than the Administration’s budget request. The Senate number is the higher of the two bills, providing a total of $7.8 billion, while the House bill would provide CDC with $7.6 billion. The Senate bill would provide a $1 million increase to the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), while the House bill proposes flat funding for the agency.

Both bills reject the Administration’s proposed creation of the America’s Health Block Grant program, which would have eliminated funding for a number of disease-specific programs under the Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion portfolio in favor of flexible block grants to states. In addition, they do not accept the Administration’s request to consolidate the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) as an institute within the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The House committee report states that, “the Committee believes NIOSH’s mission does not align with NIH’s focus on biomedical research and is better achieved within CDC.”

The House report includes a provision preventing funds from being used to “advocate for or promote gun control,” although the **FY 2018 omnibus bill** clarified that this clause should not prevent the CDC from researching gun violence. However, as no additional funding is included in the bill, the CDC is unlikely to undertake such research.

Both committee reports include language directing the CDC to develop and evaluate interventions targeting child sexual abuse and to identify research gaps related to preventing child sexual abuse.
See COSSA’s full analyses for details on FY 2019 CDC funding [House] [Senate].

**Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality**

The House and Senate bills both include flat funding of $334 million for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). Neither bill accepts the Administration’s proposed consolidation of AHRQ as a new institute within the NIH, which likely would have required separate legislation to enact. The Senate bill includes explicit language to that effect.

The Senate committee report instructs the agency to create Centers of Diagnostic Excellence to act as hubs for research on improving how medical conditions are diagnosed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research on Health Costs, Quality, and Outcomes</td>
<td>197.2</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>192.7</td>
<td>192.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Safety</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Research, Data, and Dissemination</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Technology</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Preventive Services Task Force</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Expenditure Panel Surveys</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures reflect the amounts specified for the proposed National Institute for Research on Safety and Quality within NIH.

See COSSA’s full analyses for details on FY 2019 AHRQ funding [House] [Senate].

**Department of Education**

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES), the statistics, research, and evaluation arm of the Department of Education, fares slighter better in the Senate bill than the House bill, receiving $615.5 million to the House’s proposed $613.5 million. However, in both proposals nearly all the accounts within IES would be held flat with their FY 2018 funding levels, including Research, Development, and Dissemination; Regional Education Laboratories; the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES); Research in Special Education; Statewide Data Systems; Assessment; and Special Education Studies and Evaluations. Both bills reject the Administration’s proposal to eliminate the Regional Education Laboratories.

The House and Senate both propose maintaining FY 2018 levels for the Department of Education’s International Education and Foreign Language Studies programs. The bills include a total of $65.1 million in funding for Domestic Programs (also known as Title VI) and $7.1 million for Overseas Programs (also known as Fulbright-Hays). While flat, the proposed allocations from the House and Senate for Title VI and Fulbright-Hays are good news as both programs were identified for elimination in the President’s FY 2019 budget request.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enacted FY 2018</th>
<th>Request FY 2019</th>
<th>House FY 2019</th>
<th>Senate FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Education Sciences</td>
<td>613.5</td>
<td>521.6</td>
<td>613.5</td>
<td>615.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192.7</td>
<td>187.5</td>
<td>192.7</td>
<td>192.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, and Dissemination</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Education Statistics</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Educational Laboratories</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in Special Education</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Studies and Evaluations</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>158.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Data Systems</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Education and Foreign Language Studies
| Domestic Programs (Title VI) | 65.1           | 0.0            | 65.1          | 65.1          |
| Overseas Programs (Fulbright-Hays) | 7.1            | 0.0            | 7.1           | 7.1           |

See COSSA’s full analyses for details on FY 2019 Department of Education funding [House] [Senate].

**Bureau of Labor Statistics**

The Senate bill would provide a $3 million increase to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), while the House bill seeks flat funding of $612 million. Both proposals are above the amount proposed by the Trump Administration. Within the Senate bill, the additional funding would go to the Bureau’s Employment and Unemployment Statistics activities within the Labor Force Statistics program; BLS’ remaining accounts would be held flat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enacted FY 2018</th>
<th>Request FY 2019</th>
<th>House FY 2019</th>
<th>Senate FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Labor Statistics</td>
<td>612.0</td>
<td>609.4</td>
<td>612.0</td>
<td>615.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force Statistics</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>273.0</td>
<td>277.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices and Cost of Living</td>
<td>209.0</td>
<td>207.2</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td>209.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Working Conditions</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity and Technology</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Direction and Staff Services</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See COSSA’s full analyses for details on FY 2019 BLS funding [House] [Senate].

**U.S. Department of Agriculture**

Both chambers propose relatively stable funding for the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) two statistical agencies. The House and Senate bills would each maintain flat funding for the Economic Research Service (ERS) at $86.8 million, a welcome show of support for the agency in light of the President’s proposed cut of nearly 50 percent. In addition, the House committee report specifically notes that the “Committee does not concur with the request to significantly eliminate ERS’ research activities.”
Both the House and Senate propose decreases for the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) as it ramps down from the 2017 Census of Agriculture; the House proposal of $173.7 million is $1.1 million below the Senate’s proposed $174.8 million. However, both levels are higher than the amount proposed by the President. The amounts proposed for the Census of Agriculture are about the same among the House, Senate, and Administration’s request, so the difference in funding would come from NASS’ Agricultural Estimates.

Of the two chambers, the House proposes the higher allocation for the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) at $1.45 billion, an increase of $38.8 million above FY 2018 and $188.9 million (15 percent) above the Administration’s request. The Senate’s proposal of $1.42 billion is $23.4 million below the House’s, though still $165.5 million more than the amount in the Administration’s budget. Both chambers propose increases for the Agricultural and Food Research Initiative (AFRI), with the House proposing a $15 million increase compared to the Senate’s $5 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>Request FY 2019</th>
<th>House FY 2019</th>
<th>Senate FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Research Service</strong></td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Agricultural Statistics Service</strong></td>
<td>191.7</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>174.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census of Agriculture</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Institute of Food and Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>1407.8</td>
<td>1257.7</td>
<td>1446.6</td>
<td>1423.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch Act</td>
<td>243.7</td>
<td>243.2</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>243.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Food Research Initiative</td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>415.0</td>
<td>405.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See COSSA’s full analysis for details on FY 2019 USDA funding.