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Introduction

In 2014, Congress responded effectively to the threat of an Ebola epidemic’s emergence within the United States.¹ A year-and-a-half later, it failed to respond similarly to the threat presented by the Zika virus.² In late 2014, Congress appropriated $5.4 billion in emergency funding to combat Ebola.³ In contrast, congressional paralysis, grounded in partisan politics, precluded a similar legislative response to President Obama’s request in February 2016 for $1.9 billion in emergency funds to combat Zika.⁴ In short, the congressional response to Ebola reflected a coalescence of concern that displaced partisan politics. Congress’s response to the risk posed by the Zika virus reflected broad ideological disagreements and a delay that could have proved, and may still prove, harmful to the health of the population.

This article summarizes the threat that Zika poses to public health. It reviews governmental action that would likely limit that threat and then delineates Congress’s failure to appropriate funding to combat Zika in the months between the administration’s request for such funding and the summer of 2016.⁵ The article focuses on Congress’s readiness to stymie funding for a national response to Zika by displacing cooperation with sectarian politics. That such did not occur in 2014 – when Congress voted expeditiously to fund responses to Ebola – may reflect the extraordinary level of national concern evoked by media presentations of Ebola, as compared with those of Zika in 2016,⁶ a hardening of sectarian positions in the intervening two years, or both.

Zika: Uncertainties and “Facts”: the Risks of Zika to Public Health

Significant uncertainty surrounds the emergence and spread of the Zika virus.⁷ It has proven difficult to predict where the virus will likely appear over time.⁸ Further, individuals in areas with Zika-infected mosquitoes are sometimes infected but exhibit no symptoms. A small percentage of those infected with the virus develop serious conditions, including Guillian-Barre Syndrome.⁹ It is unclear who will be affected this way or why. There is uncertainty about the relation
between the time of a pregnant woman’s being infected with Zika and the consequences for her fetus. And it is not clear whether there are long-term consequences implicating brain development in children infected in utero. These uncertainties are compounded by the absence of a vaccine or an effective treatment.

The uncertainties that surround the condition have encouraged the development of myths and conspiracy theories. Zika has been attributed falsely to the release of genetically-modified mosquitoes, to vaccinations given to pregnant women, and to bioterrorism. Others have asserted that claims about Zika’s dangers are a hoax, aimed at compelling people to “blindly obey the government.”

However, facts about Zika are emerging. Zika is a flavivirus, first isolated from a monkey in Uganda in 1947. Human infection was reported in Nigeria in 1954. More recently, the virus appeared in French Polynesia, Latin America (where it was first identified in Brazil), and the Caribbean. The Pan American Health Organization documented the first case in Brazil in May 2015. By the start of the summer of 2016, the mosquito responsible for Zika infections had spread to many Latin American countries and to some U.S. Territories. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”) estimated in June 2016 that Zika had appeared in more than 60 countries. Many of those countries are in the Caribbean or in Latin America.

The Aedes aegypti mosquito is the primary vector for the spread of Zika; the virus is also spread by Aedes albopictus mosquitoes and through certain body fluids, including sperm, blood, and perhaps urine and saliva. Although Aedes mosquitoes are the primary agent through which humans are infected with Zika virus disease, research in Brazil suggests that the Culex mosquito may also serve as a vector for Zika’s spread. If that is the case, then the United States and Europe face a significantly greater risk that the virus will be transmitted locally. Further, the Culex and Aedes mosquitoes have different feeding patterns and different breeding environments, a combination that could make containment efforts aimed at limiting or eradicating mosquitoes carrying Zika particularly complicated in areas with both sorts of mosquitoes.

The consequences of the virus in Africa – where Zika has not been terribly troublesome – are quite different from those that became manifest in Latin America and the Caribbean in 2016, and that appeared in the South Pacific a few years earlier. In Africa, the virus appeared to cause no symptoms or only minor ones, including a rash and achiness. But a different strain of the virus that seems first to have appeared in Yap in Micronesia in 2007 and then in the Western Hemisphere in 2015 has far more devastating consequences. The new strain attacks nerve cells and can cause serious nerve damage. The virus is especially dangerous to developing fetuses, causing miscarriage, microcephaly, other brain injuries, small size, and ocular defects as well as conditions such as clubfoot and joint inflexibility. There is concern about the possibility of neurodegenerative disease and developmental problems in children exposed to Zika in utero. Researchers have suggested that the Zika virus may attack fetal brains by invading rapidly dividing brain stem cells, resulting in the death of some of the stem cells and the incapacity of others to continue to divide. As a result, development of the fetal cortex is disrupted, and the brain can be left malformed and not fully developed.

That Zika attacks fetuses so brutally has made the consequences of a Zika epidemic terrifying to some, though not to all, people. One graduate student at Washington University in St. Louis doing research on Zika pinpointed the fear: “A bunch of scientists were like, ‘you can kill millions of us, you can give us cancer…. But don’t mess with our babies.”

Yet, despite Zika’s capacity to ravage fetal brains, the virus seems not to have seriously affected the majority of babies born to mothers infected during pregnancy. Preliminary research estimated that between one percent and 13 percent of women infected with Zika during early pregnancy will have babies with serious defects at birth. An early report on Zika-related birth defects in Colombia (involving patients showing symptoms of Zika between August 2015 and April 2016) suggests that infection during the third trimester of pregnancy may be far less likely to result in Zika-related defects than infection earlier in pregnancy. The seriousness of Zika’s consequences for fetuses is compounded by the absence of both a vaccine and of treatment beyond symptom relief.

In February 2016, the Director-General of the World Health Organization (“WHO”), reflecting the conclusions of a WHO Emergency Committee on Zika, declared that the spread of the Zika virus constituted a Public Health Emergency of International Concern. The WHO report described the spread of Zika and its consequences for fetuses as an “extraordinary event” and a significant public health threat to the world.

**Medicine and Epidemiology: The Spread of Zika**

As of late July 2016, locally acquired cases of Zika had been
confirmed only in one neighborhood in the continental United States—near downtown Miami.44 However, a significant number of travel-related cases were reported.43 Between the start of 2015 and August 3, 2016, about 1,800 travel-associated Zika cases had been reported in the United States, with others reported in the U.S. Territories (Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands).46 Over 5,400 additional cases of Zika virus, all locally acquired, were reported within the same time frame in Puerto Rico, 44 in American Samoa and in the U.S. Virgin Islands, and by mid-August over 10,000 cases were reported in Puerto Rico.47 As of the end of March 2016, there were over 180,000 suspected cases of Zika infection in Latin America.48

By mid-June 2016, the CDC reported that the Zika infection rate in Puerto Rico had risen faster than had been anticipated.49 The June infection rate—computed on the basis of data from the screening of donor blood—raised fears that thousands of pregnant women could become infected during the summer months, leading to “dozens to hundreds” of babies born with microcephaly.50 By July, Thomas Frieden, Director of the CDC, estimated that 50 pregnant women in Puerto Rico were being infected each day.51

Further, in mid-June, the CDC reported the births in the continental United States of three infants with birth defects related to infection of their mothers during pregnancy.52 Zika-linked defects were identified in three other fetuses, but these pregnancies did not result in live births.53 Each of these six cases was travel-related.54 From this information, it is not possible to discern what percent of births to women in the United States infected with Zika have resulted in birth defects.55 Apparently, some of the babies with Zika-related defects were gestated by women who had traveled to Zika-infected areas but had exhibited no symptoms of the disease.56

The Zika virus remains in an infected person’s blood for a week and can be spread through mosquitoes which bite an infected person and then bite others to whom the virus is thus spread.57 Thus, local transmission within the United States would likely begin after a local mosquito able to carry Zika bit someone with Zika who contracted the virus elsewhere.58 In June, it was expected that was this to happen, it is most likely that Zika-infected mosquitoes would spread, at least initially, in the South during the summer months; the appearance of locally transmitted Zika was reported in Florida in late July 2016.59 Urban areas60 and other areas with dense populations are at greatest risk of Zika’s spreading, in part because most mosquitoes that carry Zika do not move more than a city block during their lives.61

The most common vector for Zika virus, the Aedes Aegypti mosquito (also referred to as the Yellow Fever mosquito),62 is most ubiquitous in the American South and Southwest but has been found in the Northeast.63 The CDC has targeted a wide swath of states as being particularly at risk for local transmission, including some in the South but also Arizona, California, Hawaii, Louisiana and Texas. The focus of concern is on localities with high urban densities and the high likelihood of travelers from Zika-infested areas. Others suggest that Zika will not be as widespread within the United States as the CDC projections suggest.64

States and localities are responsible for mosquito control, although federal funds can be used to implement local mosquito-control plans. In many states at particular risk for Zika, however, efforts to control mosquitoes are inadequate.65 Poor states without a robust tax base are most likely not to have adequate mosquito control.66 Parts of North Carolina and Tennessee fall into this bailiwick.67 Moreover, many states were not aware of the danger until recently and thus have only just begun efforts to control mosquito populations.68 States at risk of Zika seem to be waiting for federal funding to respond with more adequate mosquito control efforts. Should a local outbreak develop, however, efforts at controlling mosquitoes will likely accelerate.69

The project may prove daunting. In Brazil, where the infestation of Zika in the Western Hemisphere was first identified, there is a far more solidly institutionalized system for eradicating mosquitoes’ breeding spots than now exists in the United States.70 In contrast, federal funding dedicated to the control of mosquitoes fell by more than 50 percent in the United States between 2004 and 2012 (from $24 million to $10 million).71

Responses to Zika in the United States

Effective responses to the spread of Zika depend on invoking a multiplicity of talents and on governmental support.72 Most felicitously, a vaccine73 and treatment options will be developed. But before that happens control of mosquitoes carrying Zika infection is essential. This control depends on the use of pesticides in areas in which mosquitoes breed, on eliminating even small pockets of water,74 and on screens and air conditioners that will facilitate the protection of home environments. Further, research is underway to release mosquitoes infected with bacteria that might limit mosquito populations,75 and new techniques for monitoring the appearance and breeding grounds of Zika-infected
mosquitoes are being actively developed. Other basic responses to the threat of Zika's spread include public education about the virus and the mosquitoes that carry it, available and affordable contraception, monitoring the disease, especially in pregnant women, supporting research aimed at precluding Zika's consequences and at accurate testing, and, of course, development of treatments and vaccine research. The Food and Drug Administration has advised the nation's blood banks not to accept blood from people at risk for Zika, including those who have travelled to nations with Zika or who have had sex with a man who has travelled to one of those nations.

All of this work needs funding. A CDC deputy director has referred to the agency's efforts to respond to Zika as "the most difficult health response" that the agency has ever been asked to undertake.

**Funding Zika Responses and Politics**

Congress reacted with a sustained display of factious politics to President Obama's request for almost $1.9 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations to strengthen national and international responses to the Zika virus. By July 2016, the House and the Senate had not agreed on an appropriations package despite predictions, proved accurate by the end of the month, that Zika would likely spread to the continental United States during the summer months.

In its request for funding to combat Zika, the administration asked Congress to appropriate funds, specifically for the operating division of the Department of Health and Human Services ("HHS") (somewhat more than $1.5 billion), the U.S. Agency for International Development ($335 million), and the Department of State ($41 million). In May, the Senate and House proposed different responses to the need defined by the President. The Senate bill, appropriating funds for other purposes as well, provided for $1.1 billion in Zika funds. The House bill ("The Zika Response Appropriations Act"), in contrast, provided $622 million, significantly short of the $1.9 billion requested by the President. Both bills and the administration sought funding for a similar list of federal agencies. But broad differences distinguished the approach of the Senate from that of the House. Republican lawmakers in the House argued adamantly that any funds allocated for the nation's Zika response had to be offset with funds already allocated for other purposes. In contrast, the Senate characterized its proposed appropriation as emergency funding and did not offset Zika appropriations with funds originally allocated for other purposes. Furthermore, the House bill included a variety of reporting, notification, and oversight provisions and provided funding for three months only. President Obama threatened to veto the House bill.

That the House insisted on offsetting Zika funds with funds allocated for other purposes was a point of some contention. Some of the offset was to come from money appropriated to combat Ebola. In 2014, Congress had approved the allocation of $5.4 billion in emergency funding to respond to Ebola. Although Ebola had largely disappeared from news reports by 2016, it had not been eradicated and could re-appear in epidemic form. HHS Secretary Sylvia Burwell described the continuing imperative to prevent another major Ebola epidemic. Speaking before world health leaders, Burwell asserted:

> We have to finish the job on Ebola, even as we act now to slow the spread of Zika. We continue to see Ebola flare-ups in West Africa – seven clusters since the initial outbreak in 2014, resulting in 33 confirmed cases and the monitoring of more than 3,600 people.

We can't sacrifice one urgent health priority in the name of another.

Yet, in light of the congressional deadlock on Zika spending several months after the Obama administration's request for emergency funding, the administration itself re-appropriated $589 million, most of which had originally been allocated for the nation's response to Ebola. The administration intended to facilitate implementation of responses to Zika before the summer months arrived. Three months had passed since the administration had requested emergency Zika funding. At that time, CDC Director Thomas Friedan defined three months as an "eternity" in the effort to control the Zika infection. There is, Frieden explained, "a narrow window of opportunity here and it's closing."

By mid-June, having failed to agree on the terms for funding a national response to Zika, the House and the Senate entered into conference negotiations to resolve their differences. Unsurprisingly, negotiations did not bring agreement. Then, immediately before the House adjourned for the July Fourth recess, it passed a bill based on a Committee Report that reflected Republican voices on the Committee. The bill provided the same level of funding proposed by the Senate's May bill ($1.1 billion), but it included a set of provisions that virtually guaranteed failure in the Senate. The White House deputy press secretary immediately told reporters that the President would veto the bill were it approved in the Senate. The President objected expressly to the bill's offsetting Zika funding with funding from "critically important public health priorities." But the President's veto proved unnecessary. Senate Democrats did not support
the bill. Less than a week after the House vote, the Senate blocked passage of the bill by a vote of 52 to 48. Senate Democrats found several provisions in the House bill especially problematic. The first of these limited funding for Planned Parenthood. Senate Harry Reid (D-Nev.), the Senate Minority leader, referred to this provision in particular in explaining Democrats’ refusing to support the House bill:

A narrowly partisan proposal that cuts off women’s access to birth control, shortchanges veterans and rescinds Obamacare funds to cover the cost is not a serious response to the threat from the Zika virus….In short, [conservative lawmakers] are trying to turn an attempt to protect women’s health into an attack on women’s health.

Second, as noted, the bill offset Zika funding with funds previously appropriated to meet other public health needs. Third, it included provisions allowing states and localities to loosen regulations developed by the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) pursuant to the Clean Water Act. A bill focused on loosening the same environmental protections had been introduced in the House a year earlier, before Zika emerged as a threat in the United States. Fourth, the House provisions for Zika funding deleted language from the larger bill that included the Zika-funding provisions – a bill that also provided funding for military construction and the Veterans Administration. The deleted language precluded the use of federal funds at veterans’ cemeteries that displayed the Confederate flag.

Criticism from all sides followed. Republicans blamed Democrats for failing to support a bill that echoed the funding allocation that the Senate originally suggested. Democrats countered that the House bill was not serious. Senator Reid called it “nothing more than a goodie bag for the fringes of the Republican Party” and “a disgrace” – “a mockery of how Congress should treat an emergency.” Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY) declared that the bill contained “poison pills” that made it impossible for Democrats in the Senate to support its passage. Schumer was referring in particular to the provision to limit funding for Planned Parenthood. The American Public Health Association called the bill “both late and inadequate,” and President Obama criticized Congress for recessing for the July 4 holiday before providing funding to combat Zika.

Disagreements between Democrats and Republicans about Zika funding reflected underlying ideological disagreements. These disagreements presented such a serious stumbling block that Congress recessed for seven weeks in mid-July 2016 – just the time of highest risk for Zika-infected mosquitoes’ appearing in the continental United States – without having agreed on a Zika-funding package. The polarized atmosphere that characterized congressional debate on Zika funding slowed the nation’s response to a disease that posed a significant threat to the continental United States, especially to states in the South during the summer months.

Comparison to Congress’s Response to Ebola

Congress’s response to the administration’s request for Zika funding in 2016 contrasted with its response to the President’s much larger request for Ebola funding in 2014. In November 2014, the Administration sought $6.18 billion in emergency funding for Ebola responses. Congress complied, in large part, and in December 2014 President Obama signed a bill that allocated $5.4 billion in emergency funding for Ebola.

There are a number of possible explanations for the contrast in Congress’s responses to funding requests for Ebola in 2014 and for Zika in 2016. Several pertinent differences between the appearance of Ebola in 2014 and that of Zika in 2016 may also be relevant. Zika appeared during the start of the 2016 presidential election, a period of angry and divisive politicking that reflected and inflamed deep ideological tensions within the nation. Perhaps partisan rivalries in Congress had simply intensified in the period between Congress’s response to Ebola and its failure to respond to Zika.

In addition, and probably of equal importance, Zika and Ebola are distinct in their mode of transmission, the sort of harm they can cause, the sub-populations they are most likely to affect, and the public’s consequent image of and response to each.

Ebola is a hemorrhagic fever that presents with frightening symptoms. These can include profound bleeding and uncontrolled waste elimination. The United States dealt with only nine cases of Ebola. The first involved Dr. Kent Brantly, a physician who had contracted Ebola while working in Liberia. Brantly, transported to the United States after diagnosis, was treated in 2014 at Emory Hospital in Atlanta. Eight of the nine Ebola patients treated in the United States in 2014 (including Dr. Brantly) survived. However, the majority of Ebola patients during the 2014 epidemic in African nations died.

Unlike Ebola, Zika has few consequences for most infected adults but, as noted above, has serious consequences for some adults and devastating consequences for fetuses carried by women infected during pregnancy. Dr. Anthony Fauci,
director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, described Zika as “not scary at all” for most people but “overwhelmingly catastrophic for pregnant women and their fetuses.” Differences in Congress’s responses to Ebola and Zika may in part reflect a difference in the intensity of concern about a condition that can harm anyone and a condition that is devastating, but, as a general matter, mainly for women and babies. In news media photos, Zika was presented, in sharp contrast with images of Ebola, as a serious disability affecting newborn babies, not a terrifying disease.

Further, the mode through which the two conditions are transmitted differs, which has probably shaped public attitudes. News reports about Ebola in 2014 led the public to fear it as highly contagious. That is not the case. The Ebola virus is not airborne and does not threaten to infect someone in the house or room with an Ebola patient unless that person comes in contact with the patient’s body fluids. However, Ebola is highly infectious. Those who come in contact with the body fluids (blood, urine, feces, semen, and saliva) of an Ebola patient with symptoms of the disease are at significant risk of contracting Ebola. Zika, by comparison, is less easily transmitted from person to person since the primary mode for Zika’s transmission is a mosquito bite. Media photos of babies born with microcephaly, however disturbing, did not threaten people with the terror of an epidemic’s developing through person-to-person contact.

Many Americans feared Ebola in 2014 and favored federal funding to control or eradicate the illness. By comparison, by the start of the summer of 2016, only about one-third of the American public expressed significant concern about Ebola. That concern waned as the threat of an immediate Ebola epidemic affecting the United States appeared to dim, even though Ebola cases continued to appear in several African countries.

The dramatic contrast in media images of the two conditions may prove to have been the most important factor that shaped divergent public attitudes toward Ebola and Zika, respectively. Media photos of responses to Ebola in the United States in 2014 resembled war scenes. Emergency workers, clad in hazmat suits, transported terribly ill people out of their homes on stretchers. Images from Africa further depicted very ill people, lying unattended on the ground, sometimes surrounded by healthcare workers in body suits, sometimes lying alone outdoors. Images of Zika featured mothers lovingly holding newborn babies with small heads. Ebola’s images were far more frightening. Images of Zika were sad but suggested compassion and love. The impact of each set of images, taken as a whole, differs markedly from that of the other. Moreover, it is possible that some part of the difference in Congress and the public’s responses to Ebola and to Zika, respectively, reflect the fact that Ebola can strike and seriously sicken or even kill anyone, but Zika is particularly horrendous for a sub-population of women and their children.

It is reasonable to suggest that differences in the nation’s political responses generally between 2014 and 2016 as well as differences between the public’s perception of Ebola and its perception of Zika explain the dramatic difference in congressional responses to the administration’s request for Ebola funding in 2014 and for Zika funding in 2016. Whatever the explanations, however, the difference in response was undeniable. Congress funded efforts to combat Ebola quickly and generously. In contrast, by July of 2016, Congress had replaced any serious effort to fund Zika responses with factional disagreements.

Responses from Physicians, Federal Agencies, and States

In April 2016, over 75 medical, research, pharmaceutical, public health and health advocacy groups signed a letter to congressional leaders in both Houses of Congress encouraging lawmakers to appropriate “emergency supplemental funding to prepare for and respond to the Zika virus here in the United States.” The letter explained:

If we take immediate action, we may be able to dramatically slow the spread of Zika, giving scientists time to develop and test a vaccine. Without action, however, we fear the number of newborns born with debilitating birth defects will only continue to rise. In addition to the human toll on children and families, the CDC estimates that the average lifetime cost of caring for each child born with microcephaly will likely be millions of dollars per child.

Two months later, in June 2016, the American Medical Association (“AMA”), anxious that Congress appropriate funding for Zika before the advent of local transmission but concerned about re-directing funding originally dedicated to other public health efforts, suggested creation of a public health fund for HHS to rely on for responses to a variety of public health emergencies.

By the start of the summer of 2016, several federal agencies filled some part of the gap left by Congress’s failure to appropriate Zika funds. The CDC allocated $85 million to Zika control efforts and issued a Zika “Interim Response Plan.” The agency proposed sending CDC Emergency Response Teams to states that requested help combatting locally-transmitted Zika should the mosquito arrive in the continental United continued on page 8
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States. In addition, reflecting a Food and Drug Administration policy (presented in early 2016), the CDC recommended that blood donations not come from areas with active Zika transmission and that those who traveled to areas with Zika not donate blood.159

In late May 2016, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (“CMS”) provided for state Medicaid programs to cover specific services related to preventing or responding to Zika.160 This included Medicaid reimbursement for certain mosquito repellents “when prescribed by an authorized health professional.”161 CMS has also stressed the importance of “family planning counseling” and contraception, including “barrier method contraceptives” that may prevent sexual transmission of the virus, as well as contraception to avoid pregnancy for those exposed, or likely to be exposed, to Zika.162 Additionally, CMS provided for states’ Medicaid programs to cover testing for Zika infection and treatment for those with the condition.163 It also required states to “cover all medically necessary diagnostic services” to detect infection with the virus “including diagnosis of microcephaly and other birth defects without limit” to those under 21 years of age.164

These responses are important. However, without more, they are inadequate.

By the early summer, states at particular risk for local transmission of the virus during the summer months also began to respond to the threat with state funding. Local public health officials in many states worked to educate their populations about Zika.165 However, resources dedicated to Zika control varied significantly from state to state and from locality to locality.166 Florida, for instance, able to provide funding at a level that could make a significant difference, implemented a mosquito control program.167 Florida’s Governor, Rick Scott, relied on the Governor’s emergency powers to allocate over $26 million for mosquito control, the purchase and distribution of kits to prevent Zika infection, and other efforts.168 At the time, 40 pregnant women in Florida (none infected by local mosquitoes) had tested positive for the Zika virus. New York City similarly implemented a program aimed at mosquito control.169

Texas dedicated state funds to increase the capacity of laboratories that test for the virus, to control the mosquito population, for surveillance of cases, and to educate the public.170 The state feared that if the CDC did not allocate additional funds to the state’s efforts, efforts to combat Zika in Texas would wither.171 This was especially troubling since Texas is among the states at highest risk for local transmission of the virus.172

In other states with more limited resources, local authorities distributed coloring books that informed people about the risks posed by mosquitoes and offered advice on how best to limit mosquito exposure.173 Such efforts – recommendations, for instance, that people use mosquito repellent and wear long sleeves174 – are important but are unlikely to provide an adequate response should Zika-infected mosquitoes spread in the United States.

Specific Populations and Additional Concerns About Zika: Immigrants, Low-Income Women of Child-Bearing Age, and Reproduction

Zika’s spread in the continental United States could raise particularly difficult funding challenges for patients without health insurance, especially undocumented immigrants and some adults in states that have not expanded their Medicaid programs. Moreover, in many states, documented immigrants must wait for five years before becoming eligible for Medicaid coverage.175 These issues raise significant implications for health and frame the importance of Congress’s displacing polarizing politics in order to reach an accord on Zika funding.

It is essential that all people, including the uninsured population, have access to Zika screening, vaccination, and treatment, if and when they are developed, and to monitoring of pregnant women and fetuses as well as infants who were affected by the virus in utero. Furthermore, the risk of Zika exposure may increase for low-income families who may not be able to afford air-conditioning or even house screen.176 Without funding, these needs, as well as many others created by the Zika threat, cannot be met.

Public health professionals and physicians in New York City have expressed particular concern about immigrants from Latin American and Caribbean nations who spend time in their home countries and then return to the United States.177 Public hospitals and clinics in New York City have few extra resources; significant bureaucracy attends every call for a Zika test in the city, and physicians often do not recommend Zika testing, even for pregnant women.178 That will likely change if and when the Zika mosquito spreads more widely in the continental United States.179

More particularly, low-income women and women who oppose the use of contraception (usually for religious reasons) will face especially difficult issues should Zika mosquitoes appear more widely in the continental United States. Until a vaccine or treatment for Zika becomes available, mosquito control and avoidance of reproduction are central components.
of the nation’s response to the virus. In other nations, this has raised very difficult questions, especially in places in which the Catholic Church continues to play a significant role in national life and, more particularly, in a population’s individual reproductive decisions.\textsuperscript{180}

Broadly, the reproductive implications of Zika raise questions about access to reproductive care, privacy, and other reproductive rights. The experience in Latin America provides a provocative illustration that warrants attention in the United States, despite significant differences. Abortion is banned or limited in the vast majority of Latin American nations.\textsuperscript{181} Yet after international organizations and some nations in Latin America began to alert people to the dangers that Zika poses to fetuses, online purchases of medications that induce abortion rose significantly.\textsuperscript{182} Researchers found an increase in online requests to Women on Web for aborticants of between 36 and 108 percent over baseline request numbers\textsuperscript{183} in Latin American nations with local Zika transmission from mosquitoes, restrictions on abortion, and national advisories about the risks to pregnant women and their fetuses of Zika exposure.\textsuperscript{184} This research did not identify, and thus did not account for, abortions performed illegally through other methods, which are almost always less safe.\textsuperscript{185} Similar patterns could appear in the United States, especially in states that make it difficult to get abortions should Zika-carrying mosquitoes spread here.

Providing easily affordable contraception for everyone in the United States, even those without healthcare coverage, may become a basic component of Zika control should Zika-carrying mosquitoes spread in the continental United States. In the spring of 2016, the CDC recommended that women with symptoms of Zika infection try not to get pregnant for eight weeks after symptoms first appear; those who have travelled to areas with Zika-infected mosquitoes or women who have sexual relations with men who traveled to such places should also postpone pregnancy for eight weeks.\textsuperscript{186} Further, the CDC has recommended that couples in which the man has had a Zika infection postpone pregnancy for “at least 6 months.”\textsuperscript{187} The situation for those living in areas with Zika-infected mosquitoes is far more worrisome and CDC guidance is less certain.\textsuperscript{188} The agency suggested that those in Zika-infected areas talk with healthcare professionals and has described individual decisions about how best to respond as “very complex [and] deeply personal.”\textsuperscript{189}

In the United States, the use of contraception is a constitutional right.\textsuperscript{190} However, exercising that right depends on contraceptive medications and devices being available and affordable.\textsuperscript{191} For the most part, that is the case in the United States, but misperceptions about access to contraceptive care may limit its use, especially by poor women.\textsuperscript{192} Such misperceptions may have followed the publicity that attended two Supreme Court cases involving the contraceptive mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (“PPACA”), both decided between 2014 and 2016.\textsuperscript{193}

Among the states most likely to experience the spread of Zika-infected mosquitoes, neither Florida nor Texas has expanded its Medicaid program under PPACA.\textsuperscript{194} This is especially problematic for women seeking coverage for medical, including reproductive, services and who are above the income level for Medicaid but below that needed to apply for subsidies offsetting the cost of participation in a state exchange.\textsuperscript{195} Although there are some healthcare options for such women, including health department clinics, those facilities may not have adequate resources to respond to women seeking contraception should Zika-infected mosquitoes appear in the state.\textsuperscript{196}

Of course, it is possible to avoid pregnancy without contraception if sexual relations are avoided. However, that is a harsh option that many couples are likely not to follow. Thus contraception becomes essential for those accepting the CDC’s advice on pregnancy postponement. Puerto Rico, which had seen more than 10,000 cases of Zika infection among its population by mid-August 2016, is illustrative.\textsuperscript{197} The CDC reports that about 66 percent of pregnancies in Puerto Rico are not intended.\textsuperscript{198} Noting that about 138,000 women living in Puerto Rico who do not wish to become pregnant are not using contraception, the CDC recommended broadened educational programs about Zika and about effective contraception.\textsuperscript{199}

Efforts by states to limit access to abortion present another arena of factious politics that may have a significant impact on the nation’s ability to confront Zika’s threat to pregnant women and fetuses. For instance, as of spring 2016, 10 states had passed laws that limit coverage for abortion, even in private plans, including plans presented on the states’ health insurance exchanges.\textsuperscript{200} More generally, almost one-third of the laws limiting abortion promulgated since the U.S. Supreme Court granted a limited right to abortion in \textit{Roe v. Wade}\textsuperscript{201} were passed within the last half-dozen years.\textsuperscript{202}

The spread of Zika also creates challenges regarding the protection of privacy. The possibility of mandated testing or screening of fetuses and infants and of testing pregnant women and fetal tissue raises troubling privacy questions. Should such testing and screening not be performed, however, the risk to pregnant women and fetuses could increase significantly. Failure to test and screen could even create liability should infants be born with disabilities, including microcephaly.\textsuperscript{203}

\textit{continued on page 10}
Conclusion

Over time, the threat of Zika may dim – as the Ebola threat has, at least for the moment. But that has not yet occurred. In fact, as noted above, by late July 2016, the threat had increased with the appearance of Zika-infected mosquitoes in an area close to downtown Miami.204 The CDC issued an unprecedented travel advisory in recommending that pregnant women not travel to an area within the continental United States.205 At present, the geographic area of concern is narrow, but that could change quickly.206 In any event, that Zika can pose significant risks is apparent. Congress’s readiness to displace emergency preparedness with political gamesmanship and displays of partisan politics reflects serious dysfunction with potentially untoward consequences for millions of people, especially those who are infected in utero and their families.

The immediate risks are significant. Without federal funding, the challenge of responding to Zika cannot adequately be met. In early August 2016, HHS Secretary Burwell announced that work on a promising Zika vaccine will be halted if funding is not soon made available.207 As important, Congress’s responses suggest a deeply troubling precedent of permitting sectarian politics to preclude action necessary to protect the nation’s health and welfare. Zika will not be the last novel and serious health threat to face the nation. The capacity of the government to respond quickly and competently to such threats is essential to population health.
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