

Everyone in this body continues to talk about duplication and says we should do something about it. GAO then highlights it for us, but the challenge is that you can't easily identify it until you do a very deep search on it. I think we should be able to have a level of transparency so we can see where the duplication is by comparing one program to another. That way we can all address it and talk about it.

Yesterday, at the Indian Affairs Committee hearing, we were doing a markup. The conversation in that markup was about several programs that seemed to be very good ideas to serve Indian Country. The problem is that many of them already exist in another agency, and they are not doing their job very well. The challenge is this: Can we get rid of it in another agency and not just start it in a second, third, or fourth agency?

We can't continue to say: It is not working over there. So let's just do it somewhere else. Every time I bring up the issue, they say: We don't know what agency it exists in. The Taxpayer's Right-to-Know Act provides a very simple list that should be searchable and public and that everyone would be able to see. It is currently being held up right now and going back and forth in this ongoing conversation about something as simple as: How many programs should we see?

OMB has pushed this issue back on us and said: We will have program transparency but only for the biggest programs.

We basically said: If you spend \$1 million on this program, you should have transparency.

They said: No, let's do a much higher number. Let's do \$10 million or more.

Yesterday, we asked Gene Dodaro: If we dropped this number from \$10 million to \$1 million, how many programs will suddenly go away?

He said: It is in the thousands. That just puts us in the same spot. We can't eliminate duplication we can't see. The famous philosopher Muhammad Ali said: "Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee, the hands can't hit what the eyes can't see."

We, as a body, spend a lot of our time saying: I would love to get rid of duplication, but we can't see it. Let's actually expose it. Let's get it out there so everyone can see it and we can clear this issue. Let's just solve this very simple issue. Let's make it transparent, and then let's work together.

Senator TESTER and I had a great conversation after the Indian Affairs Committee hearing yesterday. We agreed that we would look for areas of duplication in Indian Country. We are not looking for more programs. We are looking for programs that actually work and accomplish what they should accomplish, and for things that don't work, we can eliminate them. We can take that money from one area and put it in another area where it actually does work. At the end of the day, we have to get back to balance. We can't

keep funding duplicative programs that don't work, and we should be able to accomplish this together.

Last year, I put out a report called "Federal Fumbles: 100 Ways the Government Dropped the Ball." Two-thirds of that book identified duplication and waste in the government. We have made progress on some of those already this year. We have so much more to do. The key to it is that we actually need to get busy working on it instead of just talking about it.

Yesterday, Gene Dodaro, who is with GAO, also mentioned a bill that BEN SASSE is working on called the new hire database bill. I think it is a very good bill, and I am glad to be supportive of what he is trying to accomplish there. Senator SASSE wants to do one thing, and that is to be able to say that when we actually do means-tested programs, we should be able to see the employment records. That should be a very open process for those who are in the means-tested program, but right now GAO and other groups do not have access to the new hires database. So there is no way to see those in the means-tested program.

There are people who self-report their income, and there is no way to be able to verify that. Shouldn't we be able to verify that?

It is a straightforward solution in a day and time when they continue to bring up obvious things year after year, such as having the same person being eligible for disability and unemployment insurance at the same time. That person will actually receive unemployment and disability benefits simultaneously. Disability benefits, by definition, means you cannot work anywhere in the economy, and that is why you get disability benefits. Unemployment benefits, by definition, means you can work in the economy, but you are not currently employed. Why should you be eligible for both? GAO has brought that up to us. That is not a partisan issue. That should be a solvable issue, and it is costing taxpayers billions of dollars. It is one of the things that we have to be able to work on together so we can actually solve this problem. This is not too hard for us, and the American people expect us to get it done.

My only challenge is this: Let's actually get it done.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

ZIKA VIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to address two different issues this morning, but I think both are timely and important.

The first issue I will address has to do with a telephone conversation I had a few minutes ago with Dr. Thomas Frieden. Dr. Frieden heads up the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta, GA. Most Americans don't know much about the agency, but the

title speaks for itself. The CDC, as we call it, is America's first line of defense in a public health crisis. When we think that Americans—individuals and families—are in danger or vulnerable, we call the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and ask them to analyze the challenge and then give us the right public health response to that challenge.

A few months ago, I went to their campus in Atlanta, GA. It is very impressive, not just for the buildings but also for the people who are there. We have some of the best health researchers in the world working for our Federal Government at CDC—most of them at financial sacrifice. They want to be part of solving problems and protecting America. Just as the folks in the Pentagon across the river believe in the protection of America, so do the people at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The CDC is our first line of defense against public health attacks.

This morning I called Dr. Frieden to talk about the Zika virus. I have come to know him and have worked with him over the years. Most people have learned about it by now. We are learning more about it every single day. We have kind of traced its origin to South America, and now it is moving north. It is moving north into Puerto Rico in a big way, and Florida is likely to be the next State to witness the Zika virus being transmitted by mosquitoes. Then, frankly, the whole United States is vulnerable. Not only can this virus be transmitted to an individual if they are bit by a mosquito, but it can also be transmitted by the sexual contact of a person already infected by the virus. If you have the virus and a mosquito bites you and then bites your wife, you may have just transmitted the virus to her through that mosquito. We are learning.

The reason why this is more than just a mosquito bite and an irritation is that this virus can cause serious public health problems. We know that pregnant women with this virus run the risk of giving birth to babies with difficulties and serious problems, and so we are monitoring it very closely.

How many employees at CDC are working on the Zika virus threat to America? There are 1,000. When you think of all of the things that we need to worry about, they believe—and, I think, rightly so—that this is the imminent public health threat to our country. There are a lot of unanswered questions about the Zika virus, such as these: How long does it stay in an individual? How long can an individual who is infected with the virus transmit it to another person? For those who are carrying the virus, what impact does it have on their health? What impact does it have on a pregnant woman carrying this virus?

It turns out there are literally hundreds now in the United States who have been infected with the Zika virus. We expect some lull in the number of

cases, and then they are going to pick up in intensity and number this summer. We also know—and the announcement will be made soon—that there are pregnant women in the United States who have been infected by the Zika virus.

The obvious question is this: Are we doing everything we should be doing to protect America?

Sadly, the answer is no, we are not.

Two months ago, President Obama said to the Congress: I need a supplemental emergency appropriation to deal with this threat. He asked for \$1.9 billion. They want to monitor the Zika virus and how it is traveling across the United States. They want to monitor those who have already been infected. They want to develop a vaccine that we can take that will protect us in the future.

From where I am standing, I can't think of a single public health challenge in America as great as this Zika virus at this moment. One would think that the Congress, now that they know the facts, would have moved instantly to provide the money to the President—this emergency supplemental appropriation of \$1.9 billion. But the answer is they have done nothing. The leaders in the House and in the Senate have done nothing to provide emergency funds to this administration to deal with this public health emergency.

It is so bad that this week a Republican leader in the House announced publicly that he didn't see any emergency. He thinks we may get around to an appropriation for this in October. Well, I don't know what his lifestyle is like, but in the Midwest we have a tendency to get out on the patio and have barbecues and invite our friends and neighbors over. We worry about mosquitoes. It doesn't start in October. It starts now. I don't know if this Republican Congressman plans on sending a memo to the mosquitoes across America saying: no buzzing and biting until October when we get around to this. It won't work.

This has been declared an emergency by not only the President but by the head of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Why aren't we acting? Why aren't we doing something? We should be doing something.

We are going to leave today. This afternoon we will vote and go home. We will be back in probably 10 or 11 days. Maybe then the Republican leadership in the House and Senate will decide this is an emergency that needs a response. The numbers will start coming in—the number of people across America who are facing this virus—and the concern among American families is going to grow. This is not just an irritation. This is a danger to many people and certainly to women who could be pregnant. This is something we ought to be taking extremely seriously. We have been waiting for 2 months for this Congress to respond with an emergency appropriation to do something.

I have called on the leadership in the Senate this week, and I will continue to do so today and when we return. There is no excuse. God forbid this gets worse and we look back and say: We waited too long; we didn't respond.

Let me add one other thing. The only suggestion we have heard from the Republican side is this: Let's take some of the money we set aside to fight Ebola in Africa and use it for this purpose.

I talked to Dr. Friedman about that. He said: It is true; there has been a real drop in the number of Ebola cases.

Ebola is a deadly disease in West Africa and other places, and we worried about it coming to the United States. He said that we are still learning about how this disease travels.

There was a man who was cured after being diagnosed with Ebola in Africa, and they just learned that a year after he was cured, he transmitted the disease by sexual contact to another person. Even when we think we have cured and solved it, there is still a danger.

Let's make sure that we treat all of these public health hazards for what they are—dangerous to the United States and dangerous to our families. God forbid that something terrible happen. I hope it doesn't. Let's do our job here on Capitol Hill. When the President says we need resources to fight this, we do. I hope we move on it very quickly when we return.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, immigration is an issue which divides America. You only have to tune into the Presidential debate to hear it. Most everyone would agree that the immigration system in America is broken. I believe it is. I was part of an effort with some colleagues to try to come up with a comprehensive immigration reform bill, which passed the Senate 3 years ago by a vote of 68 to 32. We worked long and hard on that bill. We brought this bipartisan bill to the Senate, and it passed with an overwhelming majority. The House refused to consider the measure. Speaker Boehner never called it to the floor. The bill we passed never ever got a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives, and so here we sit today with the same broken immigration system.

Let me tell you that one part of that is very important to me and to many of my colleagues. Fifteen years ago I introduced a bill called the DREAM Act. The genesis of that bill—as I have said on the floor many times and will quickly repeat—began after we got a call in my Chicago office from a Korean American woman who had a daughter who was a musical prodigy. She was an amazing pianist and had been accepted at two of the best music schools in America. She was filling out her application and asked her mom: What do I put down for my nationality or citizenship. Her mom said: I don't know. When we brought you here, Tereza, you were 2 years old and came

here on a visitor's visa. I never filed any more papers. So I don't know. The daughter said: What are we going to do? The mom said: We are going to call Durbin's office.

So they called our office and we said: Let us check the law.

The law was very clear. This 18-year-old girl, brought here at the age of 2, under American law had to leave the United States for 10 years and apply to come back in. Does that sound right? When she was 2 years old, she had no voice in the decision to come to America, no voice in the decision of filing papers. Yet our law basically told her to leave.

That is when I introduced the DREAM Act. It says that if you are brought here under the age of 16, complete high school, no serious criminal issues in your background, we will give you a chance. We will give you a path to become legal and ultimately become a citizen. That is what the DREAM Act is.

We haven't passed that bill. We have passed it maybe once in the Senate, once in the House but never brought it together to be sent to the President. This President, Barack Obama, was my fellow Senator from Illinois for 2 years and he cosponsored the DREAM Act.

So a few years ago, I joined in a letter to the President, with Senator Dick Lugar, a Republican from Indiana, and said to him: Help us protect these young people from being deported until we can finally pass comprehensive immigration reform or the DREAM Act. The President listened and did it. He created what is known as DACA. What DACA says is, if you are such a young person, you may step forward, register with the government, submit yourself to a criminal background check, pay a several-hundred-dollar filing fee, and then we will give you temporary protection from deportation. Then, 2 years later, 3 years later, you have to re-apply—go through the same process—pay a fee and do it again.

As it turned out, 700,000 young people, who were in the same situation as the Korean girl I mentioned from Chicago, have applied for this DACA protection so they can stay here on a temporary basis and go to school, work, and be a part of the United States. There is no guarantee they will ever become permanently legal or citizens—I hope they will—but at least they are protected on a temporary basis.

Two years later, the President said: If you are in a family where one of the kids in the house is an American citizen or here legally in the United States as a permanent resident, we are going to give parents the same opportunity to register with the government, to go through a criminal background check, to pay their fee to the government, then to be given a temporary work permit to work in the United States. That is known as DAPA. So we have DACA and DAPA. It is currently being challenged in the Supreme Court.